



Buenos Aires, 15th December, 2018

FORMAL SUBMISSION

Initial views on the aspects of the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

Fundación Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (FARN), Argentina

Contact: Ana Di Pangracio adipangracio@farn.org.ar +541148651707 ext 163.

Content

Overarching principles of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework	1
Level of ambition and targets	2
Implementation, implementation and implementation: political commitment and resources ..	2
Human rights and good governance	4
Ecosystems	4
Communication and outreach	5
To be avoided	6

Overarching principles of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

- Full recognition of planetary boundaries and intergenerational perspective;
- The Aichi Targets, as a minimum standard (principle of non-regression). Improved implementation and political will to halt biodiversity loss;
- Take full account of the three objectives of the CBD and of its Protocols. Include targets on biosafety and access to genetic resources and benefit sharing;
- Enshrine a rights-based approach. Embrace cultural diversity. Include targets on human rights and gender;
- Meaningful involvement and recognition of the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity;
- Full integration and alignment with Rio Conventions; other biodiversity-related conventions (CITES, CMS, Ramsar and ITPGR); processes and frameworks such as the SDG and the UN Forum on Forests; and human rights treaties for synergetic actions;
- Full recognition of the Rio Declaration 1992 and its principles, particularly the prevention principle, the precautionary principle, and principle 10 on access rights in environmental matters;
- A compliance mechanism and means for holding Parties accountable;

- Periodical reviews of national actions for increasing the ambition and the sense of responsibility and accountability of Parties, accompanied by consultations of NGO, indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth and rights holders for their effective and meaningful participation in these processes;
- A plan to stop the underlying drivers of biodiversity loss and degradation, particularly agribusiness and infrastructure;
- Shift away from the current production and consumption patterns as the real transformative change.

Level of ambition and targets

The post-2020 framework needs to build on the Aichi Targets, as a minimum standard. Almost all Aichi Targets are still relevant for the realization of the 2050 vision “to live in harmony with nature”. Therefore, regression cannot be admitted. On the contrary, it is necessary to build on what has been already agreed, take note of lessons learned and increase ambition; while at the same time delivering a framework that is realistic and achievable.

Targets should therefore be: ambitious; SMART, realistic; clear; simple; science and evidence-based (including traditional and local knowledge), accompanied by necessary additional guidance and milestones; and just a few, and some new appropriate, and opportunely determined indicators. There is also room for improving inter-linkages between targets, that is how achieving some contributes to the realization of others.

Implementation, implementation and implementation: political commitment and resources

Despite efforts and continued progress made, biodiversity continues to decline at an alarming rate. Most of Aichi Targets will not be achieved. But rather than rooted in the targets and the strategic plan themselves, deficiencies lie on implementation, at all levels.

Setting tools for ensuring improved implementation has to be a priority of the post-2020 framework.

In this sense, one aspect is the strengthening of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs). Despite the several deficiencies they have presented, NBSAPs are fundamental, and the main tool for the implementation of the CBD at the national level. The post-2020 framework should foresee the strengthening of NBSAPs allowing periodical reviews so that their accuracy can be improved. This could increase the sense of responsibility, ambition, accountability of Parties while ensuring national targets make meaningful contributions and fully respect global ones; as well as opportunely tackling gaps, barriers, obstacles, etc. that might arise. All this would contribute to ensuring transparency and proper communication within the framework of NBSAPs, but also the implementation of the post-2020 strategic plan and the whole CBD process.

On another hand, accountability around the Aichi Targets has not been sufficient. In addition to the periodical reviews of NBSAPs, the post-2020 framework should set up a compliance mechanism. All of civil society need means for effectively holding Parties accountable, otherwise we risk developing a new strategic framework for them to simply ignore it, again. There is therefore a need to empower people and groups on the ground by setting up mechanisms through which they could submit their concerns, views, and bring to light insufficient actions or

failure to comply with agreed global commitments to save biodiversity, thus pushing for effective implementation.

Resource mobilization

Parties were well aware, from the very beginning, that the achievement of the Aichi Targets needed extensive resource mobilization as well as the end of incentives harmful to nature, especially in the agricultural sector.

The post-2020 framework needs an effective and comprehensive resource mobilization strategy in accordance with reigning needs. The GEF and contributions from developed nations are crucial. Synergies with resource mobilization strategies from Rio Conventions and other biodiversity-related treaties are also relevant for a better use of limited funding. Resource mobilization from diverse global, national and local sources, including innovative sources, efforts from international organizations and NGOs and in-kind contributions from indigenous peoples and local communities are welcome. In this line, Parties must create an enabling policy, legal and regulatory environment for this extensive resource mobilization, with the corresponding socio-environmental safeguards to ensure equity in the distribution of resources, full respect of environmental and human rights, and avoid offsetting from the corporate power, in line with relevant decisions and guidelines of the CBD.

But above all, phasing out perverse subsidies constitutes the heart of resource mobilization for halting biodiversity loss. Ensuring full elimination (100%) and redirection of incentives harmful to biodiversity by 2030 is of high relevance. Reports have indicated that most countries have not shown advancements on Aichi Target 3 nor have they identified perverse incentives in order to eliminate them and start investing in actions to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

It is clear developed countries have the duty and responsibility to make substantial financial contributions to help developing nations tackle the biodiversity crisis they face. However, developing countries must also take responsibility, and take note they can obtain genuine resources to save nature by putting an end to the wide range of incentives harmful to biodiversity that they provide every year.

Biodiversity cannot be saved if both the developed and developing world continue to provide perverse incentives that are fuelling biodiversity loss. Existing public support to actions towards biodiversity conservation, sustainable use and restoration, at all levels, cannot make a real and sustained difference if harmful incentives are not eliminated in a 100 per cent in the short term.

Finally, the lack of mainstreaming is also a relevant aspect in this regard, although FARN stands out that mainstreaming cannot be a synonym of increasing power asymmetries within the CBD. The post-2020 framework needs to responsibly address this issue, to prevent corporate power from taking over the CBD process; as well as foresee means for addressing the well-known weakness of environment authorities in government before those of industry, mining, agriculture and fisheries, infrastructure, development, etc. which also relates to the lack of political will. The CBD needs to call for a shift in the balance of power within governments so that environment is no longer the weakest element, but has real power to limit the activities of other sectors towards sustainable development. A target on integrating the post-2020 framework to other national plans such as those of the UNFCCC, UNCCD and SDG could help avoiding siloed approaches, trigger much needed synergies among all plans, and make the best use out of the typically limited financial and human resources.

Human rights and good governance

Good governance, rule of law, transparency, accountability and full respect of human rights are fundamental for achieving biodiversity targets.

The post-2020 framework must enshrine a rights-based approach and include specific targets on human rights and gender.

The new global framework needs to expressly refer the connection between [biodiversity and human rights](#) as stated on the work of the [UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and the Environment](#), and its work on human rights and environmental defenders as well as the [right to a safe, clean and healthy environment as a human right](#).

Moreover, this framework needs to contribute to tackling the worrying reality of those individuals working fiercely every day, often risking their lives, to defend biodiversity and human rights of themselves and their communities. In this line, the [Escazú Agreement on Principle 10 in Latin America and the Caribbean](#), the first treaty in history to include specific provisions to protect environmental defenders, needs to be fully considered and addressed in the rationale and argumentation of the post-2020 framework.

Women are rights holders that rely on healthy ecosystems and safeguard biodiversity. The post-2020 framework must build on the Gender Plan of Action 2015-2020 of the CBD and take it further, including specific measures to support women's increased involvement within its framework. In most cases women are only seen as vulnerable groups or groups that need awareness raising. What women need is their recognition as "agents of change" if we expect to have an inclusive post-2020 framework. Consequently, Parties ought to have the duty to engage and support women in developing and implementing gender-responsive measures within a new strategic plan.

Furthermore, the post-2020 biodiversity framework should also have a much stronger emphasis on: policy measures to support community conservation as it has proven to be highly effective to conserve and restore biodiversity; land tenure rights; free prior and informed consent (including the right to say no to unwanted developments); collective actions; traditional knowledge; and customary sustainable use practices.

It should also lead to the set-up of governance and support systems for the formal recognition of Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures (OECMs), including Indigenous and Conserved Communities Areas (ICCAs), in national legislations, ensuring their protection from destructive initiatives.

Ecosystems

The post-2020 framework needs to reinforce action towards the conservation and sustainable use of forests; and to further highlight the value of restoration, though restoration measures cannot be a replacement that allows for destruction.

Aichi Target 11 will most likely be achieved, at least in terms of percentages. Action on protected areas should aim to, at least, tripling those percentages by 2030, and better address: location of protected areas (where they are most needed, and not just easy to declare), implementation, representativeness, connection, and concerns derived from large-scale extractive projects in coastal and oceanic areas. Special reference to the plastics crisis, and its impact on inner waters, coasts and oceans should be included.

The state of emergency of wetlands all around the world, clearly stated by the [Global Wetland Outlook](#), needs to be expressly addressed by the post-2020 framework with a specific target. 35% of wetlands, where data is available, have been lost since 1970, at a rate three times greater than that of forests. These precious ecosystems, still highly neglected, and home to rich biodiversity and diverse livelihoods, are declining fast right before our eyes.

The post-2020 framework also needs to determine concrete action towards a change in production and consumption policies and patterns. Unsustainable food systems derived from the reigning agribusiness model must come to an end. It not only endangers agrodiversity, soil biodiversity, causing land degradation and desertification, but it also harms the health of humans and wildlife due to the abusive use of agrochemicals. In this sense, the post-2020 framework of the CBD should include an express target on a prompt shift towards agroecology. An improved, more efficient and sustainable use of land and the oceans, and an end to the culture of disposability could help conserve biodiversity and restore nature, contributing to targets set within the framework of the UNCCD and UNFCCC as well.

Communication and outreach

There is consensus among a wide range of actors about the need to enshrine biodiversity as highly as possible in the agenda, and communications and outreach play a decisive role to achieve this.

The post-2020 framework requires a coherent, comprehensive and opportune communication and outreach strategy, prepared with the support of experts, to promote awareness of, and effective engagement in the development and implementation of the new biodiversity framework. In this process broad civil society involvement has to be ensured.

Biodiversity could be thought as part of the “leave no one behind” of the SDG, in the sense of giving a voice to those who do not have it, species and ecosystems, and everything it depends on them. In this line, messages related to the fact that without nature human survival is at risk are of great relevance for touching everybody’s hearts, and could be “catchy” and popular in communicational terms, while relating to the 2050 vision “living in harmony with nature”.

Further work on getting people closer to nature is important, and it could be a target in itself. Besides the inclusion of environmental education in school curricula, actions like practical outings with children and adolescents as for them to connect with nature -with special focus on those from vulnerable backgrounds- are relevant. Youth is a big part of the solution to the environmental crisis. FARN adheres to the work and thoughts of [Nature for All](#) in this sense.

Addressing biodiversity loss has so far lacked the much-needed political will from CBD Parties. Successful implementation needs political commitment at the highest level and synergetic work among diverse government agencies. Some important opportunities to build political momentum are: IPBES-7 plenary session where the global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services will be presented; IUCN World Conservation Congress in 2020 and the regional forums towards the global congress; UN General Assemblies and the High-Level Political Forums on Sustainable Development; COPs of Rio Conventions and other biodiversity-related treaties; G20 and G7 Summits; regional workshops for developing the post-2020 framework; meetings within the framework of NBSAPs; special events of NGOs, international organizations, indigenous peoples and local communities; celebrations on international days like the ones of the environment, wetlands, forests, climate change, soils, migratory birds, oceans; food; cities; etc.; among others.

To be avoided

Finally, FARN states that the post- 2020 global biodiversity framework needs to specially avoid:

- Biodiversity offsetting as the rule. Offsetting should be an exception, not the rule. FARN adheres to the [IUCN policy](#) on this matter.
- False solutions that aim at the financialization of nature, reducing ecosystems to the services they provide;
- Rewilding, opting for ecosystem restoration instead;
- Approaches such as “Half-Earth” or similar ones. We need integral approaches to ensure the one planet we share with wildlife and ecosystems to stay healthy as a whole;
- A “Paris” approach to biodiversity with voluntary commitments. Voluntary commitments will not save biodiversity. The Paris Agreement should not be a role model for the new biodiversity framework. The CBD needs to set aside that sort of “inferiority syndrome” it shows before the UNFCCC, and rather feel proud and fully embrace its achievements which include, no more and no less, than two legally binding protocols and a supplementary one.