

SUBMISSION

In response to the notification requesting views on the preparation, scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

Notification Ref.: SCBD/OES/DC/RH/KNM/87538

Convention on Biological Diversity
Dr. Cristiana Paşca Palmer
Executive Secretary
413 Rue Saint-Jacques Ouest, Suite 800
Montreal, Quebec
Canada H2Y 1N9

15 December 2018

Dear Dr. Paşca Palmer,

This is a submission by the ICCA Consortium, an international association dedicated to promoting appropriate recognition of and support to territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities (abbreviated as “**ICCAs—Territories of Life**”) at the local, national, regional and global levels. As of November 2018, the ICCA Consortium is comprised of 140 Members (indigenous peoples’ and community-based organisations and federations, as well as civil society organisations working closely with indigenous peoples and local communities) and 317 Honorary members (individuals with relevant concerns and expertise) in 80 countries.

This submission responds to most aspects of the “Preliminary synthesis and analysis of views on the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework” (CBD/COP/14/INF/16) and includes similar headings.

Some of our Members and Honorary members participate in the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, CBD Alliance, Women’s Caucus and/or Global Youth Biodiversity Network. As such, we also support the separate submissions of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, Indigenous Women’s Biodiversity Network and Forest Peoples Programme (a Member of the ICCA Consortium) and of the Global Forest Coalition (a Member of the ICCA Consortium).

Thank you for the opportunity to provide inputs to this important process, and please do not hesitate to contact us for any clarifications. We look forward to further contributing actively to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including through official regional and global workshops, events organised by third parties, and online consultations and submissions.



Holly Jonas, LLM (holly@iccaconsortium.org)
International Policy Coordinator, ICCA Consortium

1. Context and General Approach

Recent high profile reports have underscored how little time we have left to address the current biodiversity and climate crises,ⁱ and how interlinked these are with human rights and particularly the rights of Indigenous peoples and local communities.ⁱⁱ These crises were created by certain worldviews and economic and political systems, and we cannot address them through business as usual ‘sustained economic growth’ or technological quick fixes. Above all, we need to fundamentally transform these flawed worldviews and broken systems in order to re-establish our relationship as a species with our one and only Mother Earth and all of our fellow inhabitants. More than anyone else, Indigenous peoples and local communities with strong connections to their collective territories and areas have the wisdom and demonstrate the values and systemic alternatives that can enable us to survive and thrive in harmony with Mother Earth. The rest of the world has to listen to our sisters and brothers and take urgent action for systemic change.

Three of the most important substantive issues that will elicit the ‘biggest gains’ for biodiversity and need to be systematically addressed in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework are:

- (a) **Appropriately recognising and supporting** Indigenous peoples and local communities and their efforts to govern, manage, protect and conserve their **collective Territories of Life** on their own terms, including through self-determined governance institutions, customary laws and protocols, and systems of Indigenous and local knowledge and customary sustainable use;
- (b) **Halting industrial drivers of biodiversity loss**, including by eliminating perverse investments and incentives that are harmful for biodiversity; and
- (c) **Preventing and prohibiting attacks** on the communities, organisations and individuals who defend biodiversity and Territories of Life against threats.

In Section 5 below, we propose specific targets and potential indicators and sources of data to (at least in part) address these issues.



2. Ambition of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

We agree with the points on the ambition of the post-2020 framework in the “Preliminary synthesis and analysis of views” (CBD/COP/14/INF/16), i.e. that it “should be ambitious and support the transformational changes needed to realize the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity. In particular, the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should serve as a universal framework for action on biodiversity and foster strong ownership and strong support for its implementation” (para. 5).

The CBD is a multilateral agreement, with state governments as the only Parties. However, **State Parties are not the only actors** who contribute to implementation of the CBD and the Strategic Plan. Indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth, civil society organisations and everyday citizens are contributing hugely to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, but these efforts are largely invisible, undocumented and unrecognised. If the level of ambition is left only to Parties and related political pressures, it is likely to be much lower than what is needed to truly address the biodiversity crisis. **Rights-holders** such as Indigenous peoples and local communities have to be involved in the process of determining the level of ambition.

Some organisations and Parties are proposing a system of voluntary commitments and ‘nationally determined contributions’ akin to the UNFCCC process that eventually led to the Paris Agreement. However, there is widespread acknowledgment that the Paris Agreement is nowhere near sufficient to address climate breakdown, so there are fundamental questions about the effectiveness of this approach. Voluntary commitments by State Parties will not be sufficient to address our biodiversity crisis either. We agree that **much more political will and ambition needs to be mobilised** – and quickly. However, we need to distinguish clearly between different actors and the nature of their commitments and obligations. As a binding treaty, State Parties to the CBD are legally obliged as duty-bearers to meet their commitments. This also includes binding regulation of the private sector according to the minimum standards of international law.

In contrast, ambitious voluntary commitments from the grassroots such as COICA’s recent announcement of a proposed “sacred corridor of life and culture”ⁱⁱⁱ can **inspire and catalyse additional action**, building **public awareness** and **political pressure** for binding commitments of State Parties. In this regard, self-determined voluntary commitments made by Indigenous peoples and local communities, youth, women, civil society organisations and everyday citizens should be supported and tracked as part of the post-2020 process.

5. *Recommend*, recognizing the importance of local actions and solutions, the full and effective involvement and participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, in particular women and youth, to ensure that the links between Nature and Culture, traditional territories – the territories of life- and the cosmological vision of the indigenous peoples and local communities are considered in the development of the Post 2020 Biodiversity Framework;

Operational para. 5 of the Sharm El-Sheikh Declaration on Nature and Culture conveys strong support for Indigenous peoples and local communities in the development of the post-2020 biodiversity framework.

As agreed at COP14, the process to develop the post-2020 framework must be inclusive and participatory (among other things). The more **inclusive, participatory and representative** it is – particularly of the people who are most closely connected to and dependent on biodiversity – the better the outcome will be, and the more engaged and invested people from all walks of life will be in ensuring it is actually implemented. We urge Parties, the CBD Secretariat, donors and large international NGOs to make an extra effort in their respective roles to ensure people, communities and organisations from the grassroots and frontlines have the space and time to be appropriately included and represented in this process.

3. Relationship between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, the current Strategic Plan and other relevant processes

It is clear that we still have a long way to go to achieve the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, with less than two years remaining to do so. As we begin the process to develop the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, we must not abandon the current Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets. We urge States and all other actors to **intensify efforts to fully and effectively implement** the current Plan alongside an inclusive and participatory process to develop the post-2020 framework. This should also be coupled with significant efforts to establish clear **baselines by 2020** for proposed targets and indicators (both qualitative and quantitative and using multiple forms of evidence and knowledge) for the post-2020 framework.

Biodiversity is fundamental to achieving other international commitments on sustainable development, climate change, land and soil degradation, food security, and more. Certain aspects of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development are positive, but it contains many internal contradictions and inconsistencies and too many Goals and Targets ignore the role of biodiversity. We in the CBD community need to be **stronger in our positioning and communication of the central importance of biodiversity** to sustainable development more broadly and addressing climate breakdown, and push for more ambitious goals, targets and implementation of commitments in relevant international processes.

We agree that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework “should not be less ambitious than... the commitments” of other multilateral environmental agreements (CBD/COP/14/INF/16, para. 7). This includes the CBD itself. The **CBD is a binding treaty** and already states most of the core issues that still remain to be addressed in practice. We should not try to reinvent the wheel, but use the opportunity of developing the post-2020 framework to **identify and prioritise the most important articles and decisions in the Convention for implementation in our present-day context**. The post-2020 framework must address all three of the Convention’s objectives: “the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources” (Article 1, CBD).

We should also draw on recent initiatives such as the Sharm El-Sheikh Declaration on Nature and Culture^{iv}, which was the formal conclusion of the Nature and Culture Summit held from 22-24 November 2018 in parallel with COP14. This submission aligns strongly with the Declaration and specific provisions will be included throughout.



4. Elements of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework

We agree with suggestions to have an “actionable” and inspirational mission statement and to set targets and indicators for the period between 2020-2030, serving as a stepping-stone towards the 2050 Vision (CBD/COP/14/INF/16, paras. 10-11).

We propose a focus on **key principles** to guide the development of the post-2020 framework. These include: (1) key principles of international environmental law; and (2) other crosscutting principles concerning good governance and human rights, including women’s rights. We propose that these principles are **integrated throughout the post-2020 framework and/or embodied in specific goals, targets and indicators as a necessary part of the ‘transformational change’ called for by many.**

4.1. Key principles and duties of States under international environmental law^v

- Prevention of transboundary harm, which has particular implications for the activities of multinational enterprises that are harmful for biodiversity;
- Precautionary approach when taking decisions that may harm the environment, irrespective of the absence of scientific certainty as to the existence or extent of such risk;
- ‘Polluter pays’ principle, i.e., states are required to not only take measures against pollution and other harms but also cooperate on liability regimes;
- Environmental democracy, including access to information, participation in decision-making and access to environmental justice;
- Cooperation in good faith and in a spirit of global partnership for the conservation, protection and restoration of the integrity of the Earth’s ecosystems;
- Right to a clean and healthy environment;
- Sustainable development, commonly understood as development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs;
- Common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, i.e., countries that have contributed more to biodiversity loss have greater responsibility to address the issues; and
- Non-regression and progression, reflecting highest possible ambitions.

4.2. Other key principles

- Good governance and justice, including effective, inclusive, equitable, transparent, accountable and democratic institutions and rule of law (including rule of environmental law) and combatting corruption;
- Human rights, the realisation of which is essential to ensuring a healthy environment, and vice versa. This includes both procedural and substantive rights as well as both individual and collective rights, including the right of Indigenous peoples to self-determination and to give or withhold free, prior and informed consent for any activities that may affect them and all other rights stated in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples;
- Full and effective participation of rights-holders, particularly Indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth and other marginalised populations, in decision-making processes that may affect them, including the right to give or withhold free, prior and informed consent;
- Fair and equitable sharing and distribution of costs and benefits;
- Recognition and celebration of the inherent connections between nature and culture and between biological and cultural diversity; and
- Diversity of worldviews, cultures, languages, knowledge systems and approaches to conservation and sustainable use, particularly of Indigenous peoples and local communities.

Acknowledging that biological and cultural diversity are not only closely linked but also mutually reinforcing, and that cultural elements are a fundamental part of the life and cosmological vision of indigenous peoples and local communities, who actively pursue an intrinsic and balanced relationship between Mother Nature, human-beings and the Universe;

Considering that approaching biological and cultural diversity separately results in diverging and even conflicting agendas, and that such dual approaches have led to varying and sometimes competing interests within the same geographic location;

Emphasising that reversing the current trends in dramatic loss of biodiversity and the weakening of cultural diversity requires innovative approaches to bridge the artificial divide between biological and cultural diversity which persists in siloed sectoral practices, institutions, policy-making, management and interpretation;

Preambular paras. of the Sharm El-Sheikh Declaration on Nature and Culture, underscoring the deep connections between biological and cultural diversity.

5. Targets

We agree that targets should be specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound (“SMART”) (CBD/COP/14/INF/16, para. 14), as long as the targets and the scientific basis and baselines for targets and indicators are based on **multiple types of knowledge and evidence**, including Indigenous and local knowledge systems as well as social sciences. Extra care needs to be taken in this regard, as inappropriately formulated targets and indicators (such as those only based on natural sciences and quantitative measures) can backfire and undermine the efforts of Indigenous peoples and communities. We need more dialogue and engagement between worldviews and knowledge systems. The targets should be coherent and consistent, and should not contain internal contradictions.

7. *Promote* a sustained dialogue between science and indigenous and local knowledge systems to provide a foundation for a new paradigm, generating the best possible knowledge and solutions for biological and cultural resilience;

10. *Promote* and further develop culturally-relevant and community-based monitoring and reporting indicators which can provide strong evidence, lead to better tracking, and enable meaningful action on the ground to address local issues and key threats;⁴

Operational paras. 7 and 10 of the Sharm El-Sheikh Declaration on Nature and Culture on knowledge systems, monitoring and reporting indicators.



Three of the most important substantive issues that will elicit the ‘biggest gains’ for biodiversity and need to be systematically addressed in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework are:

- (a) **Appropriately recognising and supporting** Indigenous peoples and local communities and their efforts to govern, manage, protect and conserve their **collective Territories of Life** on their own terms, including through self-determined governance institutions, customary laws and protocols, and systems of Indigenous and local knowledge and customary sustainable use; and
- (b) **Halting industrial drivers of biodiversity loss**, including by eliminating perverse investments and incentives that are harmful for biodiversity; and
- (c) **Preventing and prohibiting attacks** on the communities, organisations and individuals who defend biodiversity and Territories of Life against threats.

In this light, we propose the following specific suggestions for new or revised targets (we also support the proposals by IIFB, IWBNI and FPP and by GFC related to traditional knowledge, gender, and sustainable production and consumption):

5.1. Legal recognition of collective lands, waters and territories of life

Proposed target: *Appropriately and legally recognise and protect against external threats at least 50 per cent of collective lands, waters and territories of life of Indigenous peoples and local communities by 2025, and 100 per cent by 2030, in accordance with their self-determined governance systems, customary laws and community protocols, and free, prior and informed consent.*

- **Potential indicator:** *Percentage of collective lands, waters and territories under the collective legal ownership and governance of Indigenous peoples and local communities, against 2020 baselines.*
- **Potential sources of data:** *Indigenous peoples’ and local community organisations and networks, Indigenous- and community-led databases and registries, UNEP-WCMC, LandMark, Rights and Resources Initiative, World Resources Institute, etc.*

Rationale: Indigenous peoples’ territories are estimated to coincide with 80 per cent of the world’s biodiversity.^{vi} Indigenous peoples are (conservatively) estimated to manage or have customary and other tenure rights over at least 38 million square kilometres (nearly 9.4 billion acres), or more than a quarter of the world’s land surface^{vii}; some estimates go up to 50 or 60 per cent. However, Indigenous peoples and communities have formal legal ownership over only 10 per cent of the world’s land. Significant efforts are needed to secure these collective lands (and waters) – both for the custodian communities and for the biodiversity and nature within them. Supporting Indigenous peoples and communities to secure and self-strengthen their collective systems of tenure, self-governance and sustainable ways of life is fundamental to achieving the current Strategic Plan and should be front and centre in the post-2020 biodiversity framework.

21. *Calls upon Parties to accelerate the recognition of indigenous peoples' lands, waters and territories of life as a means to trigger a transformational change in the protection of biological diversity and cultural heritage, for all life on Earth.*

Operational para. 21 of the Sharm El-Sheikh Declaration on Nature and Culture calls for recognition of Indigenous peoples’ lands, waters and territories of life.

5.2. Protected areas and conserved areas

Proposed elements: We recommend retaining a strong target for area-based conservation, revising Aichi Target 11 to further strengthen it for the post-2020 framework and reflect the latest COP decisions, including by:

- Including both protected areas and conserved areas (the latter in place of ‘other effective area-based conservation measures,’^{viii} for the sake of communication and clarity) across all ecosystems, with distinct quantitative sub-targets for protected areas and for conserved areas and disaggregating data accordingly;
- Recognising all four governance types (government, private, Indigenous peoples and local communities, and shared) for both protected areas and conserved areas, as well as governance diversity, quality and vitality^{ix};
- Including an element of equity as a fundamental aspect of protected and conserved areas. For example, include “equitably governed and effectively managed and conserved” instead of “effectively and equitably managed”, with emphasis on achieving this by 2030 through implementation of existing guidance on governance and equity issues (including the COP14 decision on protected areas and OECMs); and
- Retaining elements of “ecologically representative” and “well connected”.

We are not yet in a position to propose specific numerical targets for protected areas and conserved areas, but look forward to further internal consultations and to engaging with a range of rights-holders and stakeholders on this topic.

Rationale: Much of the planet’s remaining biodiversity exists outside of protected areas. In addition, governments govern 82 per cent of reported protected areas; Indigenous peoples and communities govern less than 0.6 per cent of reported protected areas,^x despite the aforementioned significant overlap between their territories and remaining biodiversity. It is also increasingly recognised that **protected areas on their own are insufficient** to address our current biodiversity and climate crises, especially when are not equitably governed and effectively managed. Protected area systems need to be **more inclusive and equitable**: they need to be expanded to protected and conserved areas and they need to follow the many existing COP decisions on governance issues, including diverse governance types. More broadly, targets on protected and conserved areas must be closely linked to targets on halting the drivers of biodiversity loss. We need to work towards **living in harmony with the whole planet**, not only setting aside 30 or 50 per cent.

20. Calls for multi-partner strategies that aspire to a whole Earth approach equitably governed and sustainably managed with increased protection of both Nature and Culture within mosaic biocultural landscapes;

Operational para. 20 of the Sharm El-Sheikh Declaration on Nature and Culture calls for a “whole Earth” approach that is equitably governed and sustainably managed.

Aichi Target 11 is one of the most advanced in terms of implementation. Part of this is likely because of the clear quantitative elements (17 per cent and 10 per cent), which are perceived to be easier to meet and report on than qualitative elements. However, there are several other elements in Target 11 that are not sufficiently implemented or reported on. These **qualitative elements** must be further developed and addressed as part and parcel with the quantitative elements in the post-2020 framework.

It is crucially important to understand that custodians of ICCAs—Territories of Life may or may not wish to have their territories recognise and designated as either protected areas or conserved areas

and they have the right to refuse such recognition – even if their territories are effectively conserved. **Any mapping, recognition or designation of ICCAs—Territories of Life**, whether as protected areas, conserved areas, or otherwise, must be subject to the **self-identification, self-governance and free, prior and informed consent** of the relevant custodians.



5.3. Perverse investments and incentives, positive incentives and resource mobilisation

Proposed target: Divestment from 50 per cent of public and private investments and incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity by 2025 and 100 per cent by 2030 in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts. The funds redirected from perverse investments and incentives shall be used to support positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and systemic alternatives to harmful economic activities, contributing significantly to resource mobilisation.

- **Potential indicator for perverse investments and incentives:** Amount and per cent of perverse investments and incentives for the main drivers of biodiversity loss and related climate change, including industrial logging, monoculture tree and agricultural plantations, fisheries, physical infrastructure, mining, and oil and gas.
- **Potential sources of data:** OECD, IEA, IISD, etc.
- **Potential indicator for positive incentives and resource mobilisation:** Amount of money mobilised through redirected perverse investments and incentives and invested in positive incentives (e.g., appropriately recognising and supporting ICCAs—Territories of Life, supporting agro-ecology and food sovereignty systems, sharing economies and local currencies, development of alternative indicators for national health, wealth and wellbeing, etc.)
- **Potential sources of data:** OECD, GEF, Local Biodiversity Outlooks, Indigenous peoples' and community organisations and networks, etc.

Rationale: Aichi Target 3 is absolutely **essential** to achieving the Strategic Plan as a whole and should be retained and further strengthened in the post-2020 framework, especially given the very low levels of implementation to date. As long as scarce public funds are spent on incentives that are harmful for biodiversity (such as monoculture plantations, bioenergy, use of chemical inputs for food

crops, and infrastructure projects), we will continue to lose biodiversity and the effects of any positive incentives will likely be significantly undermined or even negated. Conversely, redirecting public funds from harmful incentives toward positive incentives would contribute hugely to **much-needed resource mobilisation** (Aichi Target 20) and also avoid the negative impacts caused by such harmful incentives. This is an obvious opportunity to greatly accelerate and scale up implementation.

Positive incentives should support **systemic alternatives** to the status quo (i.e., not market-based mechanisms and other measures that are inherently linked to the market economy and to sustained economic growth). A leading example is appropriately recognising and supporting indigenous peoples and local communities that conserve territories and areas (also known as “ICCAs” or **Territories of Life**) and other effective community conservation initiatives (Decision XIII/20, para. 23). Parties can refer to substantial existing analyses and guidance on how to appropriately recognise and support ICCAs—Territories of Life and other community conservation initiatives, including in specific national contexts (e.g., CBD Technical Series No. 64). When supporting positive incentives for Indigenous peoples and local communities, Parties should focus primarily on non-monetary incentives such as **legal recognition and protection** of their territories and areas and other community conservation initiatives. All forms of incentives should be co-developed with the Indigenous peoples and communities concerned and subject to their free, prior and informed consent. The COP14 decision on methodological guidance for assessing **collective actions** of Indigenous peoples and local communities should also be used.

Parties should also develop **alternative indicators** for national health, wealth and wellbeing that integrate nature and a healthy environment and decouple economic development from environmental harm (e.g., Gross National Happiness rather than Gross Domestic Product).



5.4. Systematic integration of human rights and protection of environmental human rights defenders

In addition to integrating human rights throughout the post-2020 framework (see Section 4 above), we recommend including a specific target on environmental human rights defenders. We are not yet in a position to propose specific text for this target, but look forward to further internal

consultations and to engaging with a range of rights-holders – most importantly, defenders themselves – and stakeholders to do so.

Potential sources of data: *Indigenous peoples’ and local community organisations and networks, Indigenous- and community-led databases and registries, UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Protection International, Front Line Defenders, Global Witness, International Land Coalition, IWGIA, etc.*

Rationale: We are extremely concerned about the increasing attacks (political, legal, economic, physical, mental and emotional) on Indigenous peoples and communities, organisations, movements and everyday citizens who are defending biodiversity and nature against external threats – often the direct drivers of biodiversity loss such as industrial agriculture, infrastructures and mining. They are risking their safety and lives as both the first and last lines of defence for nature, and it should be an utmost priority to ensure they are protected and can continue their work safely.

There is growing global attention paid to ‘environmental defenders’ and ‘human rights defenders’ more broadly. However, the datasets and media reports are barely scratching the surface of the actual extent of attacks and killings, and not nearly enough is being done to prevent them from happening in the first place. A key need is to focus more on collective protections (in addition to individual protections), as people primarily work collectively to defend biodiversity and nature and associated human rights.^{xi}



We welcome the adoption in early 2018 of UN Environment’s Environmental Rights Initiative, including its policy on environmental defenders, and stand ready to work together on these crucially important issues. Including a specific target on environmental human rights defenders in the post-2020 framework would bring these issues to the fore in the CBD and give defenders long overdue acknowledge of their contributions to biodiversity and nature. This proposed target is closely related to SDG 16 and to the proposed key principles (Section 4 above) on environmental democracy, good governance and human rights.

18. Explore the interplay and consequences between human rights and biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, including the human right to a healthy environment;
19. Call for concrete measures to protect environmental and human rights defenders;

Operational paras. 18-19 of the Sharm El-Sheikh Declaration on Nature and Culture recognise human rights as well as environmental and human rights defenders.

6. Implementation mechanisms and review processes

We are very concerned about the **insufficient implementation** of the current Strategic Plan to date, especially as the 2010 Strategic Plan was not met either. We agree *“there is a mismatch between the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the level of ambition and implementation of the national targets established by Parties in their new, revised or updated national biodiversity strategies and action plans and that this issue requires more attention in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework”* (CBD/COP/14/INF/16, para. 19).

We are also concerned about the increasingly voluntary language in CBD COP decisions. The CBD is a **binding** treaty and State Parties need to be held accountable to their international commitments. The voluntary peer-review process is a welcome development, but it should at least focus on national reports as well as NBSAPs, not only NBSAPs. We recommend including **stronger mechanisms for compliance** and for monitoring, reporting and verification in the post-2020 framework. Experiences from the Universal Periodic Review in the UN human rights system, and compliance and reporting mechanisms from other multilateral environmental agreements provide good lessons to learn from and adapt to the CBD context.

We also recommend including a **shorter timeframe** (e.g., within two years) in which Parties need to **adopt national targets and NBSAPs** in line with – and no less ambitious than – the post-2020 framework.



Endnotes

ⁱ Including: IPCC, 2018. *Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of to strengthening the global response the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty*. V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, H. O. Pörtner, D. Roberts, J. Skea, P.R. Shukla, A. Pirani, W. Moufouma-Okia, C. Péan, R. Pidcock, S. Connors, J. B. R. Matthews, Y. Chen, X. Zhou, M. I. Gomis, E. Lonnoy, T. Maycock, M. Tignor, T. Waterfield (eds.)

WWF, 2018. *Living Planet Report - 2018: Aiming Higher*. Grooten, M. and Almond, R.E.A.(Eds). WWF, Gland, Switzerland.

ⁱⁱ For example: Human Rights Council, 2018. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples to the 39th session of the Human Rights Council, including a thematic study on attacks against and the criminalization of indigenous human rights defenders and reflects on available prevention and protection measures. A/HRC/39/17.

UNGA, 2018. *Human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment*. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment to the 73rd session of the UN General Assembly. A/73/188.

UNGA, 2016. *Situation of human rights defenders*. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders to the 71st session of the UN General Assembly on the situation of environmental human rights defenders. A/71/281.

ⁱⁱⁱ Watts, Jonathan, 21 November 2018 "Amazon indigenous groups propose Mexico-sized 'corridor of life'." The Guardian, UK. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/nov/21/amazon-indigenous-groups-propose-mexico-sized-corridor-of-life>.

^{iv} Sharm El-Sheikh Declaration on Nature and Culture:
<https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/8b76/d85e/c62f920c5fd8c4743e5193e1/cop-14-inf-46-en.pdf>

^v Drawn from: UNGA, 2018. *Gaps in international environmental law and environment-related instruments: towards a global pact for the environment*. Report of the Secretary-General for the 73rd session of the UN General Assembly. A/73/419.

^{vi} Sobrevila, C. 2008. *The Role of Indigenous Peoples in Biodiversity Conservation: The Natural but Often Forgotten Partners*. World Bank: Washington, DC.

^{vii} Garnett, S.T. et al., 2018. "A spatial overview of the global importance of Indigenous lands for conservation." *Nature Sustainability* 1, 369-374.

^{viii} Jonas, H.D., and H.C. Jonas, 13 December 2018. "Global agreement on 'conserved areas' marks new era of conservation (commentary)." Mongabay. Available at: <https://news.mongabay.com/2018/12/global-agreement-on-conserved-areas-marks-new-era-of-conservation-commentary/>.

^{ix} Borrini-Feyerabend, G., and R. Hill, 2015. "Governance for the Conservation of Nature", Chapter 7 in: *Protected Area Governance and Management*, edited by Graeme L. Worboys et al. ANU Press, The Australian National University: Canberra, Australia. Available at: <https://www.iccaconsortium.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Governance-for-the-conservation-of-nature.pdf>.

Also see CBD COP14 decision on spatial planning, protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures.

^x UNEP-WCMC, IUCN and NGS, 2018. *Protected Planet Report 2018*. UNEP-WCMC, IUCN and NGS: Cambridge UK; Gland, Switzerland; and Washington, D.C., USA.

^{xi} Protection International, 2018. *Collective Protection of Human Rights Defenders: A collective approach to the right to defend human rights*.