



International NGO/CSO Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty  
c/o Centro Internazionale Crocevia  
Via Pigafetta 84 – 00154 Roma  
tel +39/ 06 5754091  
email: [ipc-cip@foodsovereignty.org](mailto:ipc-cip@foodsovereignty.org)  
[www.foodsovereignty.org](http://www.foodsovereignty.org)

---

## **Inputs from the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty on the post-2020 Strategy Plan for Biodiversity**

### **Initial views on the scale and scope of actions necessary to make progress towards the 2050 Vision**

It is recognized by all Parties that the Strategic Plan for Biological Diversity of 2011-2020 had no positive impacts in the conservation and implementation of biodiversity, nor at the international level, nor at the national one. In 2011, Parties recommended that it was necessary to take “urgent and effective measures to stop the loss of biodiversity”. In 2018, two years before the end of the Strategic Plan, Governments did not reach any of the objectives. Moreover, Governments are implementing measures that privatize and block biodiversity, and they are not supporting the work made in local communities, indigenous peoples, social movements, small-scale producers, pastoralists and small-scale fisheries. They are actually conserving sustainably the genetic resources, and they have a dynamic management of them, creating and developing new biodiversity.

In particular, Target 7 of the Strategic Plan, connected to the UN Sustainable Development Goal 2.4.1 on the sustainable agricultural production, has not resulted in any positive effect on biodiversity. The reason is related to the investments of Governments in the field of patentable biotechnology, which does not offer sustainable solutions and does not conserve sustainably the genetic resources. Biotechnology is a false solution for the development of biodiversity. **The promotion of an agroecological system of production** could be less costly and more effective in responding the loss of biodiversity. In this sense, the IPC would like to see **more coherence in the CBD strategy**, including recommendations on biodiversity from FAO, Commission on Genetic Resources and International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources.

Target 13 on the genetic diversity of cultivated plants had no achievements at all. The industrial production system aims at reducing biodiversity to few patented genes that can increase the financial benefits of transnational enterprises. While **small-scale producers are the only ones who develop biodiversity in their fields**, they are able to increase the genetic diversity of cultivated plants, especially those culturally valuables, and adapt them to the quick changes of natural conditions, especially the climate conditions. For this reason, Governments should protect small-scale farmers and give them priority, in order to achieve target 13.

### **Possible structure of the post-2020 biodiversity framework**

- 1- **Short and medium term targets.** The idea to have a vision towards 2050 can have many benefits. However, a differentiation among short, medium and long targets can give more effectiveness to the Strategic Plan and to the actions of Governments. Short and medium terms can be agreed during the COPs and can be part of the strategy to achieve long-term targets.



International NGO/CSO Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty  
c/o Centro Internazionale Crocevia  
Via Pigafetta 84 – 00154 Roma  
tel +39/ 06 5754091  
email: [ipc-cip@foodsovereignty.org](mailto:ipc-cip@foodsovereignty.org)  
[www.foodsovereignty.org](http://www.foodsovereignty.org)

---

- 2- **Small-scale producers as positive drivers for development of biodiversity.** Agriculture is always seen as a negative driver of biodiversity. However, the conservation of traditional knowledge, the development of practices and their innovations, and an agroecological approach can develop the agricultural biodiversity and at the same time, it does not harm the wild biodiversity. The Strategic Plan 2020 should recognized the important role of small-scale fisheries, pastoralists, peasants and indigenous peoples in the development and conservation of biodiversity.
- 3- **Inclusion of Digital Sequence Information.** DSI is still a concerning issue for Parties and non-Parties. Coming from genetic resources, they promote their private appropriation through patents on “native” traits. CBD should take in consideration the effects of DSI, the development of this technique and the use of data collected from DSI. CBD should take the lead and consult other decision-making spaces in which DSI is discussed and monitor it with the Strategy Plan post-2020.
- 4- **Biennial monitoring on the effects of the Strategic Plan on short, medium and long-term objectives.** Contracting parties, international UN Agencies, civil society actors should all play a role in the monitoring activities of the Strategic Plan. Every two years a report redacted by the CBD Secretariat, build on inputs taken by all those actors, should reflect the state of world biodiversity and the effects of the Strategic Plan on Biodiversity on it. In doing so, the collaboration with FAO is fundamental, since many reports on biodiversity are released regularly.
- 5- **Connect the SDGs with the post-2020 Strategic Plan.** Sustainable Development Goals include many biodiversity issues. For this reason, a part of the post-2020 Strategic Plan should take care of align the new targets with the SDGs, to avoid contradictions and ambiguity at international level.
- 6- **Combat climate change.** Climate change is a negative driver for biodiversity. Therefore, the post-2020 Strategic Plan should also consider the decisions taken at the UNFCCC and at the same time give inputs to that space on the issues regarding biodiversity.

## **Views on the scope and content of the resource mobilization component of the post-2020 biodiversity framework**

In order to put in place an effective Strategy Plan for Biodiversity in post-2020, we need that financial resources are mobilized in a clever and effective way:

1. Enhance the participatory approach at national, regional and international level, guaranteeing the **participation of Civil Society Organizations** in capacity-building workshop, working groups, meetings of experts, ad hoc technical expert groups, seminars and symposiums. In general, civil society have to participate and to be listened in all decision-making spaces at all levels. This approach will ensure much more effectiveness to measures and allocation of resources.



International NGO/CSO Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty  
c/o Centro Internazionale Crocevia  
Via Pigafetta 84 – 00154 Roma  
tel +39/ 06 5754091  
email: [ipc-cip@foodsovereignty.org](mailto:ipc-cip@foodsovereignty.org)  
[www.foodsovereignty.org](http://www.foodsovereignty.org)

---

2. The **Benefit-Sharing mechanism** should allocate resources linked to targets of the post-2020 strategy plan. The funds coming from ABS should be used for allocate resources to those people and constituencies that are developing biodiversity. Following this principle, the new targets will be more achievable.
3. Ensure a **coherence** in the Strategic Plan post 2020 with FAO processes (such as the Committee on Agriculture and the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture) and with the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. In this way, the allocation of resources can implement already existing measures or processes and better the use of financial resources.