



Policy Recommendations for **CBD SBSTTA-22 and SBI-2**

July 2018



Policy Recommendations for CBD SBSTTA-22 and SBI-2

The 22nd meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA-22) and the 2nd meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI-2) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) will be held from 2-7 July and 9-13 July 2018, respectively, in Montréal, Canada. SBSTTA-22 and SBI-2 will consider issues ranging from protected areas and other conservation measures and climate change to progress in implementation of the Strategic Plan and preparation for the post-2020 biodiversity framework.

This position paper highlights key issues and identifies ways to strengthen the draft recommendations to more appropriately recognise conservation by Indigenous peoples and local communities. It draws on the recommendations and perspectives of Indigenous peoples and local communities involved in the Community Conservation Resilience Initiative (CCRI) from 2015-2017. The CCRI aims to contribute to the implementation of the CBD Aichi Targets by providing policy advice on effective and appropriate forms of support for conservation and restoration initiatives by Indigenous peoples and local communities. Coordinated by the Global Forest Coalition (GFC), the CCRI has been supporting more than 65 communities in 22 countries to assess their own conservation efforts and to identify forms of support needed to sustain and strengthen them.

For more information about this position paper and our activities at SBSTTA-22 and SBI-2, please contact:

- Simone Lovera, PhD, Executive Director, GFC: simone@globalforestcoalition.org
- Holly Jonas, Legal Team Coordinator, CCRI, GFC: holly@globalforestcoalition.org
- Mrinalini Rai, Indigenous advisor, GFC: mrinalini.rai@globalforestcoalition.org

For general information about the Community Conservation Resilience Initiative, please visit: <http://globalforestcoalition.org/resources/supporting-community-conservation/>

To access the documents referenced in this position paper, please visit:
<http://www.cbd.int/meetings/SBSTTA-22> and www.cbd.int/meetings/SBI-02

Cover page photos: Environment around Los Maklenkes Reserve, Colombia (CENSAT/GFC); Local varieties yield a good harvest in Tajikistan (Noosfera/GFC); Women from the Bambuti Babuluko Pygmy community in DRC (PIDP-KIVU/GFC); Prayer of gratitude by Rabha women before a feast, Buxa-Chilapata, India (Souparna Lahiri/GFC)

Infographic on page 7: Oliver Munnion (GFC)

Our activities have been made possible through generous support of the International Climate Initiative (IKI) of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), EU DEVCO, The Christensen Fund and the Siemenpuu Foundation. The views expressed in this document are not necessarily those of our contributors.

Supported by:



Federal Ministry
for the Environment, Nature Conservation
and Nuclear Safety

based on a decision of the German Bundestag



THE
CHRISTENSEN
FUND



SIEMENPUU
foundation

SBSTTA-22 AGENDA ITEM 6: Updated scientific assessment of progress towards selected Aichi Biodiversity Targets and options to accelerate progress

The context: According to the mid-term assessment of progress, as contained in the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, pressures on biodiversity are increasing, its status is decreasing and current actions are not yet sufficient to halt the loss of biodiversity. It concluded that none of the Aichi Targets were on track to be completely met (with the exception of Target 16 on the Nagoya Protocol) and that additional action is required to achieve the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity by 2020. To accelerate progress, we need nothing short of “transformational change in how society interacts with biodiversity” (SBSTTA/22/5, para. 26).

Relevant documents:

SBSTTA/22/5
SBSTTA/22/5/INF/10
SBSTTA/22/5/INF/23

Key issue: Global biodiversity assessments are lacking information on the contributions of Indigenous peoples and local communities

The updated scientific assessment of progress (SBSTTA/22/5) acknowledges the general lack of information related to socioeconomic issues affecting biodiversity (including Target 18) and how they can be effectively addressed. It underscores the need for more research on cultural issues and on issues concerning women and the poor and vulnerable, and greater involvement of the social sciences in assessing progress. In addition, the IPBES regional assessments identified information on the contributions of indigenous peoples and local communities to biodiversity as one of the information gaps, “which, if addressed, would improve the ability to assess biodiversity and to take more effective actions for its conservation and sustainable use” (SBSTTA/22/5, para. 20).

Indigenous peoples and local communities contribute significantly to the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of biodiversity. However, these community conservation contributions are not sufficiently represented in biodiversity assessments and reporting, partly because they are not sufficiently documented in peer-reviewed literature (SBSTTA/22/5/INF/10, para. 135).

Recommendation: Include Indigenous peoples and local communities and their knowledge in assessments and reporting on biodiversity

- We invite Parties to include the following new paragraph in the draft recommendation for the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (SBSTTA/22/5, para. 39(4)):

*“Requests the Executive Secretary and encourages Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to make use of social science literature and of assessments by Indigenous peoples and local communities, including those of the Community Conservation Resilience Initiative supported by the International Climate Initiative of the German Government, when preparing the sixth national reports, the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, and documentation related to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.”*

- In line with the draft recommendation for the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (SBSTTA/22/5, para. 39(4)), we encourage Indigenous peoples and communities to share their contributions to biodiversity and the Aichi Targets, including through the sixth national reports.

SBSTTA-22 AGENDA ITEM 7: Protected areas and other measures for enhanced conservation and management

The context: The main document for this agenda item (SBSTTA/22/6) addresses a number of issues, including: (a) voluntary guidance and information on integration of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures into wider land- and seascapes and mainstreaming them across sectors (Annex I); (b) voluntary guidance and information on effective governance models for management of protected areas, including equity (Annex II); (c) scientific and technical advice on definition, management approaches and identification of other effective area-based conservation measures (Annex III); and (d) conclusions from the Expert Workshop on Marine Protected Areas and Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 in Marine and Coastal Areas (Annex IV).

Relevant document:
SBSTTA/22/6

Key issue: Community conservation initiatives and related access and governance rights, including of women, should be respected, and the establishment and expansion of protected areas and identification of other effective area-based conservation measures must be subject to the free, prior and informed consent of Indigenous peoples and local communities

Indigenous peoples and traditional local communities, and women, are rights-holders, not mere stakeholders. They have the right to provide or withhold free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) for any activities that affect them and their territories, including any conservation-related measures and designations. In addition, there is a growing evidence base that shows how territories and areas under collective ownership, governance, management or control of Indigenous peoples and local communities can be as effective or even more effective than state protected areas at conservation and preventing deforestation.¹ However, many protected areas overlap partially or completely with Indigenous peoples' and communities' territories and areas. The establishment and expansion of protected areas without the FPIC of such communities has had many negative impacts around the world and continues to this day, with women often being hardest hit. The same could potentially happen with the identification of other effective area-based conservation measures if FPIC is not recognised and respected.

We welcome the increasing recognition that Indigenous peoples and local communities, including in particular women, contribute significantly to Aichi Target 11 through the customary sustainable use of their territories and areas and other community conservation initiatives. Some may wish to have their territories and areas 'counted' toward Aichi Target 11's quantitative targets of 17 per cent of terrestrial and 11 per cent of marine and coastal areas. However, some may not – particularly in situations where their rights have been violated in the name of conservation. Efforts to recognise territories and areas conserved by Indigenous peoples and local communities as either protected areas or other effective conservation measures under Aichi Target 11 could backfire if not done appropriately and with the FPIC and participation of the peoples and communities concerned.

Recommendations: Recognize territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities and include references to FPIC and situations of overlap between Indigenous peoples' and local communities' territories and areas and protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (Annexes I-III)

¹ See, for example: Porter-Bolland, L. *et al.*, 2012. "Community managed forests and forest protected areas: An assessment of their conservation effectiveness across the tropics." *Forest Ecology and Management*. Vol. 268: 6-17.

- We encourage Parties to add the following new text (underlined) to Section II.A, para. (g) of **Annex I** on integrating protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures into wider land- and seascapes, in the draft decision contained in SBSTTA/2/6:

“(g) Prioritize and implement measures to decrease habitat fragmentation within landscapes and seascapes and to increase connectivity and restoration, subject to the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples and local communities who may be affected by such measures, including through recognition of territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities and other community conservation initiatives, as well as the creation or expansion of ~~new~~ protected areas in accordance with the Programme of Work on Protected Areas and the identification of other effective area-based conservation measures, as well as indigenous and community conserved areas, that can serve as stepping stones between habitats...”

- We encourage Parties to add the following new text (underlined) to para. 6 (and footnote 26), para. 7 and para. 11 of **Annex II** on effective governance models, in the draft decision contained in SBSTTA/2/6:

“6. In line with decisions VII/28 and X/31, this voluntary guidance suggests steps that can be followed in relation to the recognition, support, verification and coordination, tracking, monitoring and reporting of areas voluntarily conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities, private landowners and other actors. Particularly in the case of territories and areas under the governance of indigenous peoples and local communities, including those overlapped by protected and conserved areas, such steps should only be taken with their free, prior and informed consent, and based on respect for their governance, rights, knowledge and institutions...”²⁶

²⁶ On recognizing territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities in situations of overlap with protected areas, see Decision XIII/2 and IUCN World Conservation Congress Resolution 6.030...”

“7.(f) Review and adapt the policy, legal and regulatory framework for protected and conserved areas on the basis of the opportunities identified in the assessment and in line with decision X/31 and XIII/2 to incentivize and legally recognize different governance types and fully respect the customary and formal access and governance rights of Indigenous Peoples, local communities and/or women in this respect;”

“11.(c) Appropriate procedures and policy and legislative mechanisms to recognize and accommodate customary tenure and governance systems in protected and conserved areas and associated rights, including territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples, local communities and women, especially in situations of overlap with protected and conserved areas, customary practices and customary sustainable use, in line with the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use;...”

- We encourage Parties to add the following new text (underlined) to Section D, para. 3(g) of **Annex III** on definition, management approaches and identification of other effective area-based conservation measures, in the draft decision contained in SBSTTA/2/6:

“(g) Further guidance is needed on how OECMs of indigenous peoples and local communities are recognized and supported, taking into account the role and rights of women, and how to address situations of overlap between proposed OECMs and indigenous peoples’ and local communities’ territories and areas.

SBSTTA-22 AGENDA ITEM 9: Biodiversity and climate change: ecosystem-based approaches to climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction

The context: At its thirteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to prepare voluntary guidelines for the design and effective implementation of ecosystem-based approaches to climate change adaptation (EbA) and disaster risk reduction (Eco-DRR), including information on options for “integrating knowledge, technologies, practices and efforts of indigenous peoples and local communities related to addressing and responding to climate change and impacts on the biodiversity”. In response, the key document for this item (SBSTTA/22/8) contains three sections. Section I describes the preparation of voluntary guidelines and the accompanying annex contains the draft guidelines. A technical reference group guided the development of the guidelines, which are intended to support practitioners and implementers in operationalizing EbA and Eco-DRR at project and programme levels. Section II describes activities to support implementation of EbA and Eco-DRR and Section III presents relevant updates from scientific and technical information.

Relevant document:
SBSTTA/22/8

Key issue: Indigenous peoples and local communities are not referenced in the main body of the draft decision

EbA is defined as the use of biodiversity and ecosystem services as part of an overall adaptation strategy to help people adapt to the adverse effects of climate change (Decision X/33) and Eco-DRR as sustainable management, conservation and restoration of ecosystems to reduce disaster risk, with the aim to achieve sustainable and resilient development (see CBD Technical Series No. 85). Indigenous peoples and local communities have managed variability, uncertainty and change through multigenerational histories of interaction with the ecology and environment. Traditional knowledge, resilience and coping strategies can thus form an important basis for climate change and disaster risk reduction responses. Although the voluntary guidelines contain information related to Indigenous peoples and local communities (as requested by COP13), the main body of the draft decision (Section IV of SBSTTA/22/8) related to addressing and responding to climate change and impacts on the biodiversity. The guidelines respond, however, there is no specific reference to indigenous peoples and local communities in the suggested recommendation (SBSTTA/22/8, Section IV).

Recommendation: Include explicit reference to Indigenous peoples and local communities in the main body of the draft decision

- We encourage Parties to add the following new text (underlined) after para. 3(a-f) in the draft decision contained in SBSTTA/22/8, para. 30:

“3. *Encourages* Parties, pursuant to decisions IX/16, X/33, and XIII/4 and XIII/5, to further strengthen their efforts: ...

(g) To apply the principle of free, prior and informed consent in EbA and Eco-DRR interventions;

(k) To strengthen efforts to promote consideration and integration of traditional knowledge as held and practiced by indigenous peoples and local communities, subject to their free, prior and informed consent, in EbAs and Eco-DRR approaches and strategies;

(h) To promote the design, implementation and monitoring of EbAs and Eco-DRR at the local level, led by indigenous peoples and local communities where relevant;

(j) To ensure that EbA and Eco-DRR interventions do not result in the degradation of natural habitat, loss of biodiversity or the introduction of invasive species or monoculture plantations;”

Key issue: Insufficient integration of climate change and biodiversity issues in the respective CBD and UNFCCC processes

With climate change predicted to grow as a driver of biodiversity loss, and with the potential of biodiversity to contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation, Parties should be better integrating and reporting on climate change in CBD decisions, NBSAPs and national reports. However, the majority of NBSAPs and fifth national reports, as well as PoWPA action plans, have not sufficiently addressed matters related to climate change.

Recommendation: Ensure greater coherence between CBD and UNFCCC processes

- In general, we encourage Parties to better integrate and report on climate change throughout the work of the CBD with the full and effective participation of Indigenous peoples, local communities and women, including through regional dialogues, capacity building for multiple-evidence-based analyses of biodiversity and climate change, synergistic implementation of biodiversity and climate change mitigation and adaptation plans, and harmonization of laws, regulations and strategies.
- Conversely, when UNFCCC Parties and other governments are developing their nationally determined contributions (NDCs) and implementing associated domestic measures, we encourage them to ensure the integrity of all ecosystems and the protection of biodiversity and integrate ecosystem-based approaches with effective participation of vulnerable communities, including women, Indigenous peoples and local communities.

SBI-2 AGENDA ITEM 3: Review of progress in implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020

The context: National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) are the principal instrument for implementing the Convention at the national level. National reports are a main source of information for reviewing implementation of the Convention and Strategic Plan. By March 2018, 154 Parties (nearly 80 per cent) submitted revised or new NBSAPs and 191 Parties (97 per cent) submitted their fifth national reports. Despite efforts to translate the Aichi Biodiversity Targets into national commitments, and to take national actions to reach the Aichi Targets, these commitments and efforts will need to be significantly scaled up in order to meet the Targets and Strategic Plan.

Relevant documents:
SBI/2/2
SBI/2/2/Add.1-Add.4

Key issue: National targets and commitments are lower than the Aichi Targets and the rate of implementation is insufficient to meet the Strategic Plan, and more national concrete targets should be set for implementation of Aichi 18

Many of the revised NBSAPs show substantial improvement over previous NBSAPs and the majority contain targets related to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Overall, however, the national commitments do not correspond to the scale and level of ambition set out in the Aichi Targets and progress in implementation is insufficient to meet the Targets. More than 30 per cent of NBSAPs do not have associated national targets or commitments for some Aichi Targets including in particular the crucial Targets 3, 14 and 18. The majority of national targets and commitments in the NBSAPs are lower and more general than the Aichi Targets or do not address all of the elements of the Targets. The revision

process was also lacking in engagement with rights-holders and stakeholders, despite the commitment in Aichi Target 17 for updated NBSAPs to be participatory. Only 36 NBSAPs reported involvement of Indigenous peoples and local communities in the revision process and only 91 involved civil society and NGOs. Less than half of revised NBSAPs (70) make reference to gender or women's issues.

Of particular concern is that only 14 per cent of NBSAPs contained targets that were similar to the scope and level of ambition set out in Aichi Target 18. Almost a third (31 per cent) of NBSAPs did not contain any targets related to Target 18. More than a fifth (22 per cent) of the national reports reviewed did not contain sufficient information to assess progress towards this target.

Recommendation: Accelerate national efforts to achieve the Aichi Targets in close cooperation with Indigenous peoples and local communities

- We urge Parties to include the following new paragraphs in the draft recommendation for the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties concerning the review of NBSAPs and national reports (SBI/2/2, para. 35(A)):

[“Acknowledges that the current rate of implementation is insufficient to meet the Strategic Plan and Aichi Biodiversity Targets and emphasises the need to scale up efforts;](#)

[Urges Parties to cover all Aichi targets through their NBSAPs, including in particular Aichi target 3, 14 and 18;](#)

[Requests Parties to support national actions in collaboration with women, Indigenous peoples and local communities and civil society organisations to accelerate and scale up progress in implementation and in reporting on progress.”](#)

Key issue: Parties know that involving women is good for biodiversity conservation, yet most are not yet doing so

In 2014, Parties adopted the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action (Decision XII/7) to align with the Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets. The Plan includes actions to be undertaken by Parties and the Secretariat in order to integrate gender considerations in the work of the Convention. We welcome the Secretariat's review of progress in implementation of the Gender Plan of Action (SBI/2/2/Add.3).

However, less than half of the revised NBSAPs include some reference to gender or women's issues. At the same time, 21 per cent of NBSAPs identified the lack of involvement of women as stakeholders as a challenge for biodiversity conservation, or an indirect driver of biodiversity loss. Much work is still needed to implement the Gender Plan of Action and ensure the systematic collection of gender-disaggregated data. The development of the post-2020 biodiversity framework provides an opportunity for increased attention to gender and women's issues in the work of the Convention. Submissions regarding the process for developing the post-2020 framework called for gender to be integrated into the framework, including as a crosscutting issue and standalone target.

Recommendation: Recognise women as rights-holders and undertake suggested actions to accelerate implementation of the Gender Plan of Action

- Overall, we urge Parties to recognise that women are rights-holders, not just stakeholders, as recognized by the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).
- We support the suggested actions as contained in SBI's draft decision on the Gender Plan of Action (SBI/2/2, para. 35(B)).

SBI-2 AGENDA ITEM 8: Resource mobilisation

The context: In decision XIII/20 (para. 23), the Conference of the Parties recalled its invitation to Parties to report progress in achieving the milestones for the full implementation of Aichi Target 3 and invited Parties to include information on (a) candidates for elimination, phase-out or reform of incentives that are harmful for biodiversity, and (b) opportunities to promote positive incentive measures such as appropriate recognition and support for indigenous peoples and local communities that conserve territories and areas (also known as “ICCAs”) and other effective community conservation initiatives. This compilation and analysis is contained in SBI/2/INF/15.

Relevant documents:

SBI/2/7
SBI/2/7/Add.1 and Add.4
SBI/2/2/INF/15
SBI/2/19 and /20
WG8J/10/5 and /6

Only around 10 per cent of reporting Parties refer to the elimination, phase-out or reform of harmful incentives, including subsidies. More emphasis is placed on the design and implementation of positive incentive measures. For example, 30 per cent of reporting Parties refer to community involvement in biodiversity management and to the introduction or strengthening of associated positive incentives, such as sharing of tourism revenues and the formal recognition of community protected areas. More generally (as reported in SBI/2/2, SBI/2/2/Add.1 and /Add.2), 60 per cent of the NBSAPs assessed did not contain any national targets that reflect Aichi Target 3. Only 11 per cent of the NBSAPs contain targets that are similar in scope and level of ambition to Aichi Target 3, and a mere 3 per cent of national reports contain information suggesting that Target 3 is on track to be met in those countries.

Key issue: Aichi Target 3 is essential to achieving the entire Strategic Plan – yet Parties are far behind in implementation

Aichi Target 3 is essential to achieving the Strategic Plan as a whole. However, the above analyses underscore how much more work still remains to achieve this Target. As long as scarce public funds are spent on incentives that are harmful for biodiversity (such as monoculture plantations, bioenergy 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 seems to be an obvious opportunity to greatly accelerate and scale up implementation of the Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets.

In terms of opportunities to promote positive incentive measures, Parties can refer to

substantial existing analyses and guidance on how to appropriately recognise and support ICCAs and other community conservation initiatives, including in specific national contexts.² 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.



² For example: CCRI reports (<https://globalforestcoalition.org/resources/supporting-community-conservation/>), CBD Technical Series No. 64 (<https://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-64-en.pdf>), legal reviews on ICCAs (<https://www.iccaconsortium.org/index.php/category/national-local-en/legal-reviews-en/>).

Recommendation: Include specific mention of positive incentives and refer to existing guidance on recognising ICCAs and other community conservation initiatives

- We urge Parties to include the following new paragraphs in the draft recommendation for the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties concerning milestones for the implementation of Aichi Target 3 (SBI/2/7, para. 56(9)(C)):

“11.bis Urges Parties to redirect harmful incentives and turn them into positive incentives, thus contributing also to Aichi Target 20;

11.ter Notes the useful role of analyses and guidance on appropriately recognising and supporting indigenous peoples’ and local communities’ conserved territories and areas and other conservation initiatives, including CBD Technical Series No. 64 and reports of the Community Conservation Resilience Initiative, in efforts to identify opportunities for the design and implementation of positive incentive measures;

Key issue: Indigenous peoples and local communities contribute significantly to the Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets – yet these contributions are generally unrecognised and under-reported by CBD Parties

In response to Decision XIII/20 (para. 21), the Executive Secretary prepared a note (CBD/SBI/2/19) on elements of methodological guidance for identifying, monitoring, and assessing the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities to the achievement of the Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets. It includes a summary of submissions on assessing the contributions of Indigenous peoples’ and local communities’ collective actions (including a submission from the Global Forest Coalition and Community Conservation Resilience Initiative). This methodological guidance is a very useful tool for CBD Parties to better understand, respect and report on the many contributions of Indigenous peoples and local communities to the Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets.

Recommendation: Add provisions related to national reports and continuous learning, and adopt the draft decision on methodological guidance

- We encourage Parties to add the following new paragraphs to the draft decision, as contained in SBI/2/19, para. 66, in order to incorporate the methodological guidance into the national reporting process and to facilitate further learning from the tools, initiatives and activities that have informed the methodological guidance:

“2.bis Invites Parties to use this methodological guidance when preparing the sixth national reports and future national reports; and

*2.ter Invites Parties and relevant organisations to provide to the Clearinghouse Mechanism information and lessons learned about the tools, initiatives and activities that have informed the development of the methodological guidance (as contained in CBD/SBI/2/19), including, *inter alia*, the Multiple Evidence Base approach, community-based monitoring and information systems (CBMIS), Community Conservation Resilience Initiative, guidance on self-strengthening ICCAs, and Conceptual and Methodological Framework for Evaluating the Contribution of Collective Action to Biodiversity Conservation, in order to inform continuous development and use of the methodological guidance.”*

- Otherwise, we support the draft decision and annex (“List of elements of methodological guidance”), as contained in SBI/2/19, para. 66, and encourage Parties to adopt it in full.

SBI-2 AGENDA ITEM 12: Mechanisms for review of implementation

The context: NBSAPs and national reports are the primary tools for national implementation of the CBD and review of the same. However, this approach is limited as it relies on Parties to self-report and it does not include any strong compliance mechanisms, despite the CBD being a legally binding treaty. At the first meeting of SBI, Parties began discussing how to improve implementation review mechanisms, including a voluntary peer review mechanism for NBSAPs and a decision-tracking tool. Sri Lanka and Montenegro were selected as the first two Parties to be reviewed in the pilot phase of the peer review mechanism. The Executive Secretary's note (SBI/2/11) highlights several possible elements of review mechanisms that could be used together in a complementary manner.

Relevant document:
SBI/2/11

Key issue: Who counts as a “peer” in the peer review mechanism?

A large majority of the processes to develop NBSAPs and national reports have not sufficiently included Indigenous peoples and local communities, and women (see SBSTTA-22 Agenda Item 6 and SBI-2 Agenda Item 3). It is not surprising that these rights-holders' concerns and contributions to biodiversity are also hugely underrepresented in the NBSAPs and national reports. Despite their general exclusion to date, these rights-holders are uniquely placed to help review implementation. Not only do they themselves contribute significantly to implementation of the CBD and Strategic Plan, they are also affected by and on the frontlines of national measures such as state-run protected areas and performance-based payment schemes. However, CBD discussions about the peer review mechanism have yet to consider the potential roles of these rights-holders.

The peer-review process should provide for the effective participation of Indigenous peoples and local communities, and women and inclusion of their contributions and concerns. For example, a peer-review team could include representatives of each of these rights-holder groups who could serve as 'ombuds-people' for considering the perspectives of their respective groups in the country under review.

Recommendations: The CBD needs a more rigorous and inclusive approach to reviewing implementation

- Overall, we call for a more rigorous approach to reviewing implementation, including through stronger compliance-based mechanisms and country-by-country reviews of progress. We also support the complementary use of mechanisms to facilitate implementation such as experience sharing, joint learning and other forms of support. This combination of compliance-based and facilitation-based mechanisms would put the CBD more in line with other multilateral environmental agreements, rather than relying solely on facilitation-based mechanisms as is currently the case.
- We encourage Parties to add the following new paragraph to the draft decision, as contained in SBI/2/11, para. 42:

“2.bis Invites Parties and the Executive Secretary to include indigenous peoples and local communities, and women’s organisations in the peer review team for the pilot phase of the voluntary peer review mechanism; and...”
- As the peer review process for Sri Lanka was recently initiated, we invite the Government of Sri Lanka, the CBD Secretariat and the peer review team to consider reports and experiences of Indigenous peoples, local communities, women, youth and civil society concerning biodiversity in that country. In particular, we invite them to consider the report of the Community Conservation Resilience Initiative in Sri Lanka and to engage with the facilitating organisation, the Nirmanee Development Foundation, which is actively involved in the CBD. The report can be downloaded from: <https://globalforestcoalition.org/resources/supporting-community-conservation/>.

- We encourage the Executive Secretary and Parties to also consider the experience of the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process for UN human rights treaties. The UPR reviews implementation of all human rights treaties to which each country is party through a quadrennial cycle. Each state review is assisted by a group of three other states known as a “troika”. The review is based on information provided by the state under review, information contained in reports by independent human rights experts, human rights treaty bodies and other UN entities, and information from other stakeholders such as NGOs. It may be worth considering whether this approach could work for the CBD and also for joint review of implementation of the Rio Conventions or of biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements.

SBI-2 AGENDA ITEM 16: Preparation for the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020

The context: In 2010, the 10th meeting of the Conference of the Parties adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. As we near the end-date for the Strategic Plan, the Conference of the Parties is expected to adopt the post-2020 global biodiversity framework at its 15th meeting in 2020. The post-2020 framework will be developed through a comprehensive and participatory process between COP14 and COP15. The Executive Secretary has prepared a proposal and timetable for this process (SBI/2/17) that builds on two rounds of submissions (the Global Forest Coalition and Community Conservation Resilience Initiative contributed to both).

Relevant documents:
SBI/2/17
SBI/2/INF/26

Key issue: Indigenous peoples and local communities, including women, must be meaningfully involved in the process to develop the post-2020 framework – this includes recognising their knowledge systems as part of the evidence base

The Executive Secretary’s proposal (SBI/2/17, Section V) stipulates that the process to develop the post-2020 framework should be guided by the following overarching principles: participatory; inclusive; comprehensive; transformative; catalytic; knowledge based; transparent; and iterative.

We broadly support these principles and particularly the inclusion of Indigenous peoples and local communities, women and civil society organisations therein. For example, the principle of knowledge based “should be based on the best available science and evidence from relevant knowledge systems, including the natural and social sciences, local, traditional and indigenous knowledge...” Inputs from Indigenous peoples and local communities are identified later in the document (para. 36) as a key information source. It is crucial to recognise indigenous and traditional knowledge systems as part of the evidence base; this has been a consistent gap to date in the NBSAPs, national reports and *Global Biodiversity Outlooks*.

Expression of support:

- We broadly agree with the proposal for the preparatory process and with the draft decision as contained in SBI/2/17, para. 41. The Global Forest Coalition and other partners in the Community Conservation Resilience Initiative look forward to actively participating in this process.
- In parallel with SBSTTA-22 in Montreal (4-8 July), we are organising a global conference called “Fostering Community Conservation II” with generous support from the German Government’s BMU-International Climate Initiative. One of the key conference sessions aims to develop a “People’s Pathway” for the post-2020 biodiversity framework. We look forward to sharing the outcomes of this session and the conference more broadly with the Secretariat and Parties in the run up to COP14 in November 2018.