



Views on the scope and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including the resource mobilization component

The Global Forest Coalition is an international coalition of 98 Indigenous Peoples Organizations and NGOs from 64 different countries. From 2013 to 2018 GFC has coordinated the Community Conservation Resilience Initiative. The Community Conservation Resilience Initiative (CCRI) is a global initiative¹ that has been documenting and reviewing the findings of bottom-up, participatory assessments by 68 communities in 22 different countries of the resilience of their community conservation and restoration initiatives. This submission was elaborated in collaboration with Econexus and Forests of the World.

1. The CCRI concluded that the post-2020 biodiversity framework should embrace a human rights-based, gender-responsive approach to biodiversity conservation, which includes awareness-raising of environmental and related territorial and land tenure rights, and the equitable participation and inclusion of Indigenous Peoples, local communities and women in all conservation and restoration policies and actions.
2. The 2050 vision of Living in Harmony with Nature remains important and inspiring. This vision implies that biodiversity conservation and restoration needs to happen on the ground, at the local level, which is why conservation by Indigenous Peoples and local communities and promoting local livelihoods in harmony with nature should be at the heart of the 2050 vision.
3. While we do not oppose the suggestion that the framework itself should cover the period 2020 – 2050, it is clear urgent action is needed if biodiversity loss is to be halted and restoration is to be achieved. Extinction is forever, and biodiversity science is unequivocal about the fact that the planet cannot afford another 30 years of biodiversity loss. For that reason, the post-2020 biodiversity framework should also include a sufficient number of ambitious targets for 2030, and interim milestones.
4. We support the recommendation in CBD/COP/14/INF/16 that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to be commensurate with the challenges of fostering the transformational change required to achieve the 2050 Vision. It is important that the post-2020 framework does not reduce the level of ambition of current Aichi Targets. Above all it must avoid losing several years in devising and agreeing before taking action on new targets. Some of the targets that were adopted in 2010 might have turned out to be difficult to reach, mainly due to a lack of political will, but that does not mean that biodiversity targets have to be based on political or economic feasibility rather than scientific feasibility. Political and economic feasibility can be influenced, but scientific feasibility, the feasibility of certain targets in light of scientific realities, involves facts that have to be accepted. This requires an ambitious pathway that can only be realized if the post-2020 biodiversity framework includes clear targets and milestones regarding the policy measures that have to be taken to achieve 100% biodiversity conservation. Obviously none of this can be achieved without the necessary individual and collective political will from Parties, which has hitherto been lacking.
5. In this respect, it is important to keep in mind some of the recent alarming scientific reports on the impact of climate change, and global change in general, on biodiversity.

¹ The CCRI has been supported by supported by the German International Climate Initiative, the Christensen Fund, the Siemenpuu Foundation and Swedbio

The recently published IPCC Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5C clearly alerts that a global warming scenario of 1.5 degrees Celsius, which is almost unavoidable unless significant transformative change takes place in both the land-use sector and other sectors, will lead to devastating impacts on biodiversity. It is important to realize these impacts are not limited to biodiversity located outside formal protected areas. In fact, a recent study by Lister and Garcia² comes to the alarming conclusion that climate change-driven arthropod decline can lead to significant decline of insect, bird and even mammal species in an otherwise well protected area. These findings make it clear that specific areas cannot be protected against climate change, and that conventional approaches of formally setting aside 17%, or even 30 or 50% of the planet's ecosystems will be insufficient to halt biodiversity loss. Rather, they risk locking protected ecosystems up in specific areas, whereas many species might have significantly enhanced chances of survival if they were able to migrate along with changing climatic zones. For that reason, it is important the post-2020 biodiversity framework embraces a much stronger focus on other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) like ICCAs and other community conservation initiatives that can be applied on a country-wide scale. It must also promote cross-conventional coordination to jointly address issues related to climate change in line with decision CBD/COP/14/L.23. The post-2020 biodiversity framework must strive for 100% conservation and sustainable use of existing ecosystems, alongside ambitious restoration targets, as a pre-condition for halting biodiversity loss. From a scientific point of view, 100% ecosystem conservation is the only pathway that is feasible if humanity wants to halt biodiversity loss. It is also a key response towards both halting global warming and adapting to that which takes place.

6. Moreover, biodiversity conservation and restoration can only happen on the ground, so full support by local communities for the post-2020 biodiversity framework is a pre-condition for its success. This involves ensuring that their experiences and lessons learned are a key part of the process to build capacity and to implement decisions, from local to global level. We strongly support the following target suggested in CBD/COP/14/INF/16:

By 2030, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, at all relevant levels.

7. More in general the post-2020 biodiversity framework should have a much stronger emphasis on policy measures to support community conservation, including policy measures that recognize the role, rights, traditional knowledge, collective actions and customary sustainable use practices of groups like women and Indigenous Peoples. Rights-based approaches should be mainstreamed throughout the framework, and reflected in all relevant targets.
8. Complementary to such mainstreaming of rights-based approaches, a specific target on recognizing the territorial and land tenure rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities embodying sustainable lifestyles should be adopted, also because such recognition has proven to be a highly effective measure to conserve and restore biodiversity.

² Lister, B.C. and Garcia, A., 2018. Climate-driven declines in arthropod abundance restructure a rainforest food web, PNAS published ahead of print, October 2018, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1722477115>

9. The framework should also include a specific target on recognizing, on basis of Free Prior and Informed Consent, Indigenous Peoples and local communities conserved territories and areas (ICCAs) and Sacred Natural Sites.
10. Similarly, gender-responsive approaches to biodiversity conservation should be both integrated throughout the post-2020 biodiversity framework, and embodied in a specific target on enhanced recognition of the role, rights and participation of women in biodiversity conservation and restoration.
11. Another essential target that forms a pre-condition to an effective post-2020 biodiversity framework is a target that countries should put in place, by 2030, regulatory and other policy frameworks that ensure a 100% divestment from activities that cause ecosystem destruction. In order to make this effective we also need a deeper analysis to identify the scope and impacts of such activities.
12. The current Aichi Target 3 is at the heart of the success of the long-term vision, mission and objectives of the Convention on Biodiversity. Biodiversity will not be conserved as long as countries continue to spend far more funding in subsidies and other incentives supporting biodiversity loss than in incentives supporting biodiversity conservation.³ Public investments in biodiversity conservation and restoration, both nationally and internationally, make little sense if they are outpaced by public investments in biodiversity destruction. For that reason, the post-2020 biodiversity framework should include a target regarding a 100% redirection and phasing out of perverse incentives again.
13. The post-2020 biodiversity framework should also include a renewed, more specific target on sustainable consumption and production patterns. One important area that the previous Strategic Plan failed to address was the need for sustainable food systems, and especially the need for a global shift towards more plant-based diets in light of the devastating impacts of large-scale livestock and feedstock production on biodiversity and climate change. For that reason, we recommend the inclusion of a specific target that addresses the shift to more balanced, primarily plant-based diets in countries and societies with high meat and dairy consumption levels.
14. We support calls to conduct a more profound socio-political analysis of why certain Aichi Targets have not been reached (yet). Such an analysis should include an analysis of the possible lack of recognition of the contributions of the collective actions of Indigenous peoples, local communities and women to the Aichi Targets. Moreover, such an analysis should include a profound analysis of the conflicts of interests and other perverse governance incentives that might have undermined compliance by countries with the targets in the 2011 - 2020 Strategic Plan. Private sector engagement in biodiversity conservation, for example, can trigger conflicts of interests and other perverse governance incentives that work against effective biodiversity policies. Corporations are unable, in a capitalist economic system, to support policy measures that might limit their growth strategies, while limits to growth will be necessary if humanity is to stay within planetary boundaries. That is why private sector contributions can only be part of the solution, public institutions need to take the responsibility to put in place quantitative measures like the reduction of subsidies or regulatory frameworks that limit the growth of certain industries. But to be in a position for taking such necessary measures, public institutions themselves should not depend on the commercial interests of private companies. As such, public private partnerships and other forms of blended finance that

³ See for example: <https://globalforestcoalition.org/perverse-incentives-deforestation-for-livestock/>

create financial dependencies of public institutions on the commercial interests of private corporations need to be reviewed and, as much as possible, avoided.

15. The post-2020 biodiversity framework should include an effective, regular process of reviewing the alignment of national biodiversity targets with the targets stipulated in the post-2020 biodiversity framework, including a limited number of clearly defined interim milestones. There also is a need for a limited set of agreed indicators of progress that are adequate, appropriate, reflective of the targets and milestones, multi-disciplinary and gender-sensitive. Such a review process should feed into more effective compliance mechanisms under the CBD and its Protocols. The review process should also cover resource mobilization related targets, including a target on the mobilization of new and additional public financial resources, a target on the redirection and phasing out of remaining perverse incentives that cause biodiversity loss, and a target on divestment from activities that trigger biodiversity loss.