



## **Developing a post-2020 global biodiversity framework, recognizing the need to develop a 2021-2030 strategic framework when most of the Aichi Targets are yet to be achieved and importance of Vision 2050 of “Living in Harmony with Nature”**

*The Global Forest Coalition is an international coalition of 99 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 initiative<sup>1</sup> 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 has been developed in consultation with Econexus.*

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. Urgent action is needed if biodiversity loss is to be halted. 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 including the 2021 to 2030 strategic framework and recognizing that the Aichi Targets have to be achieved immediately.
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 transformational change. It is important that the post-2020 framework does not reduce the level of ambition of current Aichi 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 towards a sustainable future.
5. To develop clear targets, interim milestones and ambitious pathways, it is important to keep in mind the recent alarming scientific reports on the impact of climate change on biodiversity. The recently published IPCC Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5C

---

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

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 also 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. 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.

6. 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.
7. 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.*

This also means that the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group needs to be further strengthened through increased contribution and participation of indigenous peoples and local communities.

8. 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 in mainstreaming biodiversity conservation. Rights-based approaches should be mainstreamed throughout the framework, and reflected in all relevant targets.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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.

12. 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 and lead to perverse incentives towards biodiversity destruction and loss.
13. Aichi Target 3 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) states that subsidies and incentives that are harmful to biodiversity must be phased out or reformed by 2020. It is recognized that accelerating progress of AT3 is urgently needed, and that 'failing to achieve the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 jeopardizes the attainment of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development'. This is true for Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 15.2 aimed at halting deforestation by 2020 when, at the same time, the very drivers of deforestation are boosted by perverse subsidies and incentives contradicting the aims of the SDGs, the CBD and other globally-agreed targets.
14. 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. Public investments in biodiversity conservation and restoration, both nationally and internationally, make little sense if they are outpaced by public investments in biodiversity destruction. A recent study published by Global Forest Coalition "*Incentivising deforestation for livestock products*"<sup>2</sup> detailing how support for the livestock sector in the EU and Mercosur countries is subsidising forest destruction, clearly points out how direct and indirect incentives and subsidies in these countries are harming forests and biodiversity and how large agribusinesses obtain the benefits at the expense of the public good and natural resources.
15. The findings of the paper highlight the following:
  - i. Four key commodities are the key drivers of deforestation: beef, soybeans, palm oil, and wood pulp. Of these, cattle grazing has the largest role in forest loss but feed crops (mainly soybeans) are an essential part of the global livestock trade, as a significant portion of the production is mainly for export purposes.
  - ii. While profits from grain exports in Argentina are no longer redistributed at the federal level for improved social welfare (improved sanitation, education, health care, housing, and infrastructure), a **Seed Law** would grant exclusive control to seed producers, creating additional hurdles and barriers for small-scale farmers, some of the largest landholders were given approximately USD27 million in 2017 in public subsidies thus subsidizing monoculture soy in territories traditionally dedicated to small-scale farming.
  - iii. In Brazil, the '**SAFRA Plan**' which gives agricultural credits at better rates than banks mostly go to agribusinesses, as opposed to small-scale/subsistence family farming. The Brazilian National Development Bank (BNDES)'s credits have largely benefited large companies that have made heavy investments in the livestock industry. Only three companies received 90% of the support. In contrast, Brazil's funding for the implementation of activities and programs that would counteract deforestation and forest degradation, are less than a third of the livestock industry investments.
  - iv. Paraguay is one of the countries with the highest deforestation rates in the world, yet, policies on agricultural exports continue to aggravate the problem by subsidising heavily the corporates and agro-business through tax incentives while

---

<sup>2</sup> Please see <https://globalforestcoalition.org/perverse-incentives-deforestation-for-livestock/>

ensuring low rates, low wages for agricultural producers and high taxes through agricultural income tax and VAT returns.

The post-2020 biodiversity framework, therefore, should include a target regarding a 100% redirection and phasing out of perverse incentives.

16. The study also points out to the fact that the post-2020 biodiversity framework should 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.
17. 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.
18. 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 create financial dependencies of public institutions on the commercial interests of private corporations need to be reviewed and, as much as possible, avoided.
19. 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. The process leading to NBSAPs should be strengthened by being consultative and inclusive with the active participation of IPLCs, women and youth and communities as rightsholders at the national and sub-national level.
20. 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.
21. Finally, the process adopted by the Working Group on Post 2020 Framework has to be inclusive, participatory and consultative providing more space to real stakeholders including indigenous peoples, local communities and women and has to be cautious of not being driven by corporates and private sector agenda.