

Comparison of Zero Draft with 2010-2020 Strategic plan and Aichi targets

Zero draft	Strategic Plan 2010-2020			
Para. / Section	Strategic Goal / Aichi Target(s)	SDGs	Suggestion/Comments	Text proposal (delete/new text)
A. Background				
B. The purpose				
C. Theory of change				
A. 2050 Vision			Remains still relevant, no need to change.	
B. 2030 and 2050 Goals 10. The Framework has five long-term goals for 2050 related to the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity. Each of these goals has an associated outcome for 2030. The five goals are:	Strategic Goal C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity		The 2030 targets are shaped by extrapolating: where do we need to be in 2030 to be on track to achieve the final outcome in 2050? This turns the 2030 targets into milestones with less ambition already by design. This is the opposite of ambition. We need to have 2030 targets which are already as ambitious as the 2050 goals.	

<p>(a) No net loss by 2030 in the area and integrity of freshwater, marine and terrestrial ecosystems, and increases of at least [20%] by 2050, ensuring ecosystem resilience</p>	<p>Target 5: By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced</p> <p>Target 10: <i>By 2015, the multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning.</i></p> <p>Target 11: <i>By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.</i></p> <p>Target 14: <i>By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including</i></p>	<p>13, 14, 15</p>	<p>The idea of no "net" loss and similar approaches here and in other places in the text suggest nature can be replaced easily, and destruction is acceptable as long as it is compensated. But we all know peatlands or old-growth forests are irreplaceable or will take very long to re-develop. The promise of replacement is a call for trashing biodiversity, and to lower the bar for conserving habitats in the first place. We therefore prefer to have a wording more in line with Aichi target 5 and delete the "net".</p>	<p>(a) No net loss by 2030 in the area and integrity of freshwater, marine and terrestrial ecosystems, and increases of at least [20%] by 2050, ensuring ecosystem resilience</p>
---	--	----------------------------------	---	--

	<i>services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.</i>			
(b) The percentage of species threatened with extinction is reduced by [X%] and the abundance of species has increased on average by [X%] by 2030 and by [X%] by 2050	Target 12: By 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained.	14, 15	Regarding: "species threatened with extinction": The percentage of species threatened with extinction can be lowered by species going extinct... so these need to be included. "Regarding: "abundance of species " Which species? the species threatened with extinction? Alternatives to mentioning abundance (which may just refer to common species): percentage of species in favourable conservation status or in LC/NT status - or Red List Index improved/at 0.8 or better...	(b) The percentage of species that are extinct or threatened with extinction is reduced by [50%] by 2030 and their abundance of species has increased on average by [X%] by 2030 and by [X%] by 2050
(c) Genetic diversity is maintained or	Target 13: By 2020, the genetic diversity of cultivated	2, 15	Genetic diversity takes long to develop naturally. So, talking about enhancement and "on average"	(c) Genetic diversity is maintained or enhanced on average by 2030, and for

<p>enhanced on average by 2030, and for [90%] of species by 2050;</p>	<p>plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives, including other socio-economically as well as culturally valuable species, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity.</p>	<p>creates the illusion that it is possible to compensate genetic loss - except possibly by artificial methods. It is therefore much more important to stop any loss and clearly state this.</p>	<p>[90%] of species continues to be maintained at 2030 levels by 2050</p>
<p>(d) Nature provides benefits to people contributing to:</p>	<p>Strategic Goal D: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services</p>	<p>The whole goal (d) is a dangerous interpretation of the 2nd goal of the CBD, sustainable use. Sustainable use is not about quantity, it is about the quality how humans use nature - which should be sustainable, i.e. do not lead to a decrease of habitats or species. Asking for increases in production will increase pressure on biodiversity and is not the CBD's task. The presented proposal for Goal (d) is entirely centered about people and their use/exploitation of nature, where it should be about biodiversity. The argument that nature provides benefits to people is right - but this will happen if ecosystems and their functions are maintained anyway. So, quantified increases in production are more a "selling argument" and shouldn't be targets. Also, putting ecosystem services/Nature's contributions to people (NCPs) first risks that the actual diversity of ecosystems is ignored. For example, you can increase water retention and carbon sequestration with monoculture tree plantations of exotic species as well as you can by maintaining old-growth indigenous forests.</p>	<p>(d) Nature provides benefits to people contributing to: ... (i) ... (iv) All areas used by people for nutrition, water supply, resilience to natural disasters, for carbon sequestration or other ecosystem services are used in sustainable way, ensuring maintenance of species and habitats in a good status and the long-term supply for the ecosystem services concerned.</p> <p>Or (d) Safeguard and restore all ecosystems and their services / Nature's contribution to People, especially for nutrition, water supply ...</p>

			<p>For the ecosystem services/NCPs it is the same, but for biodiversity it is entirely different. Our proposed alternative wording puts the emphasis on the ecosystem and then refers to the NCPs. By referring to “other benefits”, the other 14 benefits mentioned in the IPBES Global Assessment are also included (which they are not in the present wording).</p> <p>Link to Aichi Target 14: By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.</p> <p>See also comments on AT6</p>	
(i) Improvements in nutrition for at least [X million] people by 2030 and [Y million] by 2050;		2, 2.1, 2.3	The objectives of the CBD are 1) conservation of biological diversity, 2) the sustainable use of its components and 3) ABS. Its should not promote the enhanced exploitation of natural resources or increase of production.	
(ii) Improvements in sustainable access to safe and drinkable water for at least [X million] people, by 2030 and [Y million] by 2050;	Target 14: By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.	2, 6		

<p>(iii) Improvements in resilience to natural disasters for at least [X million] people by 2030 and [Y million] by 2050;</p>	<p>Target 14: By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.</p> <p>Target 15: By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.</p>	<p>1.5</p>		
<p>(iv) At least [30%] of efforts to achieve the targets of the Paris Agreement in 2030 and 2050</p>	<p>Target 15: By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and</p>	<p>13</p>	<p>The main problem is ongoing use of fossil fuels. While carbon sequestration in ecosystems can to some extent help to combat climate change, this should not distract from the need to reduce fossil fuel emissions. However, fully functional ecosystems sequester carbon the best and the CBD should focus on safeguarding and restoration of ES and ESS.</p>	<p>We could imagine alternative wording along the lines of e.g.: "Deforestation and drainage of peatlands and wetlands is halted by 2025 and xy% of deforested areas have been restored using native species, so that carbon sequestration and water retention are increased and access to safe and drinkable water has improved."</p>

	adaptation and to combating desertification.			
(e) The benefits, shared fairly and equitably, from the use of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge have increased by [X] by 2030 and reached [X] by 2050.	Target 16: By 2015, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation.	15.6	<p>It is good to enshrine ABS and the Nagoya Protocol in the 2050 goals. But this wording assumes all IPLCs WANT to gain money by agreeing on the use of their resources. But they also have the right not to sign a contract which is not reflected here. Furthermore, an increase in benefits will also increase production and pressure on biodiversity.</p> <p>Clear baselines, indicators are needed to define “increase” e.g. the amount of benefits in comparison with the amount of uses by private actors or number of cases which are regulated by the Nagoya Protocol.</p> <p>Link to Aichi Target 16.</p>	(e) The amount of genetic resources which are regulated by the Nagoya Protocol have increased by [x] % of overall cases by 2030 and reached 100% by 2050.
<p>C. 2030 Mission</p> <p>11. The 2030 Mission for this framework is: To take urgent action across society to put biodiversity on a path to recovery for the benefit of planet and people</p>			<p>Rationale for alternative wording:</p> <p>a) The proposed mission is not SMART – how can you measure that nature was put on path to recovery? The content is just slightly more than "To do something to make things better".</p> <p>b) The proposal does not visibly address all three goals of the CBD</p> <p>c) The level of ambition does not go beyond previous goals, it's as weak and there is a clear risk of regression regarding the ambition level if we do not at least aim to “halt the loss”. For comparison:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2010 Goal (“...significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss at 	<p>“to ensure that biodiversity loss is halted, biological resources are sustainably used and benefits arising out of utilization of genetic resources are shared in a fair and equitable manner.” or</p> <p>“We, governments and decision-makers, in collaborative partnership with stakeholders across society, will take urgent, effective and accountable actions to halt and reverse the human-driven loss of biodiversity and to use biological</p>

			<p>the global, regional and national level as a contribution to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on Earth")</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2020 Mission ("take effective and urgent action to halt the loss of biodiversity...) 	resources/nature sustainably for the benefit of all people and the planet."
<p>D. 2030 action targets</p> <p>12. The Framework has 20 action-oriented targets for 2030 which, if achieved, will contribute to the outcome-oriented goals for 2030 and 2050. Actions to reach these targets should be implemented consistently and in harmony with the Convention on Biological Diversity and other relevant international</p>				
<p>(a) Reducing threats to biodiversity</p>	<p>Strategic Goal A: Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society/ Strategic Goal B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use</p>			
<p>1. Retain and restore freshwater, marine and terrestrial ecosystems, increasing by at least [50%] the land and sea area under comprehensive spatial planning addressing land/sea use</p>	<p>Target 5: By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and</p>	<p>14, 15</p>	<p>(i) This relates to Aichi target 5 that aims at halting the loss of natural habitats. New elements are restoration and spatial planning. Both are welcome, but conservation and restoration should be distinctive elements, with conserving existing habitats having priority. Maybe this could even be two distinct targets,</p>	<p>1. Retain Conserve, by 2025, and restore all existing natural freshwater, marine and terrestrial ecosystems, retain existing intact areas and wilderness and restore increasing by at least [X%] of degraded habitats, in order to achieve by 2030 a net increase in area, connectivity and integrity</p>

<p>change, achieving by 2030 a net increase in area, connectivity and integrity and retaining existing intact areas and wilderness.</p>	<p>fragmentation is significantly reduced</p>		<p>such as was the case in the current strategic plan (T5 and T 15). This would help make the target less complex.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If conservation and restoration are separate, restoration needs a % value and a reference base which we do not know at the moment - The role of IPCLs as defenders intact areas and wilderness as well as the role of ICCAs for conservation should be reflected. - The concept of having a “net” increase insinuates that habitats are freely interchangeable and can be shoved around at will - this opens the door to offsetting which we reject. - We could consider to separate targets for minimising losses (only allowing biodiversity destruction for projects that are strictly necessary for public wellbeing) and maximising conservation and restoration. - The wording on conservation is weaker than that of Aichi target 5, our suggestion tries to strengthen this by some wording suggestions highlighted in blue <p>Q: Aspect of specific, endangered habitats – should these be treated differently?</p>	<p>of habitats, by concrete conservation measures, including those undertaken by IPCLs, and increasing by at least 50% the area under comprehensive spatial planning addressing land/sea change.”</p>
<p>2. Protect sites of particular importance for biodiversity through protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, by 2030 covering at least [60%] of such sites and at least [30%] of land and sea areas with at least [10%] under strict protection.</p>	<p>Target 11: By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably</p>	<p>6, 11, 14.2 & 14.5, 15.1.- 15.5</p>	<p>This is the follow-up of Aichi target 11 – the protected area target.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - However, it relates to the area covered only, and lacks a number of important elements (which are mostly mentioned as elements in Add1, but should also be included in the target text): effectiveness, management, participation, equity, representativity, connectivity and 	<p>2. Protect sites of particular importance for biodiversity through equitably and effectively managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures which are integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes, by 2030 covering at least [60%] of such sites and at least [30%] of</p>

	<p>managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.</p>		<p>integration into the wider land- and seascape. The suggestions in cyan are supposed to bring this back in. Indicators that could be used for this are the IUCN Green Lists or % of PAs under management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further issues: sites of particular importance – needs definition. In Europe, all the sites where Emerald/Natura 2000 species and habitats could be included. “Key biodiversity areas” are insufficiently defined in many countries. Also 60% sites of particular importance by 2030 might not be very ambitious (in 2018 35% of KBAs had no protection through systems of protected areas, but 21% were fully covered and 44% partly covered). The debate on this term could be avoided if we reinstate the term “representativity”. - The element of Areas under “strict” protection, in addition to a 30% areas target, is confusing and unhelpful. Strict protection would need to be very clearly defined in order to avoid endless debates about what counts and what not. Strict protection should prevent cooperate development or extraction, however they could include Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs) that still allow use/access of IPLCs. Aichi target 11 used the word “effective”, meaning that the protected areas fulfils the purpose for which it was defined, i.e. the target habitats and species are in good status. These outcome-based definition may be more helpful than the new 	<p>land and sea areas with at least [10%] under strict protection”</p>
--	---	--	--	--

			<p>“action-based” suggestion which still may not deliver for biodiversity, and it would also be clear that activities which do not harm the conservation objectives may be allowed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Positive: relation not only to area, but also to potential sites <p>Positive: no distinction between land and sea in % area</p>	
<p>3. Control all pathways for the introduction of invasive alien species, achieving by 2030 a [50%] reduction in the rate of new introductions, and eradicate or control invasive alien species to eliminate or reduce their impacts by 2030 in at least [50%] of priority sites.</p>	<p>Target 9: By 2020, invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment.</p>	<p>15.8</p>	<p>Proposal seems stronger formulated than Aichi target 9 that only calls for priority species to be controlled or eradicated.</p> <p>Link to Aichi Target 9: By 2020, invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment.</p>	
<p>4. Reduce by 2030 pollution from excess nutrients, biocides, plastic waste and other sources by at least [50%].</p>	<p>Target 8: By 2020, pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity.</p>	<p>3, 6, 12, 14 (10, 11)</p>	<p>Text proposal: “Reduce by 2030 pollution from excess nutrients, biocides, plastic waste and other sources to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity.”</p> <p>The zero draft AT4 is very similar to Aichi target 8, but more explicit by mentioning biocides, plastic waste (up to now included but implicit). The new target is quantitative without feedback on the effect on nature, easier to measure but what happens if a 50% reduction is still detrimental to nature? Aichi target 8 formulated a concrete outcome “has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity.” Which we propose to bring back in.</p> <p>It will be necessary to define concrete qualitative subtargets for each substance at the indicator or rationale/fact sheet level. These are needed to phase out e.g. the most harmful pesticides or to ban it around protected areas or ecosystems important for freshwater. The indicators are useful, but should be formulated not as a % of status quo but on a level that is non-detrimental to biodiversity.</p> <p>Link to Aichi Target 8</p>	

<p>5. Ensure by 2030 that the harvesting, trade and use of wild species, is legal and at sustainable levels.</p>	<p>Target 4: By 2020, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits.</p> <p>Target 6: By 2020 all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species, fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and the impacts of fisheries on stocks, species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits.</p>	<p>14, 15</p>	<p>Wording needs to be improved, we don't want to legalize trade under CITES; "legal" also is confusing because it could be understood that also unsustainable practices could be legalized. Ecosystems are not addressed. Link to Aichi Targets 6 and 7 (partly – not area based).</p>	<p>5. Ensure by 2030 that the any harvesting, trade and use of wild species, is respects existing legislation is non-detrimental and at sustainable levels.</p>
<p>6. Contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation and disaster risk reduction through nature-based solutions providing by 2030 [about 30%] [at least XXX MT CO2=] of the mitigation effort needed to achieve the goals of the Paris</p>	<p>Target 15: By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded</p>	<p>13</p>	<p>The main cause for climate change is fossil fuels and this needs to be tackled. Asking ecosystems to supply a certain contribution (30%) of the decrease is not the CBD's mandate and furthermore, it is offsetting – with the burden being carried by those who have not caused the problem, because much of the actions will need to take place in developing countries while</p>	<p>Reduce fossil fuel emissions to levels that will allow the 1.5°C target to be reached. Contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation and disaster risk reduction through biodiversity-friendly nature-based solutions such as halting deforestation and forest degradation and the destruction of peatlands providing by 2030 [about 30%]</p>

<p>Agreement, complementing stringent emission reductions, and avoiding negative impacts on biodiversity and food security.</p>	<p>ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.</p>		<p>Industrialised and OPEC countries will continue to release fossil carbon into the atmosphere. Not specifying how contributions take place, and doing this without safeguards is asking for monoculture tree plantations to be established, while the priority should be on conserving habitats with a high storage of Climate gases. Link to Aichi Target 10.</p>	<p>[at least XXX MT CO₂=] of the mitigation effort needed to achieve the goals of the Paris Agreement, complementing stringent emission reductions, and avoiding negative impacts on biodiversity and food security.</p>
<p>(b) Meeting people's needs through sustainable use and benefit-sharing</p>	<p>Strategic Goal D: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services / Strategic Goal B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use</p>			
<p>7. Enhance the sustainable use of wild species providing, by 2030, benefits, including enhanced nutrition, food security and livelihoods for at least [X million] people, especially for the most vulnerable, and reduce human-wildlife conflict by [X%].</p>	<p>Target 6: By 2020 all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species, fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and the impacts of fisheries on stocks, species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits. Target 14: By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including</p>	<p>2, 12, 14, 15</p>	<p>The target should aim to enhance sustainable use, not the use and exploitation of wild species in general.</p> <p>Use by IPLCs can normally be considered sustainable, however all use has to be within limits that ensure species and habitats continue to thrive in a good conservation status.</p> <p>The mission of the CBD is to ensure biodiversity is maintained, by deciding measures in all sectors that are necessary. An increase of use does not serve this purpose and should not be dealt with within the CBD. It is better to address the % of use that is sustainable or a % of the used species that are used sustainably.</p> <p>The elements of action target 5 should aim at ensuring sustainable use (e.g. through legal and healthy fisheries, use that ensures a good conservation status of species in the medium and</p>	<p>7. Enhance the proportion of sustainable use of wild species that is sustainable, providing, by 2030, benefits, including enhanced nutrition, food security and livelihoods for at least [X million] people, especially for the most vulnerable, and reduce human-wildlife conflict by [X%].</p>

	services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.		long term – maybe define in rationale/fact sheet), if sustainable use is ensured, wild species will contribute to nutrition, food security and livelihoods of more people in 2030 and beyond. Link to Aichi Target 10.	
8. Conserve and enhance the sustainable use of biodiversity in agricultural and other managed ecosystems to support the productivity, sustainability and resilience of such systems, reducing by 2030 related productivity gaps by at least [50%].	Target 7: By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.	2, 12, 14	I. Like the previous two targets, this target calls for an increase in production. Calling for increase in agri production is not the CBD's task. CBD shouldn't push production!!! It is counter productive. We should be asking for an increase of the <u>proportion</u> of use that is sustainable. The formulation “agricultural <u>and other managed ecosystems</u> ” should be kept to include e.g. forest areas. Link to Aichi Target 7.	8. Conserve and enhance the proportion of the sustainable use of biodiversity in agricultural and other managed ecosystems that is sustainable to [80%] to support the productivity, sustainability and resilience of such systems reducing by 2030 related productivity gaps by at least [50%].
9. Enhance nature-based solutions contributing, by 2030, to clean water provision for at least [XXX million] people.	Target 14: By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of	1, 2, 5.a, 6.5, 8,12, 14, 15	Undoubtedly, access to enough clean water is a fundamental need of humanity that needs to be ensured for everyone. Potential trade-offs of nature-based solutions need to be considered and safeguards to protect biodiversity need to be put in place. But the focus should be on conserving and restoring relevant ecosystems, not just their services, for the benefit of all humans, and not put pressure on building dams,	Protect, safeguard and restore water-related ecosystems to enhance nature-based solutions in order to sustainably provide clean water for [XXX million] people.”

	women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.		<p>or planting monocultures etc. We suggest to remove a quantitative target here and delete the “nature-based solutions” for more clarity: we want natural ecosystems to be protected and restored, so people’s needs can be met.</p> <p>SDG 6.6 provides a good basis for this and has the focus that would be expected from the CBD:</p> <p><i>6.6. By 2020, protect and restore water-related ecosystems, including mountains, forests, wetlands, rivers, aquifers and lakes</i></p> <p>Link to Aichi Target 14 “..., ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water [...] restored and safeguarded.</p>	
10. Enhance the benefits of green spaces for health and well-being , especially for urban dwellers, increasing by 2030 the proportion of people with access to such spaces by at least [100%].	Target 14: By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.	11	<p>We are fine with the changes that recognize "right to nature" approach, because an increase of green spaces will be beneficial both for nature and people. But even here, the logic should be to increase green space because they create benefits, not call for an increase of the benefits. and very obviously for the sake of biodiversity itself (which means they should strive to support native species and habitats.</p>	<p>Enhance the benefits of green spaces for biodiversity, health and well-being and ensure access for all especially for urban dwellers, increasing by 2030 the proportion of people with access to such spaces by at least [100%].</p>
11. Ensure that benefits from the utilization of genetic resources , and related traditional knowledge, are shared fairly and equitably, resulting by 2030 in an [X] increase in benefits	Target 16: By 2015, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation.	15.6	<p>It is the CBD’s task to call for proper implementation of ABS, but calling for an increase of benefits encourages production and disregards the “right to say no”. Digital sequence information also needs to fall under the Nagoya Protocol in order not to undermine it. We therefore propose to modify the text:</p> <p>“11. Ensure that benefits from the utilization of genetic resources, including digital sequence information, and related traditional knowledge, are shared fairly and equitably. resulting by 2030 in an [X] increase in benefits.”</p>	

<p>(c) Tools and solutions for implementation and mainstreaming</p>	<p>Strategic Goal B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use/ Strategic Goal E: Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building</p>		<p>This section is overall quite good. These targets need to be kept since they address indirect drivers, they should not be downgraded to enabling conditions etc.</p>	
<p>12. Reform incentives, eliminating the subsidies that are most harmful for biodiversity, ensuring by 2030 that incentives, including public and private economic and regulatory incentives, are either positive or neutral for biodiversity.</p>	<p>Target 3: By 2020, at the latest, incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socio economic conditions.</p>	<p>2, 12, 14, 15</p>	<p>Very close to Aichi target 3, but weaker; AT 12 foresees that subsidies “most” harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, while Aichi target 3 postulates that “incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated,” which means all of them. Also, the second part of AT 12 which demands all incentives are either positive or neutral for biodiversity, cannot be achieved if only the most harmful subsidies are eliminated – the target in itself is contradictory as it stands.</p> <p>The target could mention that elimination of harmful subsidies could free up resources for conservation and restoration, an issue that has been thoroughly debated in the workshop on resource mobilisation.</p>	<p>Delete “... most harmful for biodiversity...”</p>
<p>13. Integrate biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts, ensuring by 2030 that biodiversity values are mainstreamed across all sectors and that biodiversity-inclusive strategic</p>	<p>Target 2: By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting</p>	<p>1, 6, 14, 15</p>	<p>Quite good as it stands.</p>	

<p>environmental assessments and environmental impact assessments are comprehensively applied.</p>	<p>systems. Target 17: By 2015 each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan.</p>			
<p>14. Reform economic sectors towards sustainable practices, including along their national and transnational supply chains, achieving by 2030 a reduction of at least [50%] in negative impacts on biodiversity.</p>	<p>Target 4: By 2020, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits.</p>	<p>8, 12, 14, 15</p>	<p>We propose to add the following text: “including through telecoupling effects and excessive demand” at the end of the sentence.</p> <p>The target should address telecoupling effects/ footprints more clearly. It is important to note that reforming sectors by reducing their specific impact is only part of the solution. We need to reduce the demand for agrocommodities/minerals etc, cut subsidies that create this demand, adopt a land footprint indicator and reduction targets, adopt legally binding duty of vigilance obligations on EU companies, banks and other Financial institutions. (http://www.foeeurope.org/sites/default/files/agriculture/2020/rerooting_eu_food_supply.pdf).</p> <p>This needs to be spelt out in the rationale / fact sheet of the target.</p>	
<p>15. Resources, including capacity-building, for implementing the framework have increased from all sources so that by 2030 resources have increased by [X%] and are commensurate with the ambition of the targets of the framework.</p>	<p>Target 20: By 2020, at the latest, the mobilization of financial resources for effectively implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 from all sources, and in accordance with the consolidated and agreed process in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, should increase substantially from the current levels. This target will be subject to changes contingent to resource needs assessments</p>	<p>15.A, 15.B</p>	<p>This target is an improvement in relation to Aichi target 20 because it is linked to the needs of the framework. We suggest to delete the wording on increase because it is relative, doesn't relate to the needs and punishes those who already pay a lot. A percentage (X%) of national budgets would be fairer, but this would need to be in line with the needs for the implementation of the framework which are not yet entirely clear at this point. It is important to keep the last part “resources are commensurate with the ambition of the targets of the framework.”</p>	<p>Resources, including capacity-building, for implementing the framework have increased from all sources so that by 2030 resources have increased by [X%] are commensurate with the ambition of the targets of the framework.</p>

	to be developed and reported by Parties.			
16. Establish and implement measures in all countries by 2030 to prevent potential adverse impacts of biotechnology on biodiversity.				
17. People everywhere take measurable steps towards sustainable consumption and lifestyles , taking into account individual and national cultural and socioeconomic conditions, achieving by 2030 just and sustainable consumption levels.	<p>Target 1: By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.</p> <p>Target 4: By 2020, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits.</p>	4, 12, 13, 15	<p>There is a need to mention governments (as was the case in Aichi Target 4). People can only consume sustainably if the right incentives are given, These must be regulated by governments. Businesses also can only produce sustainably if there are regulations/safeguards that create a level playing field that does not put biodiversity under pressure.</p> <p>Aichi Target 4 adressed sustainable production and consumption, wording was clearer.</p>	<p>Governments, Enterprises and People Governments take measurable steps towards encouraging sustainable consumption and lifestyles, putting in place measures to ensure consumption and trade are not taking place at the expense of biodiversity, that resource use is within equitable global and regional ecological boundaries, taking into account individual and national cultural and socioeconomic conditions, achieving by 2030 just and sustainable consumption levels.”.</p>
18. Promote education and the generation, sharing and use of knowledge relating to biodiversity, in the case of the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local	<p>Target 19: By 2020, knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are</p>	2.5, 15.5	<p>Whilst this text is agreeable, it would be great if the role of indigenous people could be mentioned more. The IPBES highlights them as being key to protecting biodiversity in the future. They should be central to the strategy so it is quite alarming that they just get a small mention here.</p> <p>Link to Aichi Target 18 and 19</p>	

<p>communities with their free, prior and informed consent, ensuring by 2030 that all decision makers have access to reliable and up-to-date information for the effective management of biodiversity.</p>	<p>improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied.</p>			
<p>19. Promote the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, and of women and girls as well as youth, in decision-making related to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, ensuring by 2030 equitable participation and rights over relevant resources.</p>	<p>Target 18: By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous 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 and local communities, at all relevant levels.</p>	<p>1.4, 2.3, 5a</p>	<p>“Promoting” is too weak, these are rights which must be ensured. We suggest to reshuffle the text to have a stronger focus on equitable participation and rights.</p>	<p>Ensure by 2030 equitable participation and rights over relevant resources through [...] sustainable use of biodiversity. / Promote [...] ensuring by 2030 equitable participation and rights over relevant resources</p>
<p>20. Foster diverse visions of good quality of life and unleash values of responsibility, to effect by 2030 new social norms for sustainability.</p>			<p>Vaguely related to Aichi Target 1: “people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.”</p> <p>This target is not SMART. We propose to replace it by a target on transformational change at national level, e.g. “Parties have identified the needs for transformational change at national level, and have adopted and put in place strategies and plans to bring about the necessary changes at national level.”</p>	

Some important elements are missing:

- Important parts of Aichi target 4 (Governments role not mentioned in Consumption and production)
- Aichi targets 6 and 7 (no specific mention of fisheries and forestry)
- Aichi target 10 (partly replaced by AT No.6); coral reef part and pressure part is missing, role of biodiversity as victim of climate change
- Important parts of Aichi target 11 (efficiency. Participation, management- see comments on Action target 2)
- Aichi target 17 on NBSAPs (but included in Draft decision)

<p>E. Implementation support mechanisms</p> <p>13. Effective implementation of the framework requires implementation support mechanisms commensurate with the ambition set out in the goals and targets of the framework and with the transformative changes required to reach them. These include:</p> <p>(a) The amount of resources available to implement the framework needs to be sufficient. This requires an increase in resources from all sources;</p> <p>(b) Capacity-building, particularly nationally determined and/or country-driven capacity-building;¹⁵</p> <p>(c) The generation and sharing of scientific information and knowledge important to the effective implementation, monitoring and review of the framework;</p> <p>(d) Technical and scientific cooperation, technology transfer and innovation relevant to the implementation of the framework.</p>	<p>Strategic Goal E: Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building</p> <p>Target 17: By 2015 each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

<p>F. Enabling conditions</p> <p>14. Appropriate consideration of a set of enabling conditions will facilitate the implementation of the framework. In addition, effective action on these enabling conditions will contribute to the attainment of other societal objectives. These enabling conditions are:</p> <p>(a) The participation of indigenous peoples and local communities and a recognition of their rights in the implementation of the framework;</p> <p>(b) The participation of all relevant stakeholders, including women, youth, civil society, local and subnational authorities, the private sector, academia and scientific institutions;</p> <p>(c) Gender equality, women’s empowerment and gender-responsive approaches;</p> <p>(d) Recognition of intergenerational equity;</p> <p>(e) Synergies with other relevant multilateral environmental agreements and processes;</p> <p>(f) Partnerships to leverage activities at the local, national, regional and global levels;</p>	<p>Strategic Goal E: Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building</p>		<p>Formulation on (e) “Synergies” too weak, this will mean that others will tell CBD what to do. If it is intended that the framework is a truly global framework setting the goals and targets for other MEAs and conventions, it must include clear entry points for their contributions and offer links to their processes and indicators.</p>
---	---	--	---

<p>(g) Adequate inclusive and integrative governance is put in place to ensure policy coherence and effectiveness for the implementation the framework;</p> <p>(h) Adequate political will and recognition at the highest levels of government of the urgent need to halt biodiversity loss.</p> <p>15. Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals, such as the Goals on quality education, gender equality, reduced inequality, and peace and justice, as well as sustainable production and consumption, will help to create enabling conditions for the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>G. Responsibility and transparency</p> <p>16. The framework contains measures to monitor, review and report on its implementation at the national, regional and global levels. These are essential elements of the framework and include:</p> <p>(a) Reflecting the framework in relevant planning processes, including national biodiversity strategies and action plans;</p> <p>(b) Periodic reporting, including through the use of identified indicators, by Governments, multilateral environmental agreements and other relevant international processes, indigenous peoples and local communities, civil society and the private sector of the actions taken to implement the framework, the successes achieved, and the challenges encountered;</p> <p>(c) Periodic reviews and stocktakes, including by using the monitoring framework, of the progress made in implementation and the successes and challenges encountered;</p>	<p>Strategic Goal E: Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building</p> <p>Target 17: By 2015 each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan.</p>	<p>14, 15</p>	<p>The formulation is currently too general. (d) should include compliance and accountability mechanism as well. Nothing concrete specific on NBSAPs formats, on the need to take up the GBF, no dates for reviews, stocktakes and review mechanism.</p>
---	---	----------------------	--

<p>(d) Additional mechanisms for responsibility and transparency.</p>			
<p>H. Outreach, awareness and uptake 17. All actors will need to help to raise awareness of the framework and of the need for whole-of-society engagement to implement it. This includes the need for activities at the local, national, regional and global levels and the need to implement the framework in a way which is supportive of other relevant</p>	<p>Target 1: By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably. Target 4: By 2020, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of</p>	<p>4, 12, 13, 15</p>	

international processes and strategies.	use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits.			
---	--	--	--	--