

2020 UN BIODIVERSITY CONFERENCE

COP 15 / CP-MOP 10 / NP-MOP 4

Ecological Civilization-Building a Shared Future for All Life on Earth

KUNMING - MONTREAL

- UNGA Biodiversity Summit, took place in New York, which included a Leaders Pledge for Nature from 93 countries "to scale up Nature based solutions on land and sea"
- Mobilize resources through the High Ambition Coalition for Nature and People (100 countries)
- New targets are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Ambitious, Realistic, Timebound) –*Theory of change*
- Quest for the "Paris target for Biodiversity"
- Various targets evaluated
- The High Ambition Coalition also provided the momentum for the 30x30

What's in the GBF?



- KM-GBF included four goals which are supported by 23 targets, which aim to be completed by 2030
- Goal A focuses on the integrity of ecosystems, the diversity of species and halting human driven extinction 8 targets.
- Goal B is based on sustainable use of natural resources, and the restoration of ecosystems 4 targets
- Goal C focused on Digital Sequence information, ensuring the fair and equitable use of all benefits from the utilisation of genetic resources (target 13)
- Goal D focuses on implementation, mechanisms, support (financial and through capacity building and collaboration) - 10 targets and 10 sub-targets

- Goal A includes spatial planning to halt the loss of high diversity areas (Target 1)
- Protect and restore 30% of land, freshwater, coastal and high-sea areas (T2)
- Ensure they are connected, and includes representative coverage of all ecosystems (T3)
- Reduce the chance of extinction through appropriate management plans for threatened species (T4)
- Ensure use is sustainable (T5)
- Minimise the impacts of alien species (T6)
- Manage ecosystems to minimise the impacts of pollution (T7) and climate change (T8)

- Goal B includes ensuring sustainable management of wild species (T9)
- Sustainable agriculture through holistic approaches to reduce environmental impacts (T10)
- Maximise ecosystem service provision (T11)
- Increase green spaces within urban environments (T12)

Monitoring framework

The monitoring framework aims to help implementation of the GBF through providing the metrics to chart progress

This includes various types of indicators, including headline indicators, complementary and constituent indicators, as well as binary indicators

These indicators are also likely to be key to success of the GBF

-range of widely accepted datasets and methodologies including the redlist of species, the redlist of ecosystems, and quantifiable targets around protection and populationsize

Target	Target Aim	Indicators	Indicators available		М				Taxonomically representative	Spatially representative	Needs definitions	mismatch	Other issues	Goal	Score
1	Inclusive spatial planning	3	2	yes	semi	yes	semi	no	no	no	yes	partial		A-B	5/45
2	30% of areas under effective restoration	1	0	no	semi	yes	yes	yes	not specified	semi	yes	no		A-B	8/60
3	30% areas protected	1	1	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	not specified	semi	yes	no		A-B	8/65
4	Halt human induced extinction	2	2	semi	no	yes	no	no	no	semi	no	high		A-B	2/21
5	Sustainable wildlife trade	1	1	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	yes	very high		A-B	1/10
6	Invasive alien species	1	1	no	no	yes	no	no	no	semi	yes	no		A-B	4/35
7	Pollution risks	2	1	no	no	yes	no	no	NA	semi	yes	yes	No precautionary element	A-B	3/25
8	climate change	0	0	no	no	yes	no	no	NA	no	yes	no indicator		A-B	3/20
9	Sustainable wildlife trade	2	0	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	yes	very high		A-B	1/10
10	Sustainable agriculture and aquaculture	2	2	semi	semi	semi	no	no	NA	not factored in	yes	yes		A-B	4/25
11	Ecosystem services	1	0	no	no	yes	no	no	no	possible	yes	high	scope needs defining	A-B	3/21
12	connectivity	1	1	semi	no	yes	no	no	NA	no		high		A-B	2/16
13	DSI	2	0	semi	no	semi	semi	no	NA	yes		high		C-D	4/26
1 13 14 14	Biodiversity mainstreaming	0	0	no	no	yes	no	no	NA	semi		no indicator	the use of biodiversity in poverty alleviation strategies is linked to spillover, safeguards are needed. Standards are needed to avoid loopholes	C-D	2/15
15	Business and biodiversity	1	0	yes	semi	yes	semi	no	NA	semi		high	*15 has three subtargets so indicators do not cover them. Standards are needed	C-D	5/36
16	Sustainable consumption	0	0	yes	no	yes	no	no	NA	yes		no indicator	limited to food, should consider inventory and other elements of consumption	C-D	4/30
17	Biosafety	0	0	no	no	yes	no	no	no	no		no indicator	refers to older CBD articles which may need revisiting	C-D	1/10
18	Perverse incentives	2	2	no	semi	yes	no	semi	NA	no		minor	No precautionary element	C-D	4/28
19	Finance	3	2	yes	yes	no	semi	yes	NA	possible		*seven sub- targets, most lack indicators	Annual funding deficit is more than double that of the target	C-D	7/44
20	Capacity	0	0	no	no	no	semi	no	NA	no		no indicator	lacks aim on what	C-D	1/5
21	Accessible data	1	1	no	no	no	semi	no	no	no		high	definition and framework needed	C-D	1/6
22	Representative inclusion	0	0	yes	no	semi	no	no	NA	yes		no indicator		C-D	4/25
23	Gender equality	0	0	yes	no	semi	no	no	NA	yes		no indicator		C-D	4/25

Annexes

- Various connected annexes were issued alongside the GBF
- These included:
- OneHealth
- Finance and potentially a new funding mechanism
- DSI-though this will be built on in future CBD meetings

Goal D

- Financial dimensions are also a major component of this goal, with seven sub-targets within T19 which aim to provide effective financial mechanisms, and incentives for the management of biodiversity
- Strengthened capacity building and technology transfer (T20)
- Effective communication for decision making (T21)
- Gender representation (T22) and equality (T23)

What is missing in the GBF

- Indicators may be too simple, many useful indicators are missing-i.e. BERI, STAR; solid data will be needed to make the framework actionable
- Many key elements were removed from text, i.e debt was removed
- No glossary means there is a risk of over-simplification and misinterpretation
- Topics like OneHealth are only in annexes and not the main GBF
- Business and finance called for more ambitious targets. Separate alliances may help action in these spheres
- No "best practice" elements-i.e. conservation evidence

What is missing in the GBF

- For Target 1, (protection of high diversity areas), clearer definitions or mechanisms for identifying high diversity areas are crucial. The same is true for the indicators used with the Redlist of ecosystems which still only exists for a subset of ecosystems in a subset of countries, with not all following standard guidelines (and the majority of assessments not available). Developing standards and making all data available will be crucial.
- For Target 2 (ecosystem restoration), restoration terms must be clarified and an operable indicator must be selected by COP 16. The Secretariat can reach out to global partners already engaged in large-scale restoration (Van der Esch, et al., 2021) for input and project coordination.
- For Target 3 (implementation of 30 × 30), headline indicators for representativeness, connectivity and management
 effectiveness on lands and waters must be added to the monitoring framework. It is also critical that the Secretariat
 address specific definitions and implementation guidelines for OECM lands; this is especially important to accommodate
 Indigenous Peoples' land and waters (Mitchell et al., 2018; Gurney et al., 2021).
- For Target 4 the IUCN Red List does not meet the criteria needed to monitor implementation; efforts are needed to
 create standardised approaches for the monitoring of populations, and standard reporting to detect changes in
 abundances or ranges.
- For Target 5 and 9, monitoring of what species are traded is needed, and this means better national reporting of imports and exports of wildlife, and assessments of populations for species coming from the wild to ensure that such trade is genuinely sustainable. Sustainability requires measures of what is in trade and wild populations, and data is needed for all wildlife in trade for these targets to be met. Here complementarities are possible, for example, the A.5 indicator (populations of over 500 individuals) the selection of species could aim to both be representative, and to focus on species in trade, to provide the baseline monitoring needed to assess vulnerability of species to over-exploitation.
- For Target 7 (pollution), a nitrogen headline indicator should be included.
- For Target 8 (climate change), an adequate headline indicator is needed; it should support strategic planning with other UN bodies specific to future climate impacts on conservation lands and waters as well as food systems out to 2050 and beyond (Brodie and Watson, 2023).
- For Target 16 (sustainable consumption), it is imperative to reinstate dietary change and nutrition guidelines as headline indicators.

Challenges ahead

- BBNJ-highseas targets may be particularly challenging for all reasons, though new High Seas Treaty will work towards approaching this
- "OPEC for biodiversity" may drive regressive action in tropical forest areas (Brazil, Indonesia, Congo)
- Supplychains referenced, but mechanistic elements may not be made clearly enough
- Stronger mechanistic elements need to reflect "common but differentiated responsibilities"
- An estimated US\$ 598-824 billion is needed to reverse biodiversity loss by 2030

Success?

- Major issues round funding and funding mechanisms
- NBSAP creation, updating, data aggregation and capacity?
- Many targets require identification of key areas-but how are these recognised when many areas lack data?
- Terms like agroecology were maintained, and sustainable intensification; but how does this translate, what standards are used?

Implementing GBF

- The biodiversity-finance forum, including 150 financial institutions managing over \$24 trillion highlighting their principles for responsible investment
- Quadrapartite on OneHealth
- GBF includes biodiversity finance (Biofin) of at least US\$200 billion by 2030
- Global Environment Facility (GEF) a new Special Trust Fund ("GBF Fund") will be established to implement the Global Biodiversity Framework
- Mechanisms such as debt for nature swaps, in addition to other pledges of funding for biodiversity (Finance for Biodiversity Pledge 2021)

Moving on...

- AHTEG is revisiting the indicator framework, focused on developing methods for indicators without a method
- However, missing indicators and mismatches are not being examined-meaning moving forwards will be particularly challenging
- How do we assess progress (and baselines) for the AP region?