

ECO

Volume 47, Issue 2

Wednesday, 18 June 2014

www.cbdalliance.org

twitter: biodivsoc

facebook: CBD-Alliance

In this issue

- Resource Mobilisation
- Scaling up Systems Thinking
- Mainstreaming biodiversity in the SDGs
- Side event: Stakeholder Participation

Agenda Item 6 – Resource Mobilisation

Why a strategy for resource mobilisation?

Nele Marien, CBD Alliance

Last night a long discussion was held on the text regarding the review of implementation of the strategy for resource mobilisation. A few reflections.

The definition of a final target for biodiversity finance is an important issue. Currently, the text proposes to double total biodiversity-related international financial resource by 2015, and maintain this level at least until 2020. It was pointed out by some developing countries that it is totally unsure whether this level is sufficient. To be honest, real needs are a multiple of the funds offered.

While this discussion is certainly important, it would be even more important to know how this proposed objective will be implemented. Which developed countries will provide precisely how much financial support? What sources will it come from? Where will it flow to? Is it guaranteed? For how long?

It would be interesting to learn some lessons from the climate negotiations, where “fast track finance” and a “green climate fund” were promised, but where up till now there are multiple issues, such as double accounting of committed funds, mixing climate funds with official development aid and the total lack of clarity of which country will provide which amount of funding in the future. It seems easy to set a collective goal, but more difficult to define precise responsibilities, and much more difficult to have it really arrive.

Developed countries, four years after defining the Aichi Targets, are still searching for a “strategy” to finance them. The proposed strategy relies strongly on hazy

concepts such as ‘innovative financial mechanisms’ and ‘private funding’. Does this indicate a lack of political will to act upon Article 20 of the Convention?

Is planning for ‘*innovative financial mechanisms*’ a real and effective strategy? For climate policy, after almost a decade of implementing carbon markets, results are poor, to say the least. In biodiversity, their implementation is even more problematic. There is no trading unit, and protection of biodiversity is dubious within its schemes. Most of the innovative mechanisms do not create real biodiversity finance.

Biodiversity offsets? The funds go to replace destructed sites, not to biodiversity conservation.

Payment for Ecosystem Services? It generates payments for landowners, compensating for the alternative uses, while not providing funding available for policy expenditures.

Biodiversity derivatives? They are inserted in financial markets and might generate money, but very disconnected from real conservation policies.

Furthermore, implementing those systems implies a lot of time and money. Planning for them means setting up complex measuring, exchanging, and liability systems, which take years to set up, involving substantial budgets. The continuous implementation of those mechanisms requires continuous follow up of regulatory institutions. By the time those start to become operational, the deadline for the Aichi Targets may well be gone, along with millions of dollars invested in the system.

Scaling-up systems thinking: A tool for biodiversity mainstreaming

Maria del Rosario Ortiz Quijano

Why it is that biodiversity mainstreaming in all sectors continues to be such a difficult task? Why does harmful incentive to biodiversity persist among sectors in all countries despite the Aichi Target 3? Why is there an increasing recognition of harmful subsidies but little action to eliminate them? Why are sustainable production and consumption of products and services no critical success factors throughout? Two issues could explain it. First, existing mainstreaming methodologies are limited in their application and the second, our mindset is not in tune with the complex socio-ecological systems. Exploring these issues explains why the *Aichi Target 3* is lagging.

Countries have access to important tools such as Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or Ecosystem approach to help them integrate biodiversity considerations throughout all sectors. Nonetheless, the use of these fails to deliver the necessary change in direction regarding the drivers of biodiversity loss. SEA methodologies are not effective in the inclusion of biodiversity considerations when formulating economic or social national policies, legislations or budgets. According recent research, from Denmark, policy making and planning for strategic decision-making are two different processes. We must integrate the dynamics and the understanding of their interactions so that we can see why and where this integration fails. Policy making and strategic decision-making processes are frequently not clear cut avenues without public participation consideration of environmental elements. Instead, SEA planning and strategic decision-making processes yield reasonable options to follow when determining infrastructure locations, public consultation, and consideration of all environmental aspects in the strategic decision-making processes. We can ask, for example, if biodiversity is part of the equation when defining a national macroeconomic policy decision based on the increased economic growth rooted in monoculture export commodities? Or, is it more commonly factored in when deciding land-use planning decisions in rural areas for a particular culture?

Concerning thinking framework, there are two ways of thinking when defining national or sectorial policies. On the one hand, there is *systemic thinking* in which the whole is different to the sum of the parts and can only be under-

stood within the context of the larger whole by studying their interconnections between complex socio-ecological subsystems at multiple scales, their feedback loops, their thresholds, and their redundancies. On the other hand, is the *linear thinking* and silo mentalities in which interconnections among the subsystems of different sectors are not taken into account. Neither considers the fact that the whole has emergent properties that are not revealed when the subsystems are taken in isolation: “the wetness of water cannot be understood in terms of hydrogen and oxygen.” This type of thinking is a paradox; blind to the fact that it creates both incentives for the destruction of biodiversity and disincentives for the development of agro-ecological practices.

For example, when outlining a national agricultural and livestock policy to subsidize increase in productivity by applying an all-dressed up harmful package (deforestation, destruction of agricultural biodiversity, pesticides, chemical fertilizers, displacement of rural communities etc.) to boost growth. When this happens, soil fertility or qualities of water are forgotten and thresholds related with chemical pollution, climate change and biodiversity loss are not contemplated. The Global Forest Coalition gives a good case study for this in its briefing paper for SBSTTA 18 on unsustainable livestock production in Paraguay.

To create mainstreaming tools based on system thinking there is a need to build “Systems literacy” and to scale-up “Systems’ thinking”. This type of thinking is a key capacity-building challenge for biodiversity managers and people responsible for strategic decision-making processes. In this way the interactions between policy making and planning strategic decision-making should provide for more transparency and inclusive processes with the biodiversity considerations. These should be taken as a high priority to improve choices that allow a true sustainable development anchored in healthy resilient communities.

It would be a good day when the indicator of *Aichi Target 3* relative to the elimination of harmful incentives on biodiversity starts to show a downward trend. When this new and available increase in financial resources is properly invested, biodiversity would then, at long last, become mainstreamed into all sectors and biodiversity standing would finally cease to decline.

The road ahead

Mainstreaming biodiversity in the sustainable development goals

Intervention by the Global Youth Biodiversity Network

The Global Youth Biodiversity Network welcomes the efforts of the international community and the work of the OWG in recognizing the importance of biodiversity in achieving the vision of a sustainable world and the future we really want.

However, we express our concerns that the document “Introduction and Proposed Goals and Targets on Sustainable Development for the Post-2015 Development Agenda (Zero Draft)” presented by the Co-chairs of the open working group on the SDGs does not fully reflect the importance of biodiversity in enabling and limiting all essential human and non-human activities on the planet. Biodiversity represents all of the richness and diversity on earth and therefore should be regarded as an indispensable element in the fight against poverty and inequality.

We welcome that Target 15 in the Zero Draft refers directly to the halt of the loss of Biodiversity. However, we strongly urge parties to further integrate Biodiversity into the remaining targets as well, especially into Target 4 on education, stressing the importance of mainstreaming biodiversity awareness into formal and informal curricula.

Biodiversity holds many advantages for society and is the foundation for many sectors of the economy. Mainstreaming Biodiversity into all SDGs is therefore the key to their success.

The Global Youth Biodiversity Network urges parties to prioritize the improvement and redesign of governance structures and institutions through transformative, inclusive and daring approaches to tackle power imbalance, environmental and social justice, human rights and perverse incentives, rather than allocating efforts and major funds solely on improving technology and scientific capacity.

In order to achieve sustainability, scientific development should be equally followed by ethical development, awareness raising and education.

Therefore, we welcome the establishment of quality education for all as a stand alone goal, and we further recommend that education be mainstreamed in all other sustainable development goals.

To ensure the achievement of the SDGs, we urge parties to ensure full and effective participation of all stakeholders including the frequently marginalized groups: children, youth, women, and indigenous and local communities. Their contribution is essential and should be supported during all phases of the process, from design to implementation.

In order to achieve the mission of the Strategic Plan to halt the loss of Biodiversity by 2020, we urge parties and the secretariat to further integrate the Aichi Biodiversity Targets into the SDG process, ensuring that they are mutually supportive and complement each other. All human prosperity depends on functioning ecosystem services, therefore mainstreaming biodiversity into all SDGs is absolutely essential and the CBD community should ensure that this is fully taken into account by the OWG during the whole process of establishing SDGs, keeping the pressure in the negotiations.

We are here together with half of the world's population, to stand for the right of future generations to live in harmony with the planet and with each other. We urge parties to acknowledge the planetary boundaries and to fully recognize that human activities should operate according to its limitations in order to maintain the planet's existing potential to be resilient and ensure that future generations have their chance to thrive.

Finally, we urge parties to have the courage to think outside of the box, to be innovative, and to dare to change current institutions and systems in order to fully address sustainability and safeguard our capacity to keep living on the planet for centuries to come.

CBD Alliance would like to thank Swedbio for their continued and ongoing support

The opinions, commentaries, and articles printed in ECO are the sole opinion of the individual authors or organisations, unless otherwise expressed.

Submissions are welcome from all civil society groups.

Email: lorch@ifrik.org and nele.marien@gmail.com

Mainstreaming biodiversity into the SDG agenda

Mike Barrett, Director of Science and Policy, WWF-UK

The post 2015 process provides a major opportunity to embed biodiversity into the sustainable development agenda. These opportunities are rare and must be grasped. There has been much discussion already here in Montreal about the efforts of the Executive Secretary and Secretariat of the CBD, and a number of Parties to the CBD, to press for the full integration of the objectives of the CBD into the discussions in New York. **Why is this important? Because without such mainstreaming, the post-2015 framework will not deliver sustainable development.**

There are some grounds for optimism. Progress has been made in the discussions in New York to both mainstream biodiversity and to construct new terrestrial and marine goals. But the international process is still at an early stage, and there will be some who push back on the progress made to date. All Parties to the CBD have a role to play in ensuring that their representatives in New York understand the importance of achieving the Aichi Targets in the context of the meeting new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

The Aichi Biodiversity Targets were hard won at COP 10 in 2010, and there are challenges ahead if they are to be met. The post-2015 framework should not reinvent these, but should build upon them. The post-2015 process also provides a valuable opportunity to look beyond 2020, and to build further on our objectives towards 2030 and it is encouraging to see 2030 biodiversity targets under discussion in New York. But what will be the role of the CBD, including the COP this year, in formulating these targets?

Who could be better placed to make recommendations to our colleagues in New York than the CBD? There is a challenge. Is it possible to agree, this year, on a recommendation for the marine and terrestrial environments that both encourages achievement of our Aichi Targets but also points to what needs to be done in addition by 2030?

We believe that the SBSTTA of the CBD has a role to play in considering what suitable targets might be, and to pass these to the COP in Korea for discussion, providing Parties with the opportunity to send a message from the High Level Segment as to the level of ambition that is realistic and necessary for the Sustainable Development Goals to deliver.

Side event – Today, 13:15, Room 7B

The Value of Effective Stakeholder Participation in the CBD process

The side event by the *CBD Alliance* and the *Global Youth Biodiversity Network* highlights the work that has been done by different civil society representatives, synergies between them, and how engagement by civil society organisations, including youth, indigenous peoples and local communities, women and scientists adds value to the process of the CBD.

We present case-studies that showcase different local approaches to better engage stakeholders in tackling on-ground biodiversity conservation challenges. We throw some light on the discussion involving a stakeholder engagement strategy for the CBD process and get inspired and instigated by ideas originated in civil society's current practices.

We look at ways for stakeholders to contribute to the process, present ideas on how it can be further improved, and show current obstacles that are limiting stakeholder participation in the CBD.

- **Introduction of the CBD Alliance** - Nele Marien
- **Youth Participation** - Melina Sakiyama & Christian Schwarzer
- **Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities** - Yolanda Terán
- **Women's Caucus** - Simone Lovera
- **Science Community** - Ricarda Steinbrecher
- **Case-Study Presentation about Youth Engagement in India & Ghana** - Swetha Sthothrabhasham & David Oppong Meyde
- **General Reflections** - Christine von Weizsäcker