

In this issue:

- Thinking outside the bento box
- IPBES global assessment and national circumstances
- Animal welfare in post-2020
- CBDA opening statement SBSTTA
- CBD Women Caucus recommendations on agenda item 3

Thinking outside the bento box - Dump the dashboard and let nature lead.

Severine Tschamer - Fleming (The Greenhorns) and Jim Thomas (ETC Group)

When several hundred biodiversity negotiators crowded into a room together on Sunday morning they weren't there for church - but they were hungry for inspiration and revelation. This was the much anticipated 'reveal moment' from the co-chairs of the post2020 process - a promised first glimpse of the big picture global plan to save biodiversity for the next 3 decades.

Disappointingly (and unsurprisingly) there was no divinely inspired plan on show. Despite the rhetoric of "transformative change" delegates were served something that more resembled a bento box - categories of thematic topics laid out on one slide in rounded boxes: - a portion of technology transfer and traditional knowledge here, some slices of direct drivers there, a dollop of 'sustainable use' here and some sensible condiments of monitoring and review alongside.

The co-chairs beamed at their own 'theory of change'. But it wasn't a theory of change at all - it was just a handy way to deliver a selection of 'least controversial' priorities into a single slide. Each of these morsels, we were told, could become a different goal or target to be developed into what in effect was a matrix or dashboard of key elements. The 'theory of change' was really a theory of management - for monitoring and managing biodiversity decline ("reducing biodiversity loss" -hardly inspirational).

At monday morning's plenary presentation after presentation admitted the relative failure of the GSPC, the Aichi targets and other such previous 'dashboards' of so-called 'SMART' targets. it should be apparent that "Realistic Targets" as a framework for effective action, is rapidly wearing out its welcome. Regression from the existing targets is well documented, IPCC targets for emissions reductions, too, haven't shown themselves to be terribly successful in shifting the trends. We have the science to define constraints of life on earth-- and to insist that we HALT biodiversity loss, and INSIST on best practices for AgroEcology, high standards of repair and restoration of mining and extraction sites, firm limits and strict regulation. To rewild and let biodiversity flourish.

Far from an inspiration, the periodic table of the sustainable development goals should act as a warning. The SDG's and their laundry list of targets have not ignited a broad movement of strategic joined-up progressive actions applying pressure across the

waterfront of necessary change. Instead the 17 goals and 169 targets have become more like a buffet of comfortable policy choices in which any actor can find themselves a niche with very little change. Agribusiness can badge themselves part of the SDG's so long as long by ticking a target or two on gender and infrastructure. Mining companies might point to their support for education as proof that they are warriors for the sustainable development goals.

So can we do something better? Rather than relax unimaginatively into a tired old approach can we be brave enough to dump the dashboard and adopt a more transformative' approach to the post 2020 global biodiversity framework - one that engages with on the ground political change. Imagine for a moment a global framework built on these 5 cornerstones:

The rights-based approach - The post2020 framework could bring together, elevate and propose actions to advance and defend key rights for nature. These include the procedural and substantial human rights that enable nations and communities to partner with and defend nature in the face of corporate, military and state assaults - from rights of participation and inclusion, free prior and informed consent, and defence of environmental defenders as well as economic and social rights of farmers, fisherfolk, forest dweller, pastoralists who pursue biodiversity based livelihoods.

The Rights of Nature- The post 2020 framework could build on the Declaration Rights of Mother Earth agreed by the UNGA and the work of many regions and governments to elaborate rights of nature in law so that biodiversity itself can have standing in the courtroom and against corporate and destructive actors.

AgroEcology/Food Sovereignty -Agroecological approaches to human livelihood, subsistence and locally oriented enterprise have been celebrated by many FAO publications in recent years. Rural dwellers, impacted directly by climate changes, are often bearing disproportionate risk, but also have more potential to contribute to activities that stabilize the health of nature than are urban dwellers— who pollute more, and have less opportunity to meaningfully contribute to ecosystem function.

Community conservation and restoration - Communities can drive restoration of forests and farmlands, can steward, assess and improve habitat for native species through hedgerows, trees on farms,

roadside plantings and forest patches. Communities can exert social pressure on actors to prevent habitat destruction. Governments can empower communities in their countries by making more funding, training and support available to allow communities to restore their own home places.

Peoples Technology Assessment - At a time when the 'fourth industrial revolution' of synthetic biology, artificial

intelligence, big data, robotics and ecosystem engineering is rapidly 'disrupting' biodiversity directly, building a governance mechanism for technology is urgent. Citizen-led participation in evaluating new technologies is already being practiced around the world with juries, people's tribunals and traditional knowledge complementing more familiar risk assessment approaches and able to help blunt underlying drivers of biodiversity loss.

IPBES global assessment and national circumstances

Nele Marien - Friends of the Earth International

The presentation given by the IPBES on its Global Assessment Report yesterday shows once again how much our environment is at peril. The situation is worse than what the sum of the 6th national reports may seem to show. Presumably, each country does its best to show a positive story, which may conceal negative outcomes. Further scientific explanations on the full IPBES report, given at the side event at midday, showed how the impacts of biodiversity degradation are not evenly distributed amongst the regions. Impacting economic activities have typically been outsourced from developed countries towards developing countries. E.g. imports by the global north of industrial monoculture crops, timber or

mineral ores often leave considerable environmental scars in the global south.

If we want to achieve the transformative change we need, it is imperative we base the planning and implementation of the GBF on a global understanding of the state of biodiversity and its causes. This needs to take into account the activities of economic sectors which often cause degradation and other negative impacts in regions of production or extraction, but not at place of consumption.

Claiming implementation is a national issue only is not sufficient anymore.

Animal welfare – key component for the sustainable management of wildlife beyond 2020.

Adeline Lerambert (Born Free) and Maha Bazzi (World Animal Net)

The 2019 Global Sustainable Development Report states that "the clear links between human health and well-being and animal welfare is increasingly being recognized", and identifies animal welfare as a key issue missing from the Sustainable Development Agenda.

According to the IPBES Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, the threat of extinction looms for one million species of plants and animals. Overexploitation, mainly via harvesting, logging, hunting and fishing, is one of the main drivers of biodiversity loss. The Assessment identified the need for 'transformative changes' to tackle the biodiversity crisis, which it refers to as a moral issue.

The UN Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), which provides a global platform for the conservation and sustainable use of migratory animals and their habitats, recognises that "at the basis of a transformative change, there may be the need of revisiting and broadening our

understanding and perception of biodiversity and animal species and recognizing their rights and freedom".

The Convention on Biological Diversity, in its Convention text, acknowledges that biodiversity has an "intrinsic value", which naturally extends to wild animals, an integral part of biodiversity. By virtue of this inherent value, humans have a moral responsibility to protect the welfare of wild animals and this ethic should be clearly and firmly embedded within the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Adopting evidence-based strategies which recognise that wildlife is worthy of protection in its own right, and weaving this intrinsic value into wildlife policy and management, are key to achieving sustainable development.

Compassionate conservation offers a tangible framework that fully considers the needs of individual animals within conservation research, policy and practice. The consideration of animal welfare science as a key

component of good conservation practice will lead to a reduction in harm to individual wild animals, a greater appreciation of their intrinsic value, and, ultimately, improved conservation outcomes. The ongoing development of the post 2020 global biodiversity framework presents an opportunity to fully engage with this perspective.

Complementary to the compassionate conservation approach are 'The International Consensus Principles for Ethical Wildlife Control' (Dubois et al. 2017), which can be built upon within the CBD framework. These principles were formulated with the goal of encouraging the ethical management of human-wildlife conflict. They promote the implementation of practical solutions that develop a culture of coexistence with wildlife, accounting for community values while minimizing the harm caused to individual animals.

The pioneering work of the UN Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) on the importance of cultural and social learning also provides an innovative pathway on how humans consider animals – moving away from the

Opening Statement - SBSTTA 23

CBD Alliance

The IPBES assessment clearly states that transformational change is needed to halt the biodiversity crisis. However, both the preliminary overview of the zero draft of the post-2020 framework presented yesterday and the proposed SBSTTA recommendations lack a clear consideration on how we can achieve this. Transformational change implies addressing systemic root causes – stopping all practices that lead to ecosystem collapse and biodiversity extinction. Measures need to be put in place so that no economic sector can cause harm to our planet in ways that cross dangerous tipping points for biodiversity loss.

We welcome the emphasis on addressing drivers of both climate change and biodiversity loss, such as unsustainable livestock production. In this respect, addressing unsustainable livestock production and consumption is not just a matter of behavioral change, but is contingent on a redirection of perverse incentives and other regulatory and economic tools.

Integration between the UNFCCC and the CBD is important. However, we must ensure that biodiversity stays at the forefront of all decisions and implementation in this Convention, and raise the awareness of the importance of biodiversity in the climate convention. Any measures that enhance carbon stocks but decrease biodiversity and ecosystem functioning are, in fact, negative. Notably this applies to all tree plantations, as well as BECCS.

consideration of individual animals as simple components of populations, and towards a paradigm that recognises the specific contributions those individuals make to their wider social groups. This work justifies the need to account for the welfare of individual wild animals and demonstrates that, for highly social species at least, positive conservation outcomes can depend on these individuals, behavioural diversity and the restoration of cultural knowledge. Such emerging insights may be vital for effective conservation efforts and sustainable wildlife management.

The post-2020 global biodiversity framework provides a unique opportunity to embrace truly transformative pathways for sustainable wildlife management that are both scientifically and ethically rooted. Giving active consideration to the welfare of individual animals and developing a culture of coexistence will not only enhance the potential for sustainable conservation outcomes, but will also reflect the evolving societal attitudes towards animals and the significance of human-animal interactions. Its consideration contributes towards the 2050 Vision of Living in Harmony with Nature.

We appreciate the background documents and we were heartened by the clear recognition in the IPCC report on Climate Change and Land Use that ecosystems play a central role in climate change mitigation and adaptation and that climate change policies should thus avoid negative impacts on biodiversity. But we regret that the proposed recommendations do not address the significant challenge of genuinely mainstreaming biodiversity and ecosystem-based approaches, and related existing CBD COP decisions, in climate policy.

We are glad the Parties to the CBD have explicitly recognized the important role of Indigenous Peoples, local communities and women and their ICCAs and other community conservation initiatives in biodiversity conservation, and the need to ensure their full and effective participation in the development of the post-2020 framework. Yet, some of the most important processes leading up to the post-2020 framework, such as the IAG on mainstreaming, continue to be dominated by corporations rather than rights-holders. We call on Parties and the Secretariat to duly implement the recommendation to ensure full and effective participation of women and other rights-holder groups throughout the post-2020 process and to fully integrate support for their conservation initiatives and the social and cultural dimension of biodiversity conservation, including the gender dimension, throughout the post-2020 framework. We cannot continue to exclude 50% of the world population from biodiversity policy. In line with a truly

rights-based approach we call on Parties to adopt a specific target on gender, and to integrate gender

considerations in other targets where appropriate.

Recommendations on Agenda Item 3: Informing the scientific and technical evidence base for the post-2020 GBF

CBD Women Caucus

SBSTTA/23/2/Add.1: The IPBES global assessment identifies five main “levers” to generate transformative change (19, i), “Addressing inequalities, especially regarding income and gender, which undermine capacity for sustainability:.

SBSTTA/23/2/Add.3 (Section B, Para 18) and DRAFT GBO5, page 97, notes, “the essential role of women in underpinning actions for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity have been consistently undervalued, potentially undermining effective steps towards realizing the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity unless gender issues better inform future policy decision”.

As we look to 2050, we'll have 10 million people, 25 million new kilometers of roads, 50% increase in food demand, 45% demand for water, and there will be more plastics in the ocean than biomass. Though Parties to the CBD have explicitly recognized the important role of Indigenous Peoples, local communities and women. Yet, many Parties and stakeholders continue to emphasize conventional approaches like protected areas and market-based mechanism which exclude, marginalize or even violate the rights of Indigenous Peoples, peasants, local communities and women. The need to steer away from the current limited paradigm of economic growth to a

more global sustainable economy is already reflected in the meeting document (CBD/SBSTTA/23/2, Para 21(e)). There is a need to genuinely addressing it in the development of the Global Biodiversity Framework.

We call on Parties and the Secretariat to duly implement the recommendation to ensure full and effective participation of women and other rights-holder groups in the post-2020 process and to fully integrate support for their conservation initiatives and the social and cultural dimension of biodiversity conservation, including the gender dimension, throughout the post-2020 framework. Globally through integrated actions across many conventions IPLC women are tackling many of the direct and indirect threats to biodiversity and resources must

be increased and earmarked for their local solutions providing many benefits. A post-2020 Gender plan of Action could be the mechanism for monitoring the implementation of gender as a central cross-cutting issue in the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, and we welcome the Secretariat's efforts to seek inputs on the implementation of the current Gender Plan of Action (GPA), through the survey that was just released in a notification¹ on November 21, Friday last week. We encourage all Parties and observer organizations provide input into this review process.

.....

Today, November 25 is the International day for the elimination of violence against women and following next month December 10 the International Human Rights day and here we are in Montreal at an opportune time and hope that our vision of 2050 - “ By 2050 women and girls are recognized as peoples, their collective contributions to biodiversity safeguard and conservation is valued and they have a share of the fair equitable- sharing of benefits arsign from the use of genetic resources and have the right to a healthy environment.

We sincerely thank the SCBD, UN Women, some Parties and Co-Chairs of the OEWG and Friends of Gender Equality for your support and for carrying forward our aspirations for a rights-based approach and inclusive proposal for the GBF and the vision 2050.

We also align ourselves with the Statement delivered by IIFB, GBYN, CBD Alliance, colleague from Via and UN Women.

The opinions, commentaries, and articles printed in ECO are the sole opinion of the individual authors or organizations, unless otherwise expressed. Submissions are welcome from all civil society groups.

Email: gadirlavadenz@gmail.com