

ANIMALS FOR **BIODIVERSITY, CLIMATE & HEALTH ACTION**

WHAT THE WORLD NEEDS FROM CBD COP17

This position paper was prepared by WFA on behalf of its 73 member organisations, with special contributions from Animal Protection Denmark and Eurogroup for Animals, and in close collaboration with the Born Free Foundation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	3
A. Agenda Item 9: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review	5
B. Agenda item 14(a): Mainstreaming biodiversity within and across sectors	10
C. Agenda item 18(a): Biodiversity and climate change	13
D. Agenda item 18(b): Sustainable wildlife management	15
E. Agenda item 18(f): Biodiversity and health	23
F. Agenda item 18(c): Marine and coastal biodiversity and island biodiversity	29
G. Agenda item 18(d): Biodiversity and agriculture	40
H. Agenda item 18(e): Invasive alien species	45
ABOUT WORLD FEDERATION FOR ANIMALS	51
ABOUT BORN FREE FOUNDATION	51

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

What the world needs from CBD COP17

The seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP17) is a decisive opportunity to respond to the first global review of collective progress in implementing the Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGBF). The evidence considered by SBSTTA-28 and SBI-7 shows that implementation is not advancing at the pace and scale required to achieve the 2030 goals and targets. COP17 must therefore move beyond acknowledging gaps and agree on practical, adequately financed and equitable pathways for accelerated implementation.

Animal health and welfare is integral to effective biodiversity policy. The health and well-being of wild and domesticated animals affect ecosystem functioning, resilience, food systems, human health and the risk of pathogen spillover. Policies that ignore animal health and welfare can undermine conservation outcomes, increase health risks and perpetuate harmful systems of wildlife use and food production.

WFA calls on Parties to:

1. Use the global review to identify concrete, time-bound and adequately resourced actions to close implementation gaps;
2. Strengthen monitoring of wildlife use, trade, animal-health and spillover risks without creating disproportionate reporting burdens;
3. Mainstream biodiversity, animal welfare and One Health across agriculture, fisheries, finance, health, infrastructure and other high-impact sectors;
4. Adopt and implement the voluntary global guidance on sustainable wildlife management with explicit ecological, precautionary, safety and animal-welfare safeguards;
5. Resource implementation of the Global Action Plan on Biodiversity and Health through an inclusive One Health approach that recognizes animal health and welfare;
6. Accelerate action for marine, coastal and island biodiversity, including biodiversity-friendly and higher-welfare aquaculture;

7. Protect soil biodiversity and pollinators while transforming agricultural practices and reforming harmful incentives;
8. Prioritize prevention and humane, evidence-based methods in invasive alien species policy;

A. Agenda Item 9: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review

Agenda item 9(a). Global review of collective progress in implementation of the KMGBF

STATUS OF NEGOTIATIONS

SBSTTA28 completed its scientific and technical consideration of the first global report, and SBI7 developed the broader draft global-review decision for COP17. The draft recognizes that the 2030 targets and mission will not be achieved unless collective implementation accelerates rapidly and includes a proposed Yerevan pathway for accelerated implementation. Outstanding brackets concern, among other matters, the implications for the 2050 goals, increased ambition, underlying drivers, and transformation of economic and financial systems. At COP17, WFA recommends that Parties respond to the report with targeted implementation measures—not additional reporting for its own sake—including action on the gaps most relevant to animals: sustainable, safe and legal wildlife use and trade; biodiversity and health; sustainable food systems; marine biodiversity; and the drivers affecting wild-animal populations.

This position is based on the draft decision under agenda item 9(a) in [CBD/COP/17/2, pp. 34-44](#), drawing on [SBI recommendation 7/1](#) and [SBSTTA recommendation 28/1, section A](#). Paragraph references below follow CBD/COP/17/2. Bold text indicates language that WFA recommends retaining or adding.

Recognition of the global report

We recommend removing the brackets and maintaining “**with appreciation**” in paragraph 1:

- 1. Welcomes **with appreciation** the global report on collective progress in the implementation of the Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework;*

Rationale:

The global report is the most comprehensive assessment currently available of collective progress in implementing the KMGBF. It was prepared through a Party-led process using national reports, national biodiversity strategies and action plans, national targets, scientific literature and other relevant evidence.

Although the report contains methodological and data limitations, these do not diminish its importance as the principal evidence base for the first global review. Welcoming it “with appreciation” gives the report appropriate political weight and recognizes the work undertaken by Parties, the Ad Hoc Scientific and Technical Advisory Group and the Secretariat.

Recognition of the implementation gap

We recommend maintaining the strong language in paragraph 6:

- 6. Notes with deep concern that, unless collective implementation is rapidly accelerated, including through enhanced international cooperation, improved actions and efforts and strengthened means of implementation, the 2030 targets and mission of the Framework will not be achieved, and stresses the imperative to address gaps, challenges and barriers in implementation to achieve the 2030 targets and mission;*

We additionally recommend removing the brackets in paragraph 7 and maintaining the reference to accelerated means of implementation:

7. Also notes with deep concern that, if the 2030 targets and mission of the Framework are not achieved, its 2050 goals and vision may be at risk **unless the provision of means of implementation is rapidly accelerated;**

Rationale:

The global report shows that fewer than half of the national targets associated with any global target have been assessed by Parties as being on track. Available indicators also show negative trends more frequently than positive trends.

The decision should therefore state clearly that current progress is insufficient and that implementation must be accelerated. It should not weaken the relationship between implementation outcomes and the availability of finance, capacity-building, technology transfer and technical and scientific cooperation. Accelerated implementation must address both direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss, including unsustainable production and consumption, harmful incentives, pollution, climate change, invasive alien species and unsafe or unsustainable uses of wild species.

Addressing the underlying drivers of biodiversity loss

We recommend retaining and removing the brackets around paragraph 16, with the following additions:

*16. Emphasizes that accelerating implementation would need to be supported through increased action to address both the underlying drivers of biodiversity loss and the transformation of economic and financial systems and sectors that have a negative impact on nature, **through whole-of-government and whole-of-society action, including on unsustainable production and consumption, harmful incentives, unsustainable and unsafe use of wild species, intensive food-production systems, pollution, climate change and invasive alien species, while safeguarding human, animal and ecosystem health and well-being;***

Rationale:

The global report identifies particularly significant gaps in relation to mainstreaming, harmful incentives, sustainable consumption, business impacts and other transformative elements of the

KMGBF. COP17 should not focus only on increasing the number of reported activities. It must address the economic and sectoral systems driving biodiversity loss.

This requires coordinated action across agriculture, fisheries, aquaculture, forestry, health, trade, finance, infrastructure and other sectors. It also requires recognition that biodiversity, human health, and animal health are interconnected.

Agenda item 9(b). Monitoring framework for the KMGBF

STATUS OF NEGOTIATIONS

SBSTTA28 recommended further operationalization of the monitoring framework. The COP17 draft decision provides for establishing an ad hoc technical expert group to support the eighth reporting cycle and advise on indicator methodology, metadata, disaggregation and implementation. Outstanding matters include the addition of optional component and complementary indicators, terminology concerning national monitoring systems or mechanisms, and provisions governing continuity and future reporting. WFA recommends that the expert group also provide advice on remaining indicator-coverage gaps.

This position is based on the draft decision under agenda item 9(b) in [CBD/COP/17/2, pp. 45–51](#). Paragraph references below follow that document. Bold text indicates language that WFA recommends retaining or adding.

On Annex I, we recommend adding the complementary indicator for target 4 in **bold**:

Most relevant goal or target	Type	Indicator proposed
4	Complementary	Proportion of human-wildlife conflict interventions that apply preventive, evidence-based and humane measures and monitor outcomes for people, wildlife and coexistence

Rationale

This would complement the existing component indicator, 4.CT.3, “Human-wildlife conflict indicator,” by clarifying that “effective and sustainable” management should also assess its effects on animals.

On Annex II, paragraph 1(b), we recommend adding the text in bold:

1. The Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on the Further Operationalization of the Monitoring Framework for the Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework shall develop:

[...]

*(b) Practical advice on the use and operationalization of the metadata for headline indicators in national monitoring and reporting processes, including on the use of disaggregation options **and approaches to addressing remaining indicator-coverage gaps;***

Rationale

The global report identified data and monitoring gaps that limit the ability to assess collective progress. Improving indicator metadata alone will not address cases where existing indicators do not adequately cover all elements of a target.

Target 5 is a key example. Headline indicator 5.1 covers only the biological sustainability of fish stocks, while binary indicator 5.b measures whether countries have legal or policy frameworks regulating wildlife trade. Neither adequately measures whether the use, harvesting and trade of terrestrial, freshwater and marine wild species are sustainable, safe and legal in practice, including impacts on non-target species and pathogen-spillover risks, and the implementation and enforcement of relevant laws.

The proposed addition would allow the expert group to consider these and other remaining coverage gaps when advising on the further operationalization of the monitoring framework.

B. Agenda item 14(a): Mainstreaming biodiversity within and across sectors

STATUS OF NEGOTIATIONS

SBI7 considered follow-up to decision [16/13](#) on mainstreaming biodiversity within and across sectors and adopted [recommendation 7/11](#), which forms the basis of the draft decision under agenda item 14(a) in [CBD/COP/17/2](#). The draft recognizes that progress on mainstreaming remains insufficient and calls for stronger integration of biodiversity into sectoral planning, budgets, incentives, regulations, business practices, and consumption and production patterns. It also provides for continued exchange of practical tools and experience through the clearing-house mechanism, technical and scientific cooperation, and sector-specific communities of practice. Outstanding negotiating issues include bracketed language on mainstreaming-related ambition gaps, harmful-incentive reform, sectoral transition plans, sustainable use in productive sectors, and technical guidance and capacity-building for the business and financial sectors

Priority COP17 outcomes

- Make biodiversity, animal health and well-being considerations integral to policy, planning, regulation, public finance and private financial decision-making across high-impact sectors.
- Accelerate identification, elimination, phase-out or reform of biodiversity-harmful incentives and subsidies in a just, fair and equitable manner.
- Strengthen whole-of-government implementation and accountability for business and financial-sector impacts and dependencies.

This position is based on the draft decision under agenda item 14(a) in [CBD/COP/17/2, pp. 132-135](#). Bold text indicates language that WFA recommends retaining or adding.

[Integrate animal welfare and One Health into sectoral mainstreaming](#)

On operative paragraph 4, we recommend adding the text in bold:

*4. Encourages Parties, in accordance with national circumstances, priorities, capacities and capabilities, to strengthen and accelerate efforts to integrate biodiversity and its multiple values, within and across sectors, **including by integrating animal well-being and biodiversity–health interlinkages through an inclusive One Health approach, particularly in agriculture, aquaculture, fisheries, wildlife use and trade, in line with the Framework;***

Rationale:

Paragraph 4 provides the overarching call for sectoral integration. Explicitly incorporating animal welfare and One Health would connect mainstreaming with the biodiversity-and-health and sustainable-wildlife-management tracks, helping ensure that sectoral measures address interdependent biodiversity, animal-health, welfare and public-health risks rather than shifting harms between them.

Retain and strengthen harmful-incentive reform

On operative subparagraph 6(c), we recommend retaining and removing the brackets around the provision, with the following additions in bold:

*(c) To accelerate the identification, elimination, phasing out or reforming of incentives harmful to biodiversity and scaling up positive incentives, **in a proportionate, effective, equitable and ethically responsible manner, with transition support for affected small-scale producers, workers, Indigenous Peoples and local communities;***

Rationale:

Retaining this provision is important given the global report's finding of limited progress under Target 18. Reforming harmful incentives is essential to addressing the drivers of biodiversity loss. The proposed addition emphasizes that reforms and positive incentives should be ethically responsible and socially equitable, with support for those affected by transitions, rather than transferring costs to vulnerable communities and producers.

Strengthen business accountability across value chains

On operative subparagraph 6(b)(iv), we recommend adding the text in bold:

*(iv) Strengthening the engagement of the business sector and the public and private financial sectors at all levels, highlighting nature-related opportunities and the responsibility of businesses to assess, disclose and reduce their risks, dependencies and impacts on nature **throughout their operations, supply and value chains, including through responsible and ethical business practices, taking into account the health of humans, animals, and ecosystem health** [and encouraging] [the uptake of nature-related opportunities] [and nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches to increase positive impacts];*

Rationale:

Business accountability should extend beyond disclosure to reducing adverse impacts throughout operations, supply and value chains. Responsible and ethical business practices that consider human, animal and ecosystem health would support integrated action on biodiversity and health risks and help prevent harms from being displaced across sectors or along value chains.

C. Agenda item 18(a): Biodiversity and climate change

STATUS OF NEGOTIATIONS

SBSTTA-27 considered biodiversity and climate change and forwarded a draft decision to COP17 addressing integrated implementation of the Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, biodiversity and climate synergies, and cooperation across the Rio conventions. Several provisions remain bracketed, including those recognising ecosystem functions mediated or affected by wild animals and the inclusion of wild animal populations in ecosystem protection and restoration. At COP17, WFA recommends preserving these explicit references so that integrated biodiversity and climate action recognises and supports the roles of wild animals in ecosystem functioning.

Priority COP17 outcomes

- Retain explicit recognition of ecosystem functions mediated or affected by wild animals in integrated biodiversity and climate planning.
- Retain the inclusion of wild animal populations in the protection, conservation, restoration and management of ecosystems.

This position is based on the draft decision under agenda item 18(a) in [CBD/COP/17/2, pp. 186–198](#), reproduced from [SBSTTA recommendation 27/3](#). Paragraph references below follow CBD/COP/17/2. Bold text indicates language that WFA recommends retaining or adding.

Recognise ecosystem functions mediated or affected by wild animals

On operative paragraph 6(a), we recommend removing the brackets around the subparagraph and retaining the following wording, including the bracketed reference to wild animals:

“...including by prioritizing the conservation and restoration of ecological integrity and ecosystem functions, **including those mediated or affected by wild animals**, promote synergies with other national planning processes...”

Rationale:

Explicit recognition of wild animals helps ensure that integrated biodiversity and climate planning addresses their roles in ecosystem functioning. Retaining this wording would carry forward the recognition of wild animals reflected in the COP16 decision on biodiversity and climate change.

The formulation “mediated or affected by” accommodates different ecological relationships. Retaining “affected by” allows the text to recognise that animals can also adversely affect ecosystem functions, including in the context of invasive alien species. This qualification supports a context-sensitive approach while preserving the explicit recognition of wild animals.

Include wild animal populations in ecosystem protection and restoration

On operative paragraph 6(b), we recommend removing the brackets around the subparagraph and retaining “inclusive with regard to wild animal populations”:

“To prioritize the protection, conservation, restoration, sustainable management and enhancement of terrestrial, freshwater, marine and coastal, and managed and unmanaged ecosystems, **inclusive with regard to wild animal populations**, and of ecosystems with high ecological integrity that contribute to carbon storage and sequestration and adaptation...”

Rationale:

Ecosystem protection and restoration should encompass wild animal populations alongside other components of biodiversity. Retaining this language makes their inclusion explicit within actions intended to deliver biodiversity and climate benefits and builds on the recognition already reflected in the COP16 decision. This reference should be maintained as the bracketed text is negotiated.

D. Agenda item 18(b): Sustainable wildlife management

STATUS OF NEGOTIATIONS

SBSTTA-28 completed its consideration of the voluntary global guidance on sustainable wildlife management and forwarded Recommendation 28/4 to COP17, including important provisions on ecological sustainability, the precautionary approach, cumulative pressures, One Health and safety standards, monitoring, transparency, recognition of rights and knowledge systems, inclusive decision-making, and equitable benefit-sharing. Key issues remain unresolved, notably the status and complete description of the guidance in paragraph 1, the bracketed One Health reference in paragraph 6, the proposed consultation on a possible programme of work on sustainable use in paragraph 9, language on regional and transboundary cooperation in paragraph 3. There are also a number of brackets in the annex that could affect the framing and implementation of the guidance. At COP17, WFA recommends adopting the guidance in its strongest form, retaining its ecological standards and the precautionary and animal welfare provisions, strengthening the integration of One Health, and ensuring that any potential future programme of work on sustainable use is anchored in ecological limits and does not presume that increased wildlife use, commercialization or trade will deliver biodiversity benefits.

Priority COP17 outcomes

- Adopt the voluntary global guidance as a strong framework for sustainable wildlife management.
- Preserve the ecological sustainability and precautionary approach, including ecological limits, cumulative impacts, uncertainty and the safeguard that the categorisation of practices does not imply that all species or practices are appropriate for sustainable use.
- Secure a strong One Health approach that links wildlife, livestock, ecosystem and public health, supports participatory surveillance and information-sharing, and promotes proportionate, evidence-based responses that avoid unnecessary harm to animals and biodiversity.

- Retain explicit animal welfare and ethical safeguards and extend consideration of animal welfare to wildlife management interventions and responses to disease risks.
- Ensure that customary and subsistence use is properly distinguished from commercialized and market-driven exploitation, while supporting equitable, culturally appropriate and locally-led alternatives where restrictions or transitions are necessary.
- Ensure that any future programme of work on sustainable use is evidence-based and precautionary and does not presume that sustainable use activities, products or markets inherently enhance biodiversity.

This position is based on the draft decision and annexed guidance under agenda item 18(b) in [CBD/COP/17/2, pp. 199–214](#), reproduced from [SBSTTA recommendation 28/4](#). Paragraph references below follow CBD/COP/17/2. Bold text indicates language that WFA recommends retaining or adding.

[Adopt the voluntary global guidance](#)

On operative paragraph 1, we recommend selecting “Adopts and welcomes with appreciation” and retaining the full focus of the guidance:

1. Adopts and welcomes with appreciation the voluntary global guidance on the sustainable management of wildlife applicable to multiple species and multiple practices with a focus on inclusive and participatory decision-making, the inclusion of multiple systems of knowledge and the recognition of rights, and the equitable distribution of costs and benefits.

[Rationale:](#)

Adoption would give the guidance the strongest political standing while preserving its voluntary character. The focus areas should not be deleted or narrowed. Retaining its full scope will help ensure that implementation is grounded in conservation, rights, ecological sustainability and accountability.

[Retain the safeguard that not all wildlife use is necessarily appropriate](#)

On annex section III, point (d) of the box “Species groupings and practice categories used in the present voluntary guidance”, associated with paragraph 12:, we recommend retaining the existing safeguard:

Use of categories: those categories are used solely to organize the voluntary guidance across multiple species and practices. Parties are encouraged to apply them flexibly and in a manner consistent with national legislation, customary governance systems, where applicable, and relevant international obligations. Use of such categories in the guidance does not imply that all species or practices are appropriate for sustainable use.

Rationale:

This sentence provides an important safeguard against interpreting the guidance as an endorsement of all forms of wildlife use. It should remain explicit.

The guidance covers a very broad range of practices, from fishing, logging and harvesting animals to wildlife tourism and observation. Categorising these practices for the purposes of guidance should not be understood as establishing that they can all be made sustainable in every circumstance. This is particularly important where species, populations or ecosystems are already under pressure or where use creates significant biodiversity, animal-welfare or health risks.

Include animal welfare in responses to disease risks

On operative paragraph 6, we recommend **removing the brackets around and retaining “relevant One Health approaches.”** and the reference to the WHO Pandemic Agreement, as well as adding **“animal welfare”** after “biodiversity”:

*6. Also encourages Parties to ensure, when implementing the voluntary global guidance and **relevant One Health approaches, including in the context of the WHO Pandemic Agreement**, that responses to disease risks, in particular zoonotic risks, are informed by the best available scientific evidence and traditional knowledge, taking into account potential impacts on biodiversity, **animal welfare**, wildlife health, public health and customary sustainable use by Indigenous Peoples and local communities.*

Rationale

One Health is directly relevant to sustainable wildlife management because wildlife use, trade and management can affect wildlife, livestock, human and ecosystem health. The guidance already recognises the need for cooperation across environment, forestry, fisheries, agriculture, health and veterinary authorities and for wildlife health surveillance and information-sharing. Retaining

the reference will support coordinated, evidence-based responses to zoonotic and other disease risks.

The reference to the WHO Pandemic Agreement would help reinforce coherence between biodiversity and global health frameworks, particularly on prevention and management of zoonotic disease risks.

Measures adopted in response to disease risks can have significant consequences for wild animals, including indiscriminate killing, culling or capture, confinement or movement. Explicitly including animal welfare would support evidence-based and proportionate responses designed to minimise unnecessary suffering while protecting biodiversity, animal and public health.

[Approach on the proposed programme of work](#)

On bracketed operative paragraph 9, we recommend retaining and removing the brackets around the provision, selecting “**an inclusive**”, retaining the bracketed reference to strengthening implementation, and adding to the reference to biodiversity-based activities, products and services as follows:

*9. Also requests the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources and building on decisions VII/12, 15/4, 16/12 and 16/15, to initiate **an inclusive** consultation process on options for **strengthening the implementation of sustainable use, including through** a potential programme of work on the sustainable use of biodiversity, including sustainable biodiversity-based activities, products and services that ~~enhance biodiversity~~ **demonstrably contribute to biodiversity conservation, respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, and are consistent with animal welfare, ethical and safety standards**, by requesting information from Parties, other Governments, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, women, youth and relevant organizations and actors, and to submit the options for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at a meeting held before the eighteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.*

[Rationale](#)

An inclusive consultation could help determine whether a programme of work would strengthen implementation of the KMGBF and address outstanding gaps in sustainable wildlife management.

However, the reference to biodiversity-based activities, products and services risks presuming that commercialization or expanded use inherently benefits biodiversity. Such activities may intensify wildlife exploitation or create biodiversity, animal-welfare and health risks. The consultation should first assess the need, scope, safeguards and likely consequences of any programme of work. It should be explicitly grounded in ecological limits, precaution, evidence and the objectives of the Convention and KMGBF.

Clarify that customary or traditional status does not in itself establish sustainability

On the annex, section III, box titled “Species groupings and practice categories used in the present voluntary guidance”

We recommend retaining the existing safeguard that the categorisation of species and practices does not imply that all species or practices are appropriate for sustainable use, and adding an explicit clarification that customary, traditional or subsistence status does not in itself establish that a practice is sustainable:

*Use of categories: those categories are used solely to organize the voluntary guidance across multiple species and practices. Parties are encouraged to apply them flexibly and in a manner consistent with national legislation, customary governance systems, where applicable, and relevant international obligations. Use of such categories in the guidance does not imply that all species or practices are appropriate for sustainable use. **The customary, traditional or subsistence nature of a practice does not in itself establish that the practice is sustainable; its sustainability should be assessed against ecological limits, conservation objectives and relevant animal-welfare safeguards.***

Rationale:

Customary, traditional and subsistence use can be fundamental for livelihoods, food security and cultural identity and should be recognised and respected. However, customary or traditional status does not in itself establish sustainability.

Wildlife use should be assessed against clear ecological and biological criteria, including ecological limits, conservation objectives and relevant animal-welfare and ethical safeguards. Where practices need to change, cultural and social practices should be supported to evolve in ways

compatible with biodiversity conservation and animal welfare, with the meaningful participation of affected Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

On the annex, section IV, table 1 "Principles and approaches informing the voluntary global guidance on sustainable wildlife management"

We recommend maintaining the following language under “**Ecological sustainability and the precautionary approach**”:

Resource managers and users have the responsibility to ensure that the use of wildlife does not exceed the capacity of ecosystems to maintain or recover ecological processes, species populations, genetic variability and the continued provision of ecosystem functions and services on which both biodiversity and people depend.

Parties should apply the precautionary approach in their management decisions.

Rationale:

This is one of the strongest elements of the guidance and should not be weakened. The fact that wildlife use is legal, regulated or economically beneficial does not in itself establish that it is ecologically sustainable.

Wildlife populations and ecosystems are subject to interacting pressures, including habitat loss and fragmentation, climate change, pollution, invasive alien species, disease, overexploitation and wildlife crime. Decisions should take account of ecological limits, cumulative pressures, uncertainty and the possibility of irreversible harm rather than assessing use or other interventions in isolation.

The precautionary approach is particularly important where information on wildlife populations, levels of use or trade and broader ecosystem impacts is incomplete. Maintaining this language will help ensure that uncertainty is not used to delay measures needed to prevent biodiversity loss and to avoid significant or irreversible harm.

On section V, table 2

Under “**Transparency and accountability**”, we recommend maintaining the following language as it stands:

Wildlife harvest, handling and trade practices should, as appropriate, comply with animal welfare, ethical and safety standards, norms and values of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, national legislation and applicable international obligations.

Rationale

This language recognizes that sustainable wildlife management must consider more than biological sustainability and legality. Wildlife harvest, handling and trade can have significant consequences for animal welfare and may also create ethical, biosecurity and safety concerns. The reference to animal-welfare, ethical and safety standards should therefore be retained without weakening. Where possible, its implementation should extend across the full wildlife-use value chain and be supported by appropriate monitoring, standards and enforcement.

On section VII.A

In section VII.A, paragraph 21(b)(vi), we recommend adding “safe” and reference to the full value chain:

*(vi) Management of legal, sustainable, **safe** and traceable wildlife use and trade **across the full value chain**;*

Rationale

Target 5 of the KMGBF requires the use, harvesting and trade of wild species to be sustainable, safe and legal. The existing text addresses legality, sustainability and traceability but omits safety. Risks to biodiversity, animal welfare and health can arise after harvest or capture, including during handling, transport, storage, confinement, markets and final use. A full-value-chain approach would ensure that management and traceability do not end at the point of harvest.

On section VII.D

In section VII.D, paragraph 24(i), we recommend adding the text in **bold**:

*(i) Promoting diversified and climate-resilient livelihood strategies linked with sustainable wildlife management, including sustainable use, **while recognising the importance of customary, traditional and subsistence use to livelihoods, food security and cultural identity, and supporting viable, culturally appropriate and locally led alternatives where restrictions, transitions or changes in practice are needed to ensure compatibility with biodiversity conservation, ecological limits and animal welfare;***

Rationale

Restrictions on wildlife use are unlikely to be effective or equitable if affected communities lack viable alternatives. Measures should distinguish customary and subsistence use from commercialized, market-driven and illegal exploitation. These activities can have very different ecological, social and animal welfare implications and should not be treated as interchangeable.

Customary, traditional and subsistence use can be fundamental for livelihoods, food security and cultural identity. However, customary or traditional status should not in itself be taken to demonstrate sustainability. Wildlife use should be assessed against clear ecological and biological criteria and relevant animal welfare safeguards. Where a practice exceeds ecological limits, threatens species populations or ecosystem integrity, or compromises animal welfare, supporting affected communities to adapt or evolve practices, alongside viable and culturally appropriate alternatives, can help reconcile cultural continuity with biodiversity conservation and animal welfare.

E. Agenda item 18(f): Biodiversity and health

STATUS OF NEGOTIATIONS

SBSTTA-27 reviewed implementation of the Global Action Plan on Biodiversity and Health and forwarded a highly bracketed draft decision to COP17. Unresolved matters include how to reference the IPBES Nexus Assessment and WHO Pandemic Agreement, the strength and sources of financial support, competing formulations on applying One Health, support from the Global Environment Facility and much of the proposed intersessional work on indicators, tools, stakeholder inputs, institutional cooperation and capacity-building. At COP17, WFA recommends retaining a strong, inclusive and evidence-based One Health approach that recognizes the interdependence of human, animal, plant and ecosystem health; integrating animal welfare into implementation of the Global Action Plan; securing adequate support for developing countries; and preserving work on indicators, practical guidance, stakeholder contributions and cooperation with relevant organizations and non-governmental organizations.

Priority COP17 outcomes

- Move from adoption to practical and adequately resourced implementation of the Global Action Plan on Biodiversity and Health;
- Apply an inclusive, evidence-based One Health approach that recognizes the interdependence of human, animal, plant and ecosystem health and the contribution of animal welfare;
- Integrate relevant animal health and welfare considerations into national implementation of the Global Action Plan, including through NBSAPs and relevant health, agriculture, food-system and wildlife policies;
- Ensure adequate finance, capacity-building, technical cooperation and technology transfer for implementation in developing countries;
- Develop practical indicators and progress-measurement tools that address prevention at source without duplicating existing systems or creating additional reporting burdens; and

- Preserve cooperation with the Quadripartite, relevant multilateral environmental agreements, technical organizations and non-governmental organizations.

This position is based on the draft decision under agenda item 18(f) in [CBD/COP/17/2, pp. 229-231](#), reproduced from [SBSTTA recommendation 27/10](#). Paragraph references below follow CBD/COP/17/2. Bold text indicates language that WFA recommends retaining or adding.

Welcome the IPBES Nexus Assessment

In paragraph 1, select “**Welcomes**” rather than “Takes note of” and retain the full paragraph:

1. Welcomes *The Thematic Assessment Report on the Interlinkages among Biodiversity, Water, Food and Health (“nexus assessment”) of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, including its summary for policymakers and its key messages, as well as the 71 response options, and highlights its relevance to work under the Convention on Biological Diversity and to the implementation of the Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the Global Action Plan on Biodiversity and Health.*

Rationale:

The Nexus Assessment provides an authoritative evidence base for integrated action across biodiversity, water, food and health. “Welcomes” gives its findings appropriate political weight.

Retain the reference to the WHO Pandemic Agreement

On paragraph 2, we recommend retaining and removing the brackets around the paragraph:

2. Welcomes the adoption of the WHO Pandemic Agreement and notes the potential for synergies with the implementation of the Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

Rationale:

Retaining this reference would promote policy coherence between the CBD and global health frameworks. Biodiversity loss, ecosystem degradation, land-use change and unsafe wildlife-use and production practices can increase the risk of pathogen emergence and spillover. Recognizing synergies with the WHO Pandemic Agreement can therefore strengthen upstream prevention

through One Health, avoid duplicative action and ensure that biodiversity, animal health and welfare considerations inform pandemic prevention and preparedness.

Retain a strong and inclusive One Health approach

Retain paragraph 3 and add the following text in bold:

*3. Invites Parties to create, in accordance with national circumstances and priorities, an enabling environment for the implementation of the Global Action Plan, **including by integrating biodiversity and health interlinkages, through an inclusive One Health approach, into national biodiversity strategies and action plans and other relevant health, agriculture, food-system and wildlife policies and planning processes;***

Paragraph 5 currently contains two competing formulations. We recommend a consolidated formulation in bold text below:

*5. **Urges Parties to apply an inclusive One Health approach, on the basis of scientific evidence and precaution where appropriate, that recognizes the interdependence of human, animal, plant and ecosystem health and the contribution of improved animal welfare, taking into account sanitary, phytosanitary and environmental measures, as appropriate, and internationally agreed standards and guidelines, where applicable;***

Rationale:

The Global Action Plan recognizes the interdependence of human, animal, plant and ecosystem health, explicitly promotes improved welfare standards in farming and aquaculture, and addresses health risks associated with wildlife use and trade. The GAP is intended to mainstream biodiversity and health interlinkages across sectors, but implementation could remain fragmented without integration into national planning. Embedding an inclusive One Health approach in NBSAPs and relevant sectoral policies would strengthen coordination across environment, health, agriculture and wildlife authorities and support action on the shared drivers of biodiversity loss and health risks.

One Health should address the interconnected health of people, animals, plants and ecosystems and support prevention at source. Requiring only “completed risk assessments” could delay precautionary action where there is a risk of serious or irreversible harm.

Secure adequate resources for implementation

In paragraph 4, we recommend selecting “**Urges**”, retain the reference to Article 20 of the Convention, and retain “other Parties in a position to do so”:

4. Urges, in accordance with Article 20 of the Convention, developed country Parties and other Parties in a position to do so, international and regional organizations and the private sector, among others, to provide financial resources to support implementation of the Global Action Plan in developing countries and the full and effective participation of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, women and youth, among others, in its implementation;

In paragraph 6, we recommend selecting “**Requests**” and support retaining strong finance language:

6. Requests the Global Environment Facility to provide new, additional and predictable financial support for implementation of the Global Action Plan, according to its mandate;

Rationale:

Without adequate finance and capacity, the Global Action Plan risks remaining aspirational, particularly in developing countries.

Preserve and shape the work on indicators

We recommend that the indicator process:

- map and use existing KMGBF, SDG, WHO, WOA, FAO, UNEP and national data where suitable;
- include measures of upstream prevention, ecosystem integrity, wildlife-use and trade risks, food-system drivers, animal health and welfare, and pathogen spillover risk;
- include balanced regional expertise and meaningful participation by Indigenous Peoples and local communities, women and youth and relevant stakeholders;
- avoid creating additional reporting burdens, especially for developing countries and SIDS.

As such, we recommend retaining paragraph 7(a), including the use of existing information to avoid additional reporting burdens, and add a new subparagraph 7(a)(iii):

(iii) The need for indicators, metrics and progress-measurement tools to capture upstream prevention, including ecosystem integrity, wildlife-health and pathogen-spillover risks, animal health and welfare in relevant animal-use systems, and the environmental and food-system drivers of health risks;

Rationale:

The indicator process should measure whether countries are preventing biodiversity-related health risks at their source, not only whether downstream health responses have been established.

Ensure inclusive expert participation

On paragraph 7(b), we recommend retaining and removing the brackets around the expert-workshop option and its regional representation provision, with the following additions in bold:

*(b) To convene an expert workshop, with representation from all regions nominated by Parties **and expertise across biodiversity, human, animal, plant and ecosystem health**, to review the list of integrated science-based indicators, metrics and progress measurement tools on biodiversity and health, before their consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice;*

Rationale:

Developing genuinely integrated indicators requires balanced expertise across the different components of One Health, including animal health and welfare, so that the tools capture interconnected risks and prevention opportunities.

Preserve stakeholder inputs and institutional cooperation

We recommend retaining paragraphs 7(c)–(f), including:

- compilation of measures, guidance, indicators, tools, examples and lessons learned;
- cooperation with the Quadripartite collaboration on One Health;
- references to IUCN, the Cooperation on Health and Biodiversity Initiative and non-governmental organizations;
- resumption of the Inter-Agency Liaison Group on Biodiversity and Health; and
- continued capacity-building, technical cooperation and technology transfer.

In paragraph 7(d), specifically retain and unbracket “IUCN and non-governmental organizations.”

*(d) To continue and strengthen cooperation on biodiversity and health with relevant organizations and partners, including the Quadripartite collaboration on One Health, **the International Union for Conservation of Nature**, the Cooperation on Health and Biodiversity Initiative and **non-governmental organizations**;*

Rationale:

Governments will require practical tools and sustained cooperation across biodiversity, health, agriculture and animal-welfare institutions. Civil society organizations also contribute technical expertise, implementation experience and locally relevant policy solutions.

F. Agenda item 18(c): Marine and coastal biodiversity and island biodiversity

SUMMARY OF ITEM

SBSTTA-28 concluded its consideration of marine, coastal and island biodiversity and forwarded a draft decision to COP17 that calls for accelerated implementation of the KMGBF in marine and coastal ecosystems, stronger coordination and further scientific work on marine protected areas and ecological connectivity. However, several important matters remain unresolved, including bracketed language on the qualitative elements of Target 3, explicit cooperation with the BBNJ Agreement and the establishment and composition of an informal advisory group on biodiversity beyond national jurisdiction. At COP17, WFA recommends welcoming the BBNJ Agreement's entry into force with appreciation, retaining the qualitative Target 3 language, supporting explicit and effective CBD–BBNJ cooperation with appropriate civil-society and technical expertise, unbracketing the package of scientific guidance updates, and adding targeted provisions on aquaculture, underwater noise and non-invasive monitoring so that implementation addresses both biodiversity impacts and animal welfare.

Priority COP17 outcomes

- Accelerate implementation for under-addressed marine, coastal and island ecosystems.
- Protect ecological connectivity and the qualitative elements of area-based conservation.
- Promote coherent implementation of the BBNJ Agreement, including effective environmental impact assessments and area-based management tools that protect marine animals.
- Ensure marine monitoring and management consider animal welfare, harmful practices, aquaculture impacts and underwater noise.
- Establish the informal advisory group on marine biodiversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction with its full terms of reference.

This position is based on the draft decision under agenda item 18(c) in [CBD/COP/17/2, pp. 215–223](#), reproduced from [SBSTTA recommendation 28/6](#). Paragraph references below follow CBD/COP/17/2. Bold text indicates language that WFA recommends retaining or adding.

[Welcome the entry into force of the BBNJ Agreement](#)

On operative paragraph 10, we recommend selecting “**Welcomes with appreciation**”:

*10. **Welcomes with appreciation** the entry into force on 17 January 2026 of the Agreement under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction;*

On operative paragraph 2, we similarly recommend selecting “**Welcomes**” with respect to the ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSA) submissions.

[Rationale:](#)

The BBNJ Agreement is the first legally binding global instrument specifically addressing the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction, covering nearly two thirds of the ocean. Welcoming its entry into force with appreciation sets the appropriate political register for the cooperation provisions elsewhere in the decision and signals that Parties view the Agreement as an opportunity for, rather than a constraint on, work under the Convention. Welcoming the EBSA submissions in paragraph 2 likewise recognises the scientific work of proponents and encourages further submissions, particularly for areas beyond national jurisdiction, which the decision itself acknowledges are underrepresented.

[Retain the preambular reference to the BBNJ Agreement](#)

In the third preambular paragraph, we recommend removing the brackets and maintaining the reference to the Agreement:

*Recognizing that the modification of descriptions of ecologically or biologically significant marine areas and the description of new areas is an important scientific and technical process that contributes to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework **and***

the Agreement under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction;

Rationale:

EBSA descriptions compile the best available scientific information on ecologically significant features, including feeding, breeding, nursery and migration areas of marine animals. This information is directly relevant to the identification of area-based management tools and the conduct of environmental impact assessments under the Agreement.

Retain inclusion of information from diverse knowledge systems in expert workshop

On operative paragraph 9(b), we recommend selecting the more detailed first option and specific mentioning of

*(b) To convene a global expert workshop, with balanced regional representation, to collate, synthesize and review the **best available scientific knowledge and other relevant knowledge, including information from diverse knowledge systems**, on ecological and biological features in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction in support of the potential development of future submissions,*

Rationale:

Scientific literature alone does not capture all relevant information on the ecological and biological features of areas beyond national jurisdiction, including the feeding, breeding and migration areas used by marine animals. Indigenous and local knowledge, and the observations of fishing and coastal communities, can fill important gaps. Retaining the more detailed option, with its explicit reference to diverse knowledge systems, would strengthen the evidence base available for future EBSA submissions.

Retain BBNJ cooperation in the expert workshop and experience-sharing on EBSAs

Furthermore, on operative paragraph 9(b), we recommend removing the brackets and maintaining cooperation with the Secretariat of the BBNJ Agreement:

*[...] in cooperation with **the Secretariat of the Agreement under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction** and other competent international entities for the purpose of scientific and technical exchange, while ensuring complementarity and avoiding unnecessary*

duplication of or prejudicing work carried out under the Agreement, including with respect to area-based management tools;

On operative paragraph 9(c), we recommend removing the brackets and maintaining the subparagraph, including its reference to the BBNJ Agreement:

(c) To compile experiences in the use of the information contained in the descriptions of ecologically or biologically significant marine areas, including in efforts to implement the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, the Agreement on Marine Biological Diversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction and other relevant international agreements and frameworks, and make that information available at a future meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice;

Rationale:

Formal cooperation with the BBNJ Secretariat would avoid duplication and help ensure that EBSA information feeds directly into area-based management tools and environmental impact assessments carried out under the Agreement. Compiling and sharing experience on how EBSA descriptions have already been used would help Parties, civil society and other stakeholders apply this information consistently and identify where further descriptions are most needed.

Ensure full and effective participation

On operative paragraph 12, we recommend selecting the second option:

12. Encourages Parties, and invites other Governments and relevant entities, including those in charge of regional sea conventions and action plans and regional fishery bodies, to strengthen coordination and cooperation at the global, regional and national levels on issues related to marine biodiversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction, with the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth and other stakeholders;

Rationale:

The fuller formulation is consistent with Section C of the KMGBF and with the participation language already used in paragraph 3 of the same draft decision. Civil-society organizations, scientific bodies and Indigenous Peoples and local communities hold much of the available evidence on bycatch, ghost gear, underwater noise and the cumulative effects of human activities on marine animals; their full and effective participation improves the quality and legitimacy of coordination on areas beyond national jurisdiction.

Retain the qualitative elements of Target 3

On operative paragraph 14, we recommend removing the brackets and retaining the bracketed text:

*14. Notes with concern the findings of the global report on collective progress in the implementation of the Framework that show that marine and coastal ecosystems consistently receive less attention than terrestrial ecosystems **and the fact that a significant proportion of reported protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures in marine and coastal areas do not yet meet the qualitative elements of Target 3 of the Framework, including effective conservation and management, ecological representativeness, connectivity and equitable governance;***

Rationale:

Increasing the area formally designated for conservation will not protect marine biodiversity unless those areas are effectively managed, ecologically representative, connected and equitably governed. These qualitative elements are particularly important for migratory and wide-ranging marine animals, whose survival depends on connected habitats across feeding, breeding, nursery and migration areas. Retaining this language would help ensure that implementation of Target 3 is assessed by conservation outcomes rather than area coverage alone.

Promote biodiversity-friendly and higher-welfare aquaculture

Following operative paragraph 15, we recommend inserting a new paragraph 15 bis immediately after paragraph 15 and before bracketed paragraph 16:

15 bis. Encourages Parties, and invites other Governments and relevant organizations, to ensure that areas under aquaculture are managed sustainably through biodiversity-friendly practices that minimize adverse impacts on marine and coastal ecosystems and improve standards of animal welfare;

Rationale:

Aquaculture is a rapidly expanding use of marine and coastal environments, but it is not explicitly addressed in the draft decision. Poorly managed aquaculture can contribute to habitat

degradation, pollution, disease transmission, antimicrobial use, escapes of non-native species and pressure on wild fish populations used for feed. Aquaculture policies should therefore address biodiversity and animal-welfare outcomes together. This addition would support the implementation of the KMGBF's commitments on sustainable production and the management of areas under aquaculture without prescribing a single production model.

Retain the explicit reference to implementation of the BBNJ Agreement

On operative paragraph 13, we recommend removing the brackets and maintaining the reference to the BBNJ Agreement:

*13. Also encourages Parties, and invites other Governments and organizations with competence in areas beyond national jurisdiction, to use, as appropriate and in accordance with their respective mandates and jurisdictional scopes, the wide range of tools, guidance and experiences developed under the Convention in their work to conserve and sustainably use marine biodiversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction, **such as in the implementation of the Agreement on Marine Biological Diversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction**, including work to support capacity-building, scientific and technical cooperation and technology transfer, without prejudicing work carried out by those organizations and under relevant processes, while promoting synergies and avoiding the duplication of efforts;*

Rationale:

The BBNJ Agreement entered into force on 17 January 2026 and provides the first legally binding global framework specifically addressing the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction.

CBD tools and scientific guidance can support its implementation, particularly in relation to environmental impact assessments, ecologically or biologically significant marine areas, connectivity and area-based conservation. The explicit reference should be retained to promote coherence while respecting the distinct mandates of the CBD and BBNJ Agreement.

Establish the informal advisory group on BBNJ cooperation

On operative paragraphs 16 and 17, we recommend removing the brackets and maintaining paragraphs 16 and 17:

16. Decides to establish an informal advisory group on work conducted under the Convention in relation to marine biodiversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction with the terms of reference provided in annex II to the present decision;

17. Requests the Informal Advisory Group on Work Conducted under the Convention on Biological Diversity in Relation to Marine Biodiversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction to provide a report on its progress for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at a meeting held before the eighteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

Rationale:

The informal advisory group would provide a practical mechanism for identifying areas where CBD expertise and tools can support effective implementation of the BBNJ Agreement without duplicating or undermining work under other bodies. Its work could help promote coherent scientific approaches to marine connectivity, environmental impact assessment, area-based management and the cumulative effects of human activities on marine biodiversity and animals.

Update the scientific guidance on a representative network of MPAs, cold-water areas and EIAs

On operative paragraph 18(b), we recommend removing the brackets and maintaining the subparagraph in full, including subparagraphs (i), (ii) and (iii). In subparagraph (iii), we additionally recommend adding the text in bold:

*(iii) The voluntary guidelines for the consideration of biodiversity in environmental impact assessments in marine and coastal areas and the draft guidance on biodiversity-inclusive strategic environmental assessment in marine and coastal areas, **taking into account impacts on marine species, including anthropogenic underwater noise and cumulative pressures;***

Rationale:

This subparagraph consolidates scientific guidance central to Target 3 implementation and to coherent engagement with the BBNJ Agreement: guidance on ecologically representative and connected MPA networks, on cold-water areas under growing pressure, and on environmental impact assessment.

Retaining all three elements, together with the added reference to underwater noise and cumulative pressures, would keep the guidance responsive to the pressures actually facing marine ecosystems and animals, and support Parties in closing the qualitative gaps in Target 3 identified in the global report.

Address underwater noise and other pressures on migratory species in the connectivity report

On operative paragraph 18(c), we recommend adding the text in bold:

*(c) To commission a report, to be prepared in collaboration with relevant organizations, on scientific and technical information on marine biological and ecological connectivity, including vertical connectivity **and the effects of anthropogenic pressures, including underwater noise, on migratory species and ecological connectivity**, in particular in coastal, open-ocean and deep-sea ecosystems, in order to inform the implementation of the Framework [...];*

Rationale:

Ecological connectivity is not only a spatial property of habitats; it depends on the ability of animals to move safely between them. Migratory and wide-ranging species face growing pressures along their routes, including underwater noise, vessel traffic, bycatch and habitat fragmentation, and underwater noise in particular can sever functional connectivity even where habitats remain physically intact. Including these pressures in the commissioned report would make it directly useful for implementing the connectivity element of Target 3 and would complement work under the Convention on Migratory Species without duplicating it.

Promote non-invasive monitoring technologies

On operative paragraph 18(d), we recommend adding the text in bold:

*(d) To develop, in collaboration with relevant organizations and experts, scientific guidance on the application of emerging technologies, including environmental DNA, remote sensing and other appropriate **non-invasive** biodiversity monitoring tools, to support the assessment and monitoring of marine biodiversity [...];*

Rationale:

Environmental DNA, remote sensing and other non-invasive tools can expand the coverage and frequency of marine biodiversity monitoring, including in hard-to-reach environments such as the

deep sea, while reducing disturbance, capture or handling of marine animals. Shared scientific guidance on these technologies would support consistent, validated approaches across Parties, benefiting both the data needs of Target 3 and animal welfare in marine science.

[Retain the reference to the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda](#)

On operative paragraph 18(g), we recommend removing the brackets and maintaining the reference to the **2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development**, which situates cooperation on marine and coastal biodiversity within the broader sustainable development framework, including Sustainable Development Goal 14.

[Retain Annex II: Terms of reference for the Informal Advisory Group](#)

On Annex II as a whole

We recommend removing the brackets and maintaining Appendix II in full.

Rationale:

Annex II is the operational counterpart of operative paragraph 16: establishing the advisory group while deleting or deferring its terms of reference would leave the group unable to function and would postpone CBD–BBNJ scientific cooperation.

[Retain cooperation with the BBNJ Agreement in the advisory group's mandate](#)

On Annex II, paragraph 2(b) and (c)

We recommend removing the brackets and maintaining subparagraphs 2(b) and 2(c), which would allow the advisory group to:

(b) Identify timely opportunities for specific areas of cooperation, collaboration or synergies, as appropriate, with the Secretariat of the Agreement on Marine Biological Diversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction and other competent entities and international organizations;

(c) Provide advice on areas of potential cooperation, collaboration or synergies, as appropriate and in line with the mandate and jurisdictional scope of the Convention, on relevant scientific

and technical information to inform work under the Agreement on Marine Biological Diversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction.

Rationale:

The BBNJ Agreement and the CBD have distinct but complementary mandates. Retaining these provisions would allow relevant scientific and technical information developed under the CBD to inform BBNJ implementation while respecting the authority of the new Agreement and other competent organizations.

Priority areas for cooperation would include:

- environmental impact assessments that consider harm to aquatic animals and cumulative effects;
- effectively managed and connected area-based conservation measures;
- protection of migratory, feeding and breeding areas;
- reduction of bycatch and ghost-gear impacts;
- underwater noise; and
- multidisciplinary information on aquatic animals and ecosystem functioning.

Retain civil-society participation and relevant expertise

On Annex II, paragraph 3

We recommend removing the brackets and maintaining:

up to 7 experts nominated by other relevant organizations, including from civil society and Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

We also recommend retaining the bracketed requirement to consider:

the representation of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, women's and youth groups, and relevant stakeholders.

Rationale:

Implementation of the BBNJ Agreement will require expertise extending beyond institutional and legal coordination. Civil society and scientific experts can contribute evidence on aquatic animals, ecosystem functioning, bycatch, ghost gear, underwater noise and the cumulative effects of human activities. Their participation would help ensure that cooperation between the CBD and the BBNJ Agreement translates into effective protection for marine biodiversity and the animals that sustain ocean ecosystems.

G. Agenda item 18(d): Biodiversity and agriculture

SUMMARY OF ITEM

SBSTTA-27 reviewed implementation of the Plan of Action for Soil Biodiversity and the International Initiative for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Pollinators and forwarded a draft decision to COP17. Several matters remain unresolved, including how soil biodiversity should be incorporated into national planning, cross-sectoral coordination among agriculture, environment and health authorities, reform of biodiversity-harmful incentives and the package of follow-up work on pollinators, pollution, indicators and institutional cooperation. At COP17, WFA recommends selecting the stronger integration language, retaining cross-sectoral coordination consistent with a One Health approach, removing the brackets around the just and equitable reform and redirection of harmful incentives, adding a targeted provision on agroecological and biodiversity-friendly practices that benefit soil biodiversity; and protecting the provisions on wild pollinators and a global pollinator platform.

Priority COP17 outcomes

- Integrate soil biodiversity into national biodiversity strategies and action plans and into climate and land policy instruments through participatory, biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning.
- Retain cross-sectoral coordination among agriculture, environment and health, consistent with a One Health approach.
- Reform harmful incentives in a just, fair and equitable way and redirect them towards biodiversity-friendly practices.
- Promote agroecological and other biodiversity-friendly practices that enhance soil biodiversity and improve animal health and welfare in food-production systems.

- Protect the provisions on wild pollinators and the global pollinator platform, and reduce pesticide risks to pollinators.

This position is based on the draft decision under agenda item 18(d) in [CBD/COP/17/2, pp. 224–226](#), reproduced from [SBSTTA recommendation 27/9](#). Paragraph references below follow CBD/COP/17/2. Bold text indicates language that WFA recommends retaining or adding.

[Integrate soil biodiversity into national planning and policy instruments](#)

On operative paragraph 3, we recommend selecting the first, stronger option:

*3. Encourages Parties to integrate the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of soil biodiversity into their **national biodiversity strategies and action plans and into climate and land policy instruments through biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning conducted in a participatory manner, as appropriate**;*

[Rationale:](#)

National biodiversity strategies and action plans are the principal instruments for implementing the KMGBF; the alternative reference to unspecified “national plans” would provide no clear anchor for action. The first option also connects soil biodiversity to the climate and land policy instruments where most decisions affecting soils are actually taken, consistent with the preambular recognition of soil organic carbon storage and the nexus approach described in the IPBES Nexus Assessment. Biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning conducted in a participatory manner links the provision to Target 1 of the Framework and ensures that Indigenous Peoples and local communities, farmers and pastoralists, whose contribution to soil biodiversity the preamble explicitly recognizes, participate in decisions affecting the soils they manage.

[Retain cross-sectoral coordination, consistent with One Health](#)

On operative paragraph 4, we recommend removing the brackets and maintaining the paragraph, with the addition of the One Health language in bold:

*4. Invites Parties to enhance coordination among the agricultural, environmental and health sectors to mainstream sustainable soil biodiversity initiatives across other sectoral plans, policies and strategies, in line with the Framework, **consistent with a One Health approach that recognizes the interlinkages between human, animal, plant and ecosystem health**, and ensuring the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth;*

Rationale:

Soil biodiversity sits at the interface of the agricultural, environmental and health sectors: soil organisms underpin food production, nutrient cycling, water regulation and the suppression of plant and animal pathogens, while pesticides, veterinary antimicrobials and other agrochemicals used in food production accumulate in soils and harm the organisms living in them. The paragraph is the only provision in the draft decision that addresses this institutional coordination, and deleting it would leave implementation fragmented across sectors. Adding an explicit One Health reference aligns the paragraph with the Global Action Plan on Biodiversity and Health and the IPBES Nexus Assessment already cited in the preamble, and recognizes that the health of soils, animals, plants, people and ecosystems cannot be managed in isolation from one another.

Retain the reference to financial resources

On operative paragraph 6, we recommend removing the brackets and maintaining both bracketed elements:

*6. Further invites Parties **in a position to do so**, multilateral funds and relevant organizations to provide **financial resources**, capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation, technological transfer and the training of experts*

Rationale:

Document CBD/SBSTTA/27/8, which paragraph 1 of the decision takes note of, identifies the mobilization of sustainable financial resources as a barrier to national implementation, alongside taxonomic capacity and knowledge gaps on fungal biodiversity. Capacity-building and technology transfer can not substitute for the funding needed to establish and sustain soil biodiversity monitoring, particularly community-based monitoring that engages farmers, pastoralists, women and youth.

Reform harmful incentives and redirect them towards biodiversity-friendly practices

On operative paragraph 7, we recommend removing the brackets and maintaining the paragraph in full, including the redirection language:

7. Urges Parties and other Governments to identify, eliminate, phase out or reform incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity in a proportionate, just, fair, effective and equitable way, and invites them to scale up positive incentives and to redirect them towards promoting

biodiversity-friendly practices in soil biodiversity protection, conservation and management, as applicable;

Rationale:

Document CBD/SBSTTA/27/8 identifies biodiversity-harmful incentives, including subsidies that encourage intensive input use, as a major barrier to protecting soil biodiversity. Retaining the paragraph in full, including the instruction to redirect incentives towards biodiversity-friendly practices, applies the KMGBF's Target 18 commitment specifically to soils and signals that reform should support transition, not only removal of harm. The requirement that reform be proportionate, just, fair, effective and equitable protects farmers and pastoralists affected by the change.

Promote agroecological practices that benefit soil biodiversity and animal welfare

Following operative paragraph 3, we recommend inserting a new paragraph 3 bis:

3 bis. Encourages Parties, and invites other Governments and relevant organizations, to promote agroecological and other biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices that enhance soil biodiversity and soil health, reduce reliance on synthetic pesticides and fertilizers, minimize risks to pollinators and other non-target species, and contribute to improved animal health and welfare in food-production systems;

Rationale:

The draft decision contains no provision on the agricultural practices that determine the state of soil biodiversity in the first place. Intensive production systems degrade soils through compaction, agrochemical loading and the loss of organic matter, harm soil invertebrates, fungi and pollinators, and are associated with animal-health and welfare problems and antimicrobial use that contribute to resistance risks. Agroecological and other biodiversity-friendly approaches, as recognized by the FAO and reflected in Target 10 of the KMGBF, can enhance soil biodiversity and productivity while reducing chemical inputs and improving conditions for farmed animals. The proposed paragraph supports these outcomes without prescribing a single production model.

Strengthen action for wild pollinators and reduce pesticide risks

On operative paragraph 10, we recommend maintaining the reference to wild pollinators and adding the text in bold:

*10. Welcomes the twenty-fifth anniversary of the International Initiative for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Pollinators, and invites the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and encourages Parties and other Governments, to strengthen the implementation of the Initiative by enhancing actions, notably with regard to wild pollinators **and the reduction of risks to pollinators from pesticides**, according to national legislation and circumstances;*

Rationale:

Wild pollinators, including wild bees, butterflies, moths, beetles and other insects, deliver the majority of pollination services to wild plants and a substantial share to crops, yet policy attention and resources are frequently concentrated on managed honeybees. Pesticide exposure, particularly to systemic insecticides, is one of the best-documented drivers of pollinator decline and is already the subject of Target 7 of the KMGBF, which commits Parties to reducing the overall risk from pesticides and highly hazardous chemicals by at least half by 2030. Naming pesticide-risk reduction in the paragraph connects the Initiative to Target 7 and gives the twenty-fifth anniversary practical content, while the qualifier on national legislation and circumstances preserves flexibility in implementation.

Retain provisions on global pollinator platform

On operative paragraph 11, we recommend removing the brackets and maintaining the paragraph in full:

11. Requests the Executive Secretary of the Convention, subject to the availability of resources, to continue to engage with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture on work related to soil biodiversity and pollinators, including through a global pollinator platform, as referred to in paragraph 9;

Rationale:

A global pollinator platform would give Parties, FAO and the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture a standing mechanism for exchanging data, tools and experience on pollinator conservation, building on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Pollinator Initiative referenced in paragraph 9. Given the role of pollinators, particularly wild pollinators, in linking soil health and ecosystem function, retaining this provision would sustain momentum without creating new institutional structures.

H. Agenda item 18(e): Invasive alien species

STATUS OF NEGOTIATIONS

SBSTTA-27 forwarded a draft decision focused on implementation of KMGBF Target 6, particularly improving information and data-sharing, addressing pathways of introduction, including international and online trade, and strengthening integrated, cross-sectoral and cross-border responses to invasive alien species. Outstanding issues include bracketed references to climate change, implementation of the Global Action Plan on Biodiversity and Health, stakeholder participation, whether Parties should “use” or merely “consider the use of” integrated approaches, One Health cooperation and the entire package of Secretariat work on early detection, capacity-building, technology transfer, and the invasive alien species portal.

Priority COP17 outcomes

- Strengthen implementation of Target 6, with prevention and pathway management at the centre of IAS action.
- Retain the explicit focus on international and online trade as pathways of introduction and spread.
- Remove brackets around the IAS–climate change, Global Action Plan on Biodiversity and Health and One Health references.
- Strengthen early detection and rapid response, capacity-building, technology transfer and access to relevant information and tools.
- Ensure IAS management is evidence-based, proportionate and taking animal welfare into account alongside biodiversity, animal health and human health.
- Strengthen cross-sectoral and cross-border cooperation, including coherence among biodiversity, health, trade, transport, veterinary, agriculture and other relevant frameworks.

This position is based on the draft decision under agenda item 18(e) in [CBD/COP/17/2, pp. 227–228](#), reproduced from [SBSTTA recommendation 27/8](#). Paragraph references below follow CBD/COP/17/2. Bold text indicates language that WFA recommends retaining or adding.

Retain the One Health approach

On operative paragraph 2(c), we recommend removing the brackets around and retaining the One Health language:

*2(c) To strengthen cross-sectoral and cross-border collaboration **among countries and regional mechanisms in order to implement the One Health approach** in relation to the management of invasive alien species;*

Rationale:

IAS can have implications across wildlife, livestock, human and ecosystem health, including where invasive species act as hosts, vectors or carriers of pathogens. A One Health approach can support more coherent surveillance, risk assessment, prevention and management across relevant sectors.

This would also build directly on COP16 Decision 16/18, which already calls for coordination among countries, international and regional mechanisms and across sectors to support implementation of the One Health approach in managing IAS.

Strengthen early detection and rapid response

On bracketed operative paragraph 3(a)(ii), we recommend retaining the proposed work on early detection and rapid response:

*(ii) The exploration and proposal of strategies to enable **early detection and rapid response** to support the collection, sharing and mobilization of data, so as to reduce the time lag between the detection of an invasive alien species and information availability;*

Rationale:

Early detection and rapid response are essential to prevent newly introduced IAS from becoming established and spreading. Target 6 specifically combines pathway management and prevention with eradication or control of established IAS, while CBD guidance identifies early warning, early detection and rapid response as key implementation measures.

Reducing delays between detection, information-sharing, risk assessment and mobilisation of an appropriate response could significantly improve the ability of Parties to prevent new invasions before they become more difficult to manage.

Include animal health and welfare in integrated IAS management

On operative paragraph 2(b), we recommend selecting “use” rather than “consider the use of” and adding animal health and welfare to the impacts to be considered:

*2(b) To **use** integrated and collaborative approaches that bring together relevant sectors, including the private sector, to address the challenges posed by invasive and potentially invasive alien species to biodiversity, nature’s contributions to people, **animal health and welfare**, and human well-being;*

Rationale:

IAS can have interconnected consequences for biodiversity, ecosystems, animal health, human health and livelihoods. A genuinely integrated approach should therefore consider these dimensions together rather than treating biodiversity impacts in isolation.

This is consistent with COP16 Decision 16/18, which explicitly recommends considering impacts on public health, animal health and welfare, alongside biodiversity and social and cultural values, when communicating risks and informing management decisions.

For WFA, this is also important because management interventions can themselves affect individual wild animals. The need to address IAS should not remove the obligation to minimise unnecessary suffering.

Ensure proportionate and evidence-based management responses

We recommend that implementation of Target 6, including measures for eradication, containment and control, take animal welfare into account and promote evidence-based and proportionate management interventions that minimise adverse animal welfare impacts.

Rationale:

Management of established IAS can involve trapping, capture, confinement, poisoning, shooting, culling or other interventions that directly affect individual animals. The need to protect biodiversity does not remove the importance of considering animal welfare and minimising unnecessary suffering.

Existing CBD guidance already recognises animal health and welfare as relevant considerations in IAS risk and management decisions. Born Free has also highlighted the potential animal welfare consequences of IAS control measures and the importance of ensuring that interventions are supported by evidence, appropriately targeted and designed to minimise welfare impacts.

Where intervention is necessary, measures should therefore have clear conservation objectives, measurable outcomes, appropriate monitoring and safeguards to minimise adverse animal welfare impacts and non-target effects.

Strengthen prevention through international and online trade

On operative paragraph 2(a), we recommend retaining the reference to international trade, including online trade, and using this as a basis for stronger action on human-mediated pathways:

*(a) To improve the collection, analysis, storage, availability and sharing of data on impacts, pathways of introduction and spread, **especially through international trade, including online trade**, occurrences and management measures with regard to invasive alien species identified in their territories, in order to support efforts towards addressing Target 6 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework;*

Rationale:

The explicit reference to international and online trade is an important agreed element of the recommendation.

For wildlife, this is particularly relevant to the movement and trade of **live wild animals**, including species traded as pets, aquarium and terrarium species and other live organisms. Such pathways can contribute to escapes, releases or unintentional introductions, as well as associated animal-health and disease risks.

Prevention at the pathway stage should therefore remain a central component of implementation, rather than relying predominantly on control once invasive populations are established. CBD Decision 16/18 similarly calls for strengthened national regulatory instruments to reduce movement and introduction, including measures addressing online trade.

Recognise the IAS–climate change connection

We recommend removing the brackets and retaining the following preambular language:

Emphasizing the important connection between invasive alien species and climate change,

Rationale:

Climate change can alter species distributions, pathways of introduction and the environmental conditions that enable alien species to establish and spread. Climate change and IAS can therefore interact with other drivers of biodiversity loss and increase pressures on ecosystems.

Recognising this connection would support more forward-looking prevention and management, including the use of predictive modelling to identify areas that may become more vulnerable to invasion as climate conditions change. This would build on the voluntary guidance adopted at COP16 on the links between invasive alien species, climate change and other drivers of biodiversity loss, which recognises that climate change can increase the risks of introduction, establishment and spread.

Strengthen cross-border cooperation and policy coherence

We recommend retaining and strengthening the provisions on cross-sectoral and cross-border collaboration, including cooperation among relevant international and regional mechanisms.

Rationale:

IAS can spread across national boundaries through trade, transport, waterways and other pathways. Effective implementation therefore requires cooperation on surveillance, risk assessment, information-sharing, prevention and rapid response.

Greater coherence is also needed across biodiversity, animal and public health, plant health, agriculture, trade, transport and customs frameworks. COP16 Decision 16/18 already identifies coordination across sectors and international and regional mechanisms as an important part of Target 6 implementation.

For wildlife-related pathways, this should include appropriate alignment with CITES, CMS and other relevant international frameworks, avoiding gaps between wildlife-trade controls and IAS prevention measures.

Support technical capacity and technology transfer

On bracketed operative paragraph 3(a)(iii)–(iv), we recommend retaining the proposed work on emerging detection tools, technical capacity and technology transfer, particularly for developing countries:

(iii) The development of training materials on emerging detection tools, for example, predictive modelling of species range shifts to identify areas most vulnerable to invasion in the context of climate change, environmental DNA analysis and artificial intelligence-based detection;

(iv) The enhancement of technical capacity and the facilitation of technology transfer, especially for developing countries, to support data collection, monitoring and the management of invasive alien species;

Rationale:

Access to reliable information, surveillance technologies and technical expertise is an important implementation gap identified in the recommendation, particularly in developing countries.

Predictive modelling, environmental DNA and other emerging tools may strengthen early warning and surveillance, provided they are appropriately validated and supported by the necessary technical capacity. Capacity-building and technology transfer should therefore be treated as practical components of Target 6 implementation rather than optional additions.

ABOUT WORLD FEDERATION FOR ANIMALS

We are a federation of more than 70 NGOs working towards the recognition of animal welfare as an essential component of the sustainable development agenda. Our efforts focus on integrating animal welfare into international health, food, and environmental regimes, as well as trade and development finance rules.

We are accredited observers to the FAO Committee on Agriculture, the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and we have Special Consultative Status with the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). We are also members of GASL's Action Network on Animal Welfare, the CFS' Civil Society and Indigenous Peoples' Mechanism, and the AMR Multi-Stakeholder Partnership Platform.

www.wfa.org



ABOUT BORN FREE FOUNDATION

Born Free's mission is to protect wild animals, natural habitats and functioning ecosystems in perpetuity and to end the exploitation of wild animals, whether free-living or in captivity. Our vision of a co-existent future is one where animals are respected for their own intrinsic value and for the critical roles they play within the natural world.

www.bornfree.org.uk