

WHAT THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK MUST DO FOR ANIMALS, PEOPLE & NATURE

Position Paper | November 2022



This Position Paper was published in November 2022 to support negotiations of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.

The Born Free Foundation and the World Federation for Animals, representing 42 member organisations, prepared this Paper in close collaboration with:



Animal Welfare.
Worldwide.



CONTENTS

The Framework the world needs	1
Three key ingredients for an ambitious, effective & transformative GBF	2
Overview of recommended text	3

Proposed changes in detail

Halt & prevent human-induced species extinctions, restore threatened species and sustainably conserve all

Goal A. Ecosystem, species and genetic diversity	7
Target 4. Species conservation, management and recovery actions	11
Target 6. Invasive Alien Species on biodiversity	15

Embed animal health & wellbeing to address biodiversity loss and reduce zoonotic disease risk

Target 5. Eliminating threats to wild animal species from exploitation & unsustainable use	20
Target 23. NEW 'One Health' approach for effective implementation	26

End animal exploitation by shifting the sustainable use narrative towards ecocentrism

Goal B. Ensuring ecological sustainable use of biodiversity by people	30
Target 9. Ensuring species are valued, used in a truly sustainable way and not exploited	34
Target 10. Ensuring ecosystems used by productive sectors are valued	38

THE FRAMEWORK THE WORLD NEEDS



The purpose of this Paper is to guide and support negotiators in developing a Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) that adequately integrates animal considerations. It provides concrete and evidence-based recommendations based on the latest draft adopted at the OEWG-4 meeting (hereafter 'current text') while taking into account the outcomes of the Informal Group meeting in September 2022. It also draws on the monitoring framework proposed by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) and the expert workshop report.

In its preamble, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) recognises the need to conserve biodiversity for its intrinsic value and contributions to human well-being and sustainable development. We concur. All living organisms play an essential part in the environment in which they live. As such, in line with the One Health approach, animals are a vital component of ecosystems, and the value they provide should not be underestimated. Animals, like humans, are sentient creatures and are particularly impacted by pressures and changes to ecosystems beyond their control. A highly precautionary approach to activities that increase risk to animal species should therefore be adopted.

Our recommendations reflect this understanding. We outline what the GBF must incorporate to achieve its mission to halt and reverse biodiversity loss by 2030, live in harmony with nature by 2050, effectively contribute towards achieving the sustainable development agenda, and ultimately benefit all life on Earth.

In this Paper, we have focused on two goals and six targets of the GBF. For each, we have outlined (1) current text with suggested edits, (2) suggested clean text, (3) rationale for suggestions, and (4) recommended indicators.

3 KEY INGREDIENTS FOR AN AMBITIOUS, EFFECTIVE & TRANSFORMATIVE GBF

1. Halt & prevent human-induced species extinctions, restore threatened species and sustainably conserve all

A million species are at risk of extinction, extinction rates are accelerating, and nature's decline is unprecedented. Preventing species from becoming threatened is vital while reducing pressure on already threatened species and enabling their recovery. We need to protect and restore viable wildlife populations within functional ecosystems urgently. The GBF should aim to maintain or improve the population abundances of wild native species commensurate with their role in the habitat and improve or maintain the natural geographical extent of all species. It should include species recovery aspects.

Relevant sections of the GBF: Goal A, Target 4, and Target 6

2. Eliminate animal exploitation and embed animal health & wellbeing to address biodiversity loss and reduce zoonotic disease risk

The GBF must recognise the interrelationship between human, animal and ecosystem health and well-being by adhering to a One Health approach. This is essential to substantially reduce zoonotic disease risk and tackle the biodiversity and climate crises. Doing so would be consistent with the UNEA resolutions on the animal welfare–environment–sustainable development nexus and biodiversity and health, as well as the CBD/SBSTTA/24/9 draft Global Action Plan for Biodiversity and Health. It would further work towards an equitable, sustainable and humane future.

Relevant sections of the GBF: Target 5 and Target 23 NEW on 'One Health'

3. Shift the sustainable use narrative towards ecocentrism and better integrate the multiple values of biodiversity

'Sustainable use' is a cross-cutting concept in the GBF. The term should only be applied to uses that meet strict criteria for managing and assessing biological and ecological sustainability, allowing species and the ecosystems they are part of to recover and thrive. As such, it is essential to establish robust sustainability criteria that consider all uses and pressures on species (including legal and illegal wildlife trade) and incorporate the potential societal and economic risks for human and animal health and well-being from wildlife exploitation. With wildlife exploitation being the second most significant direct driver of biodiversity loss, a highly precautionary approach is needed.

Relevant sections of the GBF: Goal B, Target 9, and Target 10.

OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDED TEXT

Goal A - Option 1 (containing numerical values):

The human-induced extinction of all known threatened species is halted and prevented now, extinction risk is reduced by at least 25 per cent by 2030 and eliminated by 2050, and the average population abundance of all wild native species is increased by at least 20 per cent by 2030 and restored to healthy and resilient levels by 2050.

Goal A - Option 2 (our preferred version):

Biodiversity is conserved, maintaining and enhancing the connectivity and ecological integrity of all ecosystems and reducing the risk of ecosystem collapse, halting from now and preventing human-induced extinctions and eliminating extinction risk, supporting healthy and resilient populations of all wild native species, and maintaining genetic diversity of species populations and their adaptive potential.

Goal B

Biodiversity is valued, enhanced and maintained through conservation, restoration and ecologically sustainable use, supporting the global development agenda for the benefit of all life on Earth.

Section B.bis, par. 16 / One Health Target - Option 1: a standalone One Health target:

Implement the One Health approach (as defined by the One Health High level Expert Panel and endorsed by the WHO/WOAH/FAO/UNEP Quadripartite), focusing especially on the emergence and transmission of zoonotic diseases, including their drivers, to prevent risks to the health and well-being of humans, wild and domesticated animal species, and ecosystems.

Section B.bis, par. 16 / One Health Target - Option 2: a standalone ambitious paragraph on One Health in introductory section B.bis:

The framework fully adopts and enables the effective implementation of a biodiversity-inclusive One Health approach (as defined by the One Health High level Expert Panel and endorsed by the WHO/WOAH/FAO/UNEP Quadripartite) which aims to sustainably balance and optimise the health and wellbeing of people, animals and ecosystems.

Target 4

Undertake urgent management actions to achieve the recovery and conservation of all species, in particular threatened species, including through in-situ conservation and, where appropriate, reintroductions, to prevent human-induced extinctions, maintain and restore the genetic diversity of wild and domesticated species, and enhance human-wildlife coexistence for the benefit of both.

Target 5

Eliminate all exploitation, trade and use of wild species that is illegal, ecologically unsustainable or poses any risk of pathogen spillover to humans, wildlife or other animals, while safeguarding customary sustainable use by indigenous peoples and local communities.

Target 6

Eliminate or reduce the impacts caused by invasive alien species on native biodiversity, by managing pathways for the introduction of alien species, preventing the introduction and establishment of all priority invasive species, reducing the rate of introduction of other known or potential invasive species by at least 50 per cent, and effectively managing invasive alien species, supporting innovation and the use of new tools to enhance the efficiency of management measures and avoid the unnecessary suffering of animals.

Target 9

Ensure all management and use of wild species are ecologically sustainable and benefits are equitably distributed, thereby providing social and environmental benefits for all people, especially those most dependent on biodiversity for food and economic security, while safeguarding customary sustainable use by indigenous peoples and local communities.

Target 10

Ensure that all areas under agriculture, aquaculture, forestry, and other productive uses are managed sustainably through the ecologically sustainable use of biodiversity; conserving and restoring biodiversity and contributing to the long-term resilience of these systems.

1.

HALT & PREVENT HUMAN-INDUCED SPECIES EXTINCTIONS, RESTORE THREATENED SPECIES, AND SUSTAINABLY CONSERVE ALL SPECIES

- Goal A** on addressing ecosystem, species and genetic diversity from an ecological perspective
- Target 4** on urgently preventing extinctions and improving species' status through conservation, management and recovery actions
- Target 6** on preventing and/or managing the emergence and impacts of Invasive Alien Species on biodiversity



Goal A. Addressing ecosystem, species and genetic diversity from an ecological perspective

CURRENT TEXT - OPTION 1.

LEGEND: **New language proposed**
| **Important to keep** | **Deletions**

[Beginning now,] **the human-induced extinction of [all] [known] [threatened] species is halted [and prevented][now]** [by 2030] [by 2050], [[and] **extinction risk is reduced [by at least [10] [20] [25] per cent] by 2030** and **[eliminated]** [reduced [to a minimum] [by 50 per cent]] [halved] **by 2050,] and the** [conservation status] **[average population] [abundance]** [and distribution] of [depleted populations of] **all [wild and domesticated] [native] [threatened] species is [increased [or maintained] by at least [10] [20] percent by 2030** and] [increased **restored**] **to healthy and resilient levels by 2050].**

OPTION 2.

Biodiversity is conserved, maintaining and enhancing the [area,] connectivity [restoration] and [ecological] integrity of all [terrestrial, freshwater, coastal and marine] ecosystems [and reducing the risk of ecosystem collapse], halting [from now] [and preventing] human-induced extinctions [and reducing [eliminating] extinction risk [to zero by 2050]], supporting healthy and resilient populations of [all wild] [native] species, and maintaining genetic diversity of populations and their adaptive potential [numerical values to be added].

RECOMMENDED TEXT - OPTION 1.

If option 1 (with numerical values) is favoured by Parties:

The human-induced extinction of all known threatened species is halted and prevented now, extinction risk is reduced by at least 25 per cent by 2030 and eliminated by 2050, and the average population abundance of all wild native species is increased by at least 20 per cent by 2030 and restored to healthy and resilient levels by 2050.

RECOMMENDED TEXT - OPTION 2.

If option 2 is favoured by Parties:

Biodiversity is conserved, maintaining and enhancing the connectivity and ecological integrity of all ecosystems and reducing the risk of ecosystem collapse, halting from now and preventing human-induced extinctions and eliminating extinction risk, supporting healthy and resilient populations of all wild native species, and maintaining genetic diversity of species populations and their adaptive potential.

Goal A must:

- **Halt & prevent species extinctions, starting now.** Scientists predict that over 1 million species are on the brink of extinction, many within decades. As the IPBES Global Assessment report states: *“An average of around 25 percent of species in assessed animal and plant groups are threatened, [...] unless action is taken to reduce the intensity of drivers of biodiversity loss [...], there will be a further acceleration in the global rate of species extinction, which is already at least tens to hundreds of times higher than it has averaged over the past 10 million years.”* Committing to halting human-induced extinctions now is paramount to avoid grave impacts on animals, ecosystems and people. Goal A needs to step up its ambition by preventing extinctions from happening in the first place by shifting its focus towards reducing extinction risk as a measurable means of moving toward species recovery. The need for species recovery to be commensurate with ecosystem stability and functionality is a crucial aspect of Goal A. The potential benefits of reintroduction and rewilding processes should also be considered.
- **Restore, conserve and maintain healthy & resilient populations of all native species.** Preventing an increase in extinction rates is not sufficient. Restoring viable wildlife populations within functional ecosystems is what is required. The ecological role of species also depends on the existence of socially and culturally functional units, not just sufficient numbers. To be ambitious, the focus of the GBF should be on improving the status of threatened species by 2030 and sustaining all other native species. We cannot only focus on species at high risk of extinction – we need to improve or maintain the population abundances of wild native species, as well as the natural geographic extent of all species (within the context of ecological stability/integrity). Some native species are abundant and others decline rapidly before being designated as “threatened.” Thus, agreeing to ‘support healthy and resilient populations’ of all wild native species might best capture the balance needed to ensure the abundance, genetic diversity, and distribution of native species.

Goal A. Recommended indicators

To measure progress on the species elements

Currently proposed headline indicators to measure Goal A's species elements are “**A.0.2 Species Habitat Index**” (however not fully operational and better suited as a component indicator), “**A.0.3 Red list index (SDG 15.5.1)**”, and “**A.0.4 The proportion of populations within [umbrella] species with a [genetically] effective population size > 500**”.

We support monitoring elements for three measures for species conservation:

- species extinction trends, using the Green Status of Species Index to measure the proportion of species requiring intensive recovery actions to avoid extinction. This indicator can be readily developed from existing Red List data. See Target 4 indicators.
- trends in species extinction risk, using the proposed headline indicator **A.0.3 Red list index (SDG 15.5.1)**. However, with the current approach, there is a risk of enshrining some level of extinction as acceptable, which could lead to a process of deciding which species are allowed to go extinct, contravening the objective of halting human-induced extinctions. Further, many species are classified by the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species as Data Deficient, are overdue for assessment, or have not been assessed. The Red List Index is useful for identifying long-term trends but is limited by which species have or have not been assessed/reassessed for Red List categories. Often, higher taxa are assessed/reassessed together, which could give a skewed view. In addition, Red List assessments are periodic and slow. Any use of the Red List should also account for the species trend, not just the category in which the species is placed. Note that of 2,117,421 species described, only 6% were anticipated to have been evaluated by 2021. Further, some Parties noted differences in the implementation of the Red List Index at the national level;
- trends in species population abundance and distribution, using the **proposed component indicators A.4.1 Species status information index**, A.4.2. Living Planet, and A.8.1 Proportion of populations maintained within species, and complemented by measures of species diversity and the functional, social and cultural integrity of populations. It is essential to measure species traits relating to the structural, chemical, physiological and social characteristics of organisms, as they will determine how the ecosystem can respond to perturbation and environmental change.

**HALT & PREVENT SPECIES
EXTINCTIONS, STARTING NOW**



Target 4. Urgent & effective species conservation, management and recovery actions

CURRENT TEXT

LEGEND: **New language proposed**
| **Important to keep** | **Deletions**

“[Ensure active] [**Undertake urgent**] [and sustainable] **management actions** [, **including through in situ conservation, and, where appropriate, reintroductions**] [**to**] [enable] [**achieve**] the **recovery and conservation of** [threatened species] [**all**] [**species, in particular threatened species**], [and] [**to**] [**maintain and restore**] the [**genetic diversity**] [within and between populations] **of** [all species] [[all] [**native wild and domesticated species**]] [[to] [and] maintain their adaptive potential] including through in situ and ~~ex-situ conservation,~~ [**to**] [[**prevent**] **human-induced extinctions** [**and maintain the genetic diversity of wild and domesticated species**] [of [known] threatened species,]] **and** [effectively manage human-wildlife interactions] and to [[halt] [minimise] [avoid or reduce]] human wildlife conflict] [to [**enhance**] [**human-wildlife**] promote their [**coexistence**] [to [**for**] **the benefit of both** humans and wildlife]].

RECOMMENDED TEXT

Undertake urgent management actions to achieve the recovery and conservation of all species, in particular threatened species, including through in-situ conservation and, where appropriate, reintroductions, to prevent human-induced extinctions, maintain and restore the genetic diversity of wild and domesticated species, and enhance human-wildlife coexistence for the benefit of both.

Target 4 must:

- **Foster immediate action to halt and prevent species extinctions, through active conservation, management and recovery measures**

Aichi-Biodiversity Target 12 was established to prevent the extinction of known threatened species and improve the conservation status of those in decline. Acting as its successor, Target 4 in the GBF must retain its bold stance on extinction while achieving the recovery and stabilisation of all species, including non-threatened species, for the vital role they play in ecosystem function. It is key that Target 4 also aligns with the ambition of the GBF's 2030 mission to halt and reverse biodiversity loss.

Therefore, aiming to 'achieve' the recovery and conservation of species through 'urgent management actions' better reflects the ambition needed for Target 4, designed to attain Goal A (see rationale on preventing species extinctions in Goal A above).

Restoring populations to healthy viable levels and social structures consistent with their ecological role should be the focus here.

We support the recommendation by the Informal Group to use the terms '*all species, in particular threatened species*' as it is broader and the most appropriate in the context of Target 4. We also recommend that the definition of '*wild species*' used by IPBES is included in the [glossary](#) for the GBF.

Target 4 should include reference to actions aimed at recovering and, where appropriate, reintroducing species, consistent with established international guidelines and protocols. Ex-situ conservation measures should be at best peripheral, as they can only be regarded as a measurable intervention once they are proven to be successful – they are not a measure in and of themselves. Carefully managed reintroduction and rewilding programmes can be extremely valuable if local stakeholders are included. Active recovery and conservation management actions also require improved transboundary conservation work and cooperation.

- **Instil a culture of coexistence between humans and wildlife**

Effectively managing human-wildlife interactions and minimising human-wildlife conflict are necessary components for the fulfilment of this target. Target 4 should therefore include actions aimed at implementing practical solutions that develop a culture of coexistence with wildlife, accounting for indigenous and community values while minimising the harm caused to individual animals. Co-existing alongside healthy wildlife populations provides cultural, economic, health, and social well-being benefits. There are several historical examples of rural communities having coexisted with 'dangerous' wildlife like elephants and tigers, including when these were in higher numbers and occupied wider ranges. These cultures and methods have been largely lost, ignored or are fading out, e.g. seasonal cultivation practices. Retaining/relearning indigenous practices should be accounted for in the indicators for this target.

Target 4. Recommended indicators

To measure the species conservation & recovery elements

To complement the use of the Red List Index, we suggest using the conceptual framework developed by the IUCN Red List Committee's Task Force on Species Conservation Success since 2012. The '**IUCN Green Status of Species**' (proposed alternative indicator for Target 4) to be integrated into the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species provides an indicator for species recovery and, therefore, a fuller picture of species' conservation status. It uses four practical indices to demonstrate conservation successes and the degree of species' recovery rather than threat status. It considers the impacts of past conservation, what would happen if all current conservation ceased, expected gains from conservation action, and how close to 'fully recovered' a species can get with effective conservation action. Full recovery is defined as one that is viable, and that fulfils the species' ecological role throughout its native range.

To measure the human-wildlife coexistence elements

Data on human-wildlife conflict is required. We support the currently proposed headline indicators related to species "**4.0.1 Proportion of species populations that are affected by human wildlife conflict [requiring intensive recovery due to human wildlife conflict]**".

Human-wildlife conflict is exacerbated by poorly planned development, including encroachment into wild areas, mainly when it results in habitat fragmentation and loss of migratory routes or access to prey. Monitoring systems that address broader issues beyond providing a record of damage incidents are likely to have a greater effect in reducing human-wildlife conflicts in the long term, and we would support their use. Upstream planning and habitat connectivity are key to preventing human-wildlife conflict, as retaining intact and ecologically balanced wildlife areas is critical to effective mitigation.

Possible indicators for reduced human-wildlife conflict might include: rural communities' attitudes; the resilience of sustainable rural economies; improved land use planning; the implementation and success of methods to mitigate and reduce human-wildlife conflicts (e.g. fencing around communities and farms and deterrents to prevent crop-raiding or livestock predation using ecological boundaries); and policy changes.

ENHANCE HUMAN-WILDLIFE COEXISTENCE FOR THE BENEFIT OF BOTH



Target 6. Preventing and/or managing the emergence & impacts of Invasive Alien Species on biodiversity

CURRENT TEXT

Legend: **New language proposed**
Important to keep

[[Ensure that the]/[**Identify** [prioritise] **and manage**]/[Address the drivers and, where possible, manage all] [the] **pathways for the introduction of [invasive] alien species** [are identified and managed], **preventing**, [or]/[and] [significantly] reducing [their] **[the** [[rate of] **introduction** [by at least 50 per cent] **and] establishment** **[of all priority invasive species, reducing the rate of introduction of other known or potential invasive species]** **[by at least 50 per cent]**, **and** [detect and] [eradicate]/[**effectively manage**] or control [priority] **invasive alien species** to eliminate[, minimise] or [reduce]/[mitigate] their [coverage and] impacts[, **supporting innovation and the use of new tools**] **[to enhance efficiency of management measures and avoid the suffering of animals.]**

Alt.1 [**Eliminate or reduce the impacts of invasive alien species on native biodiversity by managing pathways for the introduction of alien species, preventing the introduction and establishment of all priority invasive species, reducing the rate of introduction of other known or potential invasive species by at least 50 per cent, and** eradicating or controlling invasive alien species] **[effectively manage invasive alien species, supporting innovation and the use of new tools to enhance efficiency of management measures and avoid the suffering of animals].**

RECOMMENDED TEXT

Our preferred option builds on from Alt.1:

Eliminate or reduce the impacts caused by invasive alien species on native biodiversity, by managing pathways for the introduction of alien species, preventing the introduction and establishment of all priority invasive species, reducing the rate of introduction of other known or potential invasive species by at least 50 per cent, and effectively managing invasive alien species, supporting innovation and the use of new tools to enhance the efficiency of management measures and avoid the unnecessary suffering of animals.

Target 6 must:

- **Prevent the emergence and spread of invasive alien species**

Invasive alien species, introduced by humans into environments outside their natural distributions, are one of the five major drivers of biodiversity loss. They cause severe threats to local ecosystems, wildlife, and domesticated animals, as well as human health and well-being and local and national economies.

Because of the unintended impacts control measures can have on biodiversity, livelihoods and security, efforts to eliminate invasive alien species can raise public health and ethical concerns. This target needs to acknowledge better the role of invasive alien species as potential sources of new pathogens. Therefore, in line with the One Health approach, it needs to focus on prevention as a far more cost-effective approach than attempting to eradicate alien species once populations are established.

The IPBES assessment on Invasive Alien Species, due to be finalised in 2023, will assess the current status and trends of invasive alien species, their impacts, their drivers, and their management, and will propose policy options to deal with the challenges they pose, with an emphasis on prevention and adaptive management strategies. It will examine the precautionary approach in preventing and managing invasive alien species and the efficacy of risk assessment for managing such species. The assessment's findings should therefore be considered in implementing this target.

- **Ensure humane management through the use and development of innovative tools**

While this target should incorporate a strong focus on preventing the introduction and establishment of invasive alien species, it should also incorporate the elimination of the impacts of existing invasive alien species on biodiversity as an outcome. The current target does not reference the humane management of invasive alien species. Target 6 needs to support the development of innovative methods that minimise animal suffering when interventions are necessary to protect biodiversity.

In 2021, the IUCN launched a project for the European Commission which examined humane methods of managing invasive alien species, such as fertility control and other non-lethal interventions. Measures designed to spare avoidable pain, distress or suffering in targeted vertebrates, their cost-effectiveness, and possible negative impacts on non-targeted species were identified.

Target 6. Recommended indicators

The current proposed headline indicator for Target 6 is “**6.0.1 Rate of invasive alien species spread [and rate of impact]**”. However, we agree with Parties who noted that this indicator should address the impact of invasive alien species and not only their spread. We suggest using the standard Environmental Impact Classification of Alien taxa that scores the damaging impacts of invasive species, since measuring the spread of number of invasive species in and of itself is not necessarily a reflection of the impact on biodiversity.

There is currently no reference to the humane management of invasive species. Dubois et al., (2017) set out seven principles for ethical wildlife control, which should be considered when establishing measures for managing invasive species. These include “*that efforts to control wildlife should begin wherever possible by altering the human practices that cause human-wildlife conflict and by developing a culture of coexistence; be justified by evidence that significant harms are being caused to people, property, livelihoods, ecosystems, and/or other animals; have measurable outcome-based objectives that are clear, achievable, monitored, and adaptive; predictably minimise animal welfare harms to the fewest number of animals; be informed by community values as well as scientific, technical, and practical information; be integrated into plans for systematic long-term management; and be based on the specifics of the situation rather than negative labels (pest, overabundant) applied to the target species.*”

ENSURE HUMANE MANAGEMENT OF INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES





2.

ELIMINATE ANIMAL EXPLOITATION AND EMBED ANIMAL HEALTH & WELLBEING TO REDUCE ZOOONOTIC DISEASE RISK AND ADDRESS BIODIVERSITY LOSS

Target 5 on eliminating threats to wild animal species from exploitation and unsustainable use

Target 23 - NEW on fully adhering to a 'One Health' approach to facilitate effective implementation

Target 5. Eliminating threats to wild animal species from exploitation & unsustainable use

CURRENT TEXT

LEGEND: **New language proposed**
| **Important to keep** | **Deletions**

[Eliminate all] [Prevent overexploitation by ensuring]/[Ensure] that [any]/[the] ~~[harvesting]~~/[exploitation], ~~[captive breeding]~~/[farming], **trade and use of** terrestrial, [and aquatic]/[[freshwater]/[inland water] and marine and coastal], **wild** [animal and plant] **species** **[that is illegal,]** [, including eggs, fries, parts and derivatives], is **ecologically unsustainable** sustainable [and legal] [and safe for target and non-target species] [effectively regulated] [and traceable], [minimizing impacts on non-target species and ecosystems] [without adverse effects on the populations of species], [and safe for [[human], [animal and plant]] health]/[**and poses no [any] risks of pathogen spillover to humans, wildlife or other animals**] [and for all living beings on Mother Earth]], [and prevent and eliminate biopiracy and other forms of illegal access to and transfer of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge], **while** [respecting]/[protecting] **[safeguarding] the customary** [rights of and] **sustainable use [by indigenous peoples and local communities]**[and preventing pathogen spillover],[applies [ecosystem-based approaches]/[the ecosystem approach] to management][and creating the conditions for the use and provision of benefits for indigenous peoples and local communities][and take urgent action to address both demand for and supply of illegal wildlife products].

Alt.1 **[Eliminate all ~~harvesting~~, trade and use of wild terrestrial freshwater and marine species that is illegal, unsustainable or ~~unsafe~~, while safeguarding the customary sustainable use by indigenous peoples and local communities.]**

RECOMMENDED TEXT

Our preferred option builds on from Alt.1:

Eliminate all exploitation, trade and use of wild species that is illegal, ecologically unsustainable or poses any risk of pathogen spillover to humans, wildlife or other animals, while safeguarding customary sustainable use by indigenous peoples and local communities.

Target 5 must:

- **Eliminate unsustainable harvest, trade & use of wild animal species**

Target 5 aims to eliminate threats posed by the direct exploitation of wildlife. Wildlife direct exploitation is the second leading driver of biodiversity loss and extinction.

Wildlife trade is linked to the spread of infections, as animals are more susceptible to diseases when kept in poor environments, on poor diets, crowded, or under stress. The loss of high-functioning, thriving, and wildlife-rich ecosystems hinder the foundations of human life, including clean air, clean water, food security, and flood control, as well as reduce the ability of ecosystems to absorb carbon and buffer climate change impacts.

The GBF must protect biodiversity for ourselves and future generations through targets that curb the drivers of nature's decline, including eliminating direct wildlife use, trade and exploitation that is unsustainable, illegal or risks the health of humans, animals and ecosystems. In light of the COVID-19 pandemic and future zoonotic disease risks, we must eliminate activities that damage biodiversity or increase risk to animal and human health and well-being. Social or economic factors must not be used to justify these. Target 5's current formulation does not reflect the threats wildlife trade, markets, and consumption pose to biodiversity and human and animal health and well-being.

Eliminating unsustainable and illegal wildlife exploitation is an ambitious, proactive solution and a duty of care for which Parties should strive. Monitoring progress in implementing Target 5 will be simpler if it begins with "*eliminate*". The term 'eliminate' is also consistent with other international obligations and domestic legislation, such as CITES (where countries have agreed to eliminate unsustainable and illegal trade). In addition, SDG 15.7 states: "*Take urgent action to end poaching and trafficking of protected species of flora and fauna and address both demand and supply of illegal wildlife products*".

Further, ensuring use is only "*sustainable*" is insufficient as this can be defined differently depending on context. For clarity, Target 5 must ensure that any direct wildlife exploitation is ecologically sustainable.

We also suggest replacing the term "*harvest*" with "*exploitation*" since Target 5 was developed in response to the IPBES report that recognised one of the five key drivers of biodiversity loss as "*over-exploitation*". The term "*exploitation*" is broader and more encompassing, better describing the removal of species from the wild. It also translates better across UN languages, helping to ensure a common understanding among Parties.

We support deleting the terms "*captive breeding/farming*" as suggested by the Informal Group, as it is already implied in "*harvest (or as we prefer, "exploitation"), use and trade*".

- **Prevent and combat wildlife trafficking**

Wildlife trafficking is recognised as a serious issue in the Sustainable Development Goals, five UN General Assembly Resolutions, and multiple CITES, CMS, ECOSOC, UN CCPCJ and World Heritage Convention Resolutions.

The GBF needs to address wildlife trafficking, which has an estimated impact of \$1-2 trillion or more per year. By its nature, wildlife trafficking is clandestine, therefore, not subject to checks and balances, making it all the more damaging.

- **Prevent pathogen spillover to humans to avert the next pandemic**

We are highly concerned that the GBF still fails to include strong health-related language to ensure wildlife exploitation poses no risk of pathogen spillover. The target needs to better clarify the health risk it seeks to avoid by replacing “unsafe” with “or poses any risk of pathogen spillover to humans, wildlife, or other animals”.

COVID-19 showed that wildlife use is unsafe and opens up the potential for zoonotic diseases to become widespread. Without a significant shift in how we utilise wildlife, the safety of people cannot be ensured.

The Informal Group report wrongly claims that the phrasing requiring wildlife trade to be legal and sustainable is sufficiently “*broad and inclusive*” of elements related to the safety of humans, animals and plants. It claims that any of the currently bracketed health-related text can be omitted. That is a precarious and ill-advised assumption that takes no account of scientific consensus. Even if trade is biologically sustainable and legal, it can still threaten human or animal health and well-being. Pathogens are indifferent to the sustainability or legality of trade or whether the wildlife was taken directly from the wild, commercial farming, or breeding facilities.

In addition, the GBF glossary makes specific reference to ensuring it does not contribute to spreading pathogens or invasive species. The glossary refers to safety as a distinct attribute next to “*sustainable and legal*”. It is arbitrary to remove the concept at this stage from the target language without any negotiations between the Parties.

Animal health and welfare should be a core component of Target 5. Considering wild animal welfare is important on ethical grounds because of the suffering inflicted on wild animals. It is also a precondition for any successful sustainable use programme. Animals play a role in the spread of pathogens to people as reservoirs, spillover hosts, and through ongoing transmission. A highly precautionary One Health approach must be adopted, with a focus on preventing pathogen emergence, proliferation and spillover. A One Health approach to wildlife trade, markets, and consumption is required. While we strongly support the adoption of a One Health standalone target, we need strong health-related language in specific targets and Target 5. The capture, breeding, handling, transport, keeping, use and slaughter of wild animals often exposes them to appalling conditions. This, in turn, compromises their welfare and immune responses, making it much more likely that they will contract and shed pathogens, which in turn increases the risk to other animals and, ultimately, to people.

Target 5. Recommended indicators

The only current proposed headline indicator for Target 5 focuses on legality, which is not in itself a direct measure of sustainability or safety. This indicator is “**5.0.1 Proportion of [wildlife] [wild species][wood and plant] that is harvested and traded legally and sustainably**”.

We recommend three headline indicators to separately monitor legality, sustainability, and pathogen risk. Each should be applied to all wildlife (both terrestrial and marine).

1. We propose for the first headline indicator to measure “*the proportion of wildlife that is used or exploited illegally*”. It should address all species subject to illegal exploitation (domestically and internationally). The methodology to calculate it should be publicly available and include the absolute extraction flows and trends over time. This indicator could build on Parties’ experience with SDG Indicator 15.7.1, which deals with the proportion of wildlife that is poached. However, rather than draw conclusions based on proportionality, it would examine documented trends in exploiting species protected under national and international law. It should also be noted that the proportion of traded wildlife that is “*legal and sustainable*” does not account for fluctuations in supply and demand, the effects of which can be dramatic on the total trade volume.

National recognition of wildlife trafficking as a serious and predicate crime and implementation of associated enforcement activities and penalties could also be measured.

2. Target 5’s indicators lack true measures of ecological and biological sustainability. We propose “Trends in biological or ecological sustainability of legal use, exploitation and trade.” For this, we recommend using IUCN Red List assessments of the conservation status and trends for species that are exploited commercially, including but not limited to those in international trade, or included on either the CMS or CITES Appendices.

As all wild species are, prior to being harvested, an integral part of the ecosystem in which they live, it follows that a measurement of the sustainability of harvesting/using/trading of wild species must incorporate the dynamic interactions between wild species and their ecosystems and therefore reflect the sustainability impact of harvesting a wild species both in terms of the sustainability of the species itself as well as the sustainability of the ecosystem from which it was derived.

It is important to safeguard customary sustainable use by indigenous peoples and local communities. However, subsistence, traditional or customary uses should not automatically be considered ‘sustainable’. Instead, it is important to develop clear measures of biological sustainability and seek to help cultural and social ‘norms’ adapt according to biological sustainability criteria.

3. No elements have been identified for monitoring human health in relation to wildlife use, rather the only element related to this will monitor measures ensuring safe harvesting/trade operations, which will inevitably fall short of actually keeping people safe. We need clear indicators measuring reductions in the commercial exploitation of wildlife that risks zoonotic disease transfer. We recommend “Elimination of exploitation and trade that presents a risk to human health”. For this, we recommend that Parties report on the adoption of legislation or regulation to prohibit or tightly restrict domestic and international trade and markets in certain taxa, particularly birds and mammals, that present known risks for pathogen spillover, or those recognised to present other threats to ecosystems.

There are some interesting risk assessment tools being developed, looking at species in trade that are known to be hosts of zoonotic pathogens. While such assessments are currently in development, only cover certain taxa, and do not account for novel pathogens, they do represent potentially useful risk assessment tools which should be considered for use in a One Health approach.



**PREVENT PATHOGEN SPILLOVER
TO HUMANS TO AVERT THE
NEXT PANDEMIC**

New Target 23. Adhering to 'One Health' to facilitate effective implementation

CURRENT TEXT

Legend: **Important to keep**

Section B.bis, paragraph 16.

Sound implementation of the framework will aim to generate co-benefits for the achievement of the goals established under the Paris Agreement, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the UN Ocean Decade, and the promotion of **a biodiversity inclusive One Health approach.**

Note: we firmly believe that One Health is a vital cross-cutting concept and should not be diluted in the horizontal section of the GBF. As such we do not support its current treatment in the new framework. The concept deserves to be fully integrated as a standalone target as is proposed in the right column.

RECOMMENDED TEXT

Option 1. A standalone One Health target

Implement the One Health approach (as defined by the One Health High level Expert Panel and endorsed by the WHO/WOAH/FAO/UNEP Quadripartite), focusing especially on the emergence and transmission of zoonotic diseases, including their drivers, to prevent risks to the health and well-being of humans, wild and domesticated animal species, and ecosystems.

Option 2. A standalone ambitious paragraph on One Health in introductory section B.bis

The framework fully adopts and enables the effective implementation of a biodiversity-inclusive One Health approach (as defined by the One Health High level Expert Panel and endorsed by the WHO/WOAH/FAO/UNEP Quadripartite) which aims to sustainably balance and optimise the health and wellbeing of people, animals and ecosystems.

Target 23 must:

Fully integrate a One Health approach

Biodiversity can be considered the foundation for human health and well-being. The links between biodiversity and health are intricate, complex and multifaceted. The current GBF fails to apply an effective approach to tackle the common drivers of biodiversity loss, climate change, adverse health outcomes and increased pandemic risk.

The One Health approach, as defined by the One Health High-level Expert Panel (OHHLEP), integrating human, animal and environmental health and wellbeing, should have a prominent place in the GBF. We strongly advocate for a standalone target on One Health. If it remains in Section B.bis or “*the fundamental premises for the implementation of the framework*”, it should at least be referenced in an ambitious standalone paragraph.

Applying the One Health approach would facilitate a holistic approach to halting biodiversity loss and mitigating human health risks from human-wildlife interactions. It should be applied to achieve Goals A and B and Targets 4, 5 and 12.

One Health is highly relevant for Target 5 to prevent zoonotic disease risk from using, trading and exploiting wildlife. However, while Target 5 should tackle health risks associated with species exploitation, it is not within its remit to address the role of other factors in the emergence of diseases, such as habitat fragmentation or agricultural intensification. **One Health needs to be a standalone target of the GBF.**

One Health allows for integrating sanitary and zoonotic risk prevention into biodiversity policy. The landscape of human, animal and environmental health is changing rapidly due to many interrelated factors, including changing geographic and migration patterns, climate change, and increased contact between humans and animals. Animal health and welfare must feature as critical elements of biodiversity policy. OHHLEP’s definition of One Health references ‘well-being’. Just as human and animal health are interdependent and bound to the health of the ecosystems in which they exist, protecting and improving animal welfare is essential for human and environmental wellbeing.

The draft Global Action Plan on Biodiversity & Health recognises the importance of ecosystems for human health and animal welfare and aims to promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity alongside human well-being and animal welfare through the mainstreaming of biodiversity and health linkages. CBD/SBSTTA/24/9 notes that “*a One Health transition can play a critical and catalytic role in reducing the loss and degradation of biodiversity, restoring healthy ecosystems, enhancing the health, well-being and livelihood of all living beings, including humans, animals and plants, and preventing future pandemics.*”

Our recommendations echo the 2022 UNEA Resolution on the animal welfare–environment–sustainable development nexus, which acknowledges the role of animal welfare in protecting the environment and achieving sustainable development.

Target 23. Recommended indicators

Indicators of other GBF Goals and Targets could be used to measure progress on applying the One Health approach. Examples are Target 14 indicators on the extent to which countries have integrated biodiversity considerations into relevant national multisectoral strategies, and our recommended indicators for Goals A and B, and Targets 4 and 5.

We also recommend considering readily available indicators from the WHO's International Health Regulations. These include: One Health collaborative efforts across sectors on activities to address zoonoses; coordinated surveillance systems in place in the animal health and public health sectors for zoonotic diseases/pathogens identified as joint priorities; and mechanisms for responding to infectious zoonoses and potential zoonoses are established and functional.

Indicators could also include the number of countries with national constitution or legislation recognising a right to a healthy environment.

In addition, health and well-being indicators that could be used to measure progress towards the proposed standalone target could be developed by the proposed Ad Hoc and Technical Advisory Group (AHTEG) in the lead up to COP16.

3.

SHIFT THE SUSTAINABLE USE NARRATIVE TOWARDS ECOCENTRISM AND BETTER INTEGRATE THE MULTIPLE VALUES OF BIODIVERSITY

Goal B on ensuring ecological sustainable use of biodiversity by people

Target 9 on ensuring species are valued, used in a truly sustainable way and not exploited

Target 10 on ensuring ecosystems used by productive sectors (agriculture, forestry, fisheries) are valued



Goal B. Ensuring ecological sustainable use of biodiversity by people

CURRENT TEXT

LEGEND: **New language proposed**
| **Important to keep**

Biodiversity is **conserved**, sustainably used and managed and nature's contributions to people, including [the long-term [integrity] [health] of] ecosystem functions and services, [with those ecosystem[s] [services] currently in decline being **restored by [2030]** [2050] [taking into account the wide range of biodiversity values] [are **valued**], maintained and enhanced **through conservation**, **restoration and sustainable use** [especially in the places most important for delivering these contributions] [achieving] **supporting** the achievement of] **the [global] sustainable development [agenda]** [goals] **for the benefit of [all life on Earth.]** present and future generations] [the fulfilment of the right to a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment] [recognizing that a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment is important for the enjoyment of human rights] [and [an equitable] [a] reduction of the ecological footprint of [--%] by 2030 within planetary boundaries is achieved].

RECOMMENDED TEXT

Biodiversity is valued, enhanced and maintained through conservation, restoration and ecologically sustainable use, supporting the global development agenda for the benefit of all life on Earth.

Goal B must:

- **Prioritise ecological sustainability, and ensure that biodiversity is adequately valued and enhanced as a prerequisite for any use**

Goal B, closely linked to targets 9 and 10, focuses on valuing, maintaining and enhancing biodiversity and its contributions to people. That such enhancement must not result in further declines should be made implicit in the Goal.

A sequential approach needs to be adopted, as sustainable use can only be achieved once ecosystem integrity has been established. We therefore do not support the streamlined text proposed by the Informal Group [Biodiversity is sustainably used and managed]. The use of the term 'sustainable use' suggests that the effects will accrue on uses that are sustainable. Instead, the focus should be on ensuring biodiversity is adequately valued (for its multiple services, including non-economic), with the objective to halt its loss and restore it, as opposed to encouraging further use. Maintaining and enhancing the benefits that nature provides to people is a part of the rationale for protecting biodiversity, but the Goals should not be primarily driven by it. The risk of having a Goal aimed at increasing nature's contributions to people may result in Parties reporting successful achievement even if biodiversity has declined as result.

Therefore, the question of how sustainability is defined and measured is hugely significant, and the term 'sustainable use' should only be applied in reference to uses which have been demonstrated to meet strict criteria for assessing biological and ecological sustainability. It is essential that emphasis is placed on maintaining and increasing biodiversity in order to support its sustainability, as opposed to enhancing the productivity and use of wildlife, particularly of species in decline.

We support the reference to restoration in Goal B. Ecosystem restoration offers the opportunity to halt and reverse degradation, improve ecosystem services and recover biodiversity. It is estimated that 60% of expected species extinctions could be averted through the effective restoration of 15% of converted lands. Furthermore, the protection of existing intact ecosystems and the restoration of degraded ecosystems has the potential to contribute to over one third of total climate change mitigation required by 2030. In addition, recovering wild animal populations to healthy viable numbers is key to ensuring the provision of ecosystem services, with a focus on achieving social and cultural integrity consistent with the ecological role of species.

- **Better recognise the intrinsic and other non-economic values of biodiversity, and ensure that its diverse uses benefit all forms of life on Earth, not just people**

Sustainable use in the GBF is couched as a progressive wildlife management approach, but fails to value biodiversity and ecosystem services in their own right, despite the Addis Ababa Principles requiring consideration for the intrinsic and other non-economic values of biological diversity. The GBF needs to move away from its purely anthropocentric approach, by adopting greater recognition of the benefits from non-consumptive uses of wildlife for sustainable development, and to conservation in particular through long-term attitudinal change towards animals and natural habitats.

The way biodiversity is currently valued in political and economic decisions is a key driver of the global biodiversity crisis. The IPBES Values Assessment suggests that shifting decision-making towards the multiple values of nature is required to halt and reverse biodiversity loss. Similarly, the Dasgupta Review explores the sustainability of our engagements with biodiversity, and recognises that humanity has “*collectively failed to engage with Nature sustainably, to the extent that our demands far exceed its capacity to supply us with the goods and services we all rely on*”. If we are to avoid exceeding the limits of what biodiversity can provide on a sustainable basis while meeting the needs of the growing human population, we need to ensure that we conserve and restore our natural assets, and that our demands on biodiversity do not exceed its supply.

Accounting for the diverse value systems is an integral part of the GBF’s successful implementation, and we welcome the related text on ‘the fundamental premises for the implementation of the framework’ in current Section B.bis, prepared by the Co-Chairs at the request of the members of the Informal Group. This understanding needs to harmoniously translate throughout the Framework, including in Goal B.

Finally, we would recommend going back to the Geneva (OEWG-3.2) text ‘*for the benefit of all forms of life on Earth*’, in line with PP3 of the Kunming Declaration for a “Shared Future for All Life on Earth” adopted at the first part of CBD COP15 in October 2021.

GOAL B. Recommended indicators

Goal B has strong linkages with targets 9, 10, 11.

The current proposed headline indicator for Goal B is “**B.0.1 National environmental economic accounts of ecosystem services**”. Some Parties suggested splitting this indicator into biophysical and monetary accounts with the monetary accounts being optional. Injecting natural capital into national accounting is a critical first step towards measuring the true value of biodiversity, as confirmed in the [Dasgupta Review](#). Frameworks for natural capital accounting and assessment are being developed, in many cases through the UN’s System of Environmental and Economic Accounts (SEEA). Countries are beginning to incorporate natural capital and ecosystem services into national economic metrics of success.

To measure progress on Goal B, we suggest as an indicator “*incorporation of the economic and intrinsic value of biodiversity into national accounting systems*”.



**RECOGNISE BIODIVERSITY'S
ECONOMIC & INTRINSIC VALUE**

Target 9. Ensuring species are valued, used in a truly sustainable way and not exploited

CURRENT TEXT

LEGEND: **New language proposed**
| **Important to keep** | **Deletions**

“**[Ensure that the management and use of wild species are **ecologically sustainable** **and benefits are equally distributed**]** [and consistent with relevant national laws and in harmony with international commitments], ~~[and promote the development of sustainable biodiversity-based products]~~, **thereby providing social, economic and environmental benefits for people, especially** those in vulnerable situations and **those most dependent on biodiversity** **[for subsistence and economic security]** ~~[including through the use [and promotion] of [sustainable biodiversity-based products and services] [including sustainable trophy hunting]]~~ [ensuring the protection and promotion of] **[while] [safeguarding and protecting]** the livelihoods of and **customary sustainable use by indigenous peoples and local communities**].”

RECOMMENDED TEXT

Ensure all management and use of wild species are ecologically sustainable and benefits are equitably distributed, thereby providing social and environmental benefits for all people, especially those most dependent on biodiversity for food and economic security, while safeguarding customary sustainable use by indigenous peoples and local communities.

Target 9 must:

- **Prevent wildlife exploitation by ensuring ecological sustainability as a prerequisite for the provision of benefits to people**

The direct exploitation of wild species is the second major driver of biodiversity loss, which the GBF must address. This target on species' use needs to go far beyond maintaining current levels of exploitation. Such a reductive short-term approach will inevitably lead to the accumulation of localised benefits and further wildlife exploitation. Encouraging the continued exploitation of diminishing resources is bound to have further damaging impacts on people and their livelihoods, particularly for those most reliant on biodiversity for subsistence and economic security. Including “*for food and economic security*” in this target will more clearly contain wildlife uses to small scale, locally determined needs and benefits.

- **Move away from consumptive non-essential uses, and remove 'trophy hunting'**

Promoting economic activities based on consumptive uses of wildlife will reinforce or exacerbate current forms of exploitation and create new ones. Consumptive commercial wildlife exploitation for inessential, luxury, entertainment and recreational uses are neither ethical nor sustainable. Target 9 is about securing benefits from wildlife to all people through ecologically sustainable management in an equitable way that is safe for both human and animal health. It should strictly focus on essential uses by people whose livelihoods depend most directly on biodiversity, particularly indigenous peoples and rural and coastal communities. It must also capture the full range of benefits from biodiversity to people, including cultural, psychological and spiritual.

Including “trophy hunting” is unacceptable and contrary to existing international commitments towards the protection of biodiversity and the foundations of the GBF. A 2020 CBD report on GBF targets related to the sustainable use of biological diversity provides that the GBF “*should ban all inessential uses of wildlife, including recreational hunting and trophy hunting.*” Trophy hunting is not consistent with sustainable use, has a long history as a direct driver of wildlife exploitation, has not demonstrated a contribution to biodiversity conservation, and provides few benefits to local communities. Further, it does not apply to the majority of the CBD parties. References to trophy hunting in the context of sustainable use should be removed from the GBF.

The term “biodiversity-based products” is not clearly defined and can be misleading. The current text can be interpreted as promoting the intensification of wildlife exploitation driven by large commercial consumer markets. The prioritisation of economic benefits is among the leading causes of wildlife exploitation. It also undermines the required precautionary approach to benefits. If economic benefits are to be included, they should be strictly confined to non-consumptive activities with a proven contribution to biodiversity enhancement.

Target 9. Recommended indicators

Target 9's current proposed headline indicator is “**9.0.1 National environmental-economic accounts of benefits from the use of wild species**”.

Current indicators do not consider biodiversity's contributions to people, in particular those that do not have an obvious measurable economic value, nor do they measure benefits from sustainable use for people, especially for the most vulnerable and IPLCs. Further, it's intended positive outcome should be better spelled out: to reduce the number of people relying on wildlife for their livelihoods. Encouraging the continued use of depleting resources is bound to have further damaging impacts on people and their livelihoods, particularly the most vulnerable. Wildlife recovery needs to be prioritised, alongside the provision of alternative livelihood opportunities for affected people.

Target 9 should focus on investment in nature protection, incorporating investments criteria, which include no damage as a minimum and preferably net biodiversity benefits, into development funding. Such investments must also incorporate animal welfare as a key component of conservation projects using a One Health approach, and aim to reduce non-essential uses. Biological and ecological sustainability is key to the long-term ability to provide equitable benefits.

To effectively measure Target 9, we recommend considering the following:

1. Data on the extent of use is critical for establishing robust, consistent, and comparable baselines. As currently developed, National Systems of Environmental-Economic Accounts (SEEA) do not include an Extent Account for wildlife.
2. This indicator needs to assess benefits in a more balanced and comprehensive way, including costs (negative impacts) affecting different sectors of society, especially those most dependent on wildlife, like indigenous peoples and local communities.

SEEA does not currently differentiate wildlife uses by type of users. To protect indigenous peoples and local communities, the distinction by type of user should be included in wildlife extent accounts.

A more comprehensive indicator could read "*9.0.1: National environmental-economic accounts of benefits and negative impacts affecting different sectors of society, especially the most vulnerable, and indigenous peoples and local communities, as a result of changes in the stocks and flows of wild species*".

3. There are additional relevant indicators (measuring implementation progress of the Tasks in the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity):
 - Incorporation of ecologically sustainable customary use practices (with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities) into national biodiversity strategies and action plans;
 - Identification of best practices.

**PREVENT WILDLIFE EXPLOITATION
BY ENSURING ECOLOGICAL
SUSTAINABILITY**



Target 10. Ensuring ecosystems used by productive sectors are valued

CURRENT TEXT

LEGEND: **New language proposed**
| **Important to keep** | **Deletions**

Ensure that [all] areas under agriculture, aquaculture, [fisheries], forestry [and other productive uses] are managed sustainably, in particular through the [ecological] sustainable use of biodiversity, contributing to [the long term] [efficiency, ~~productivity~~] and resilience of these systems, conserving and restoring biodiversity and maintaining [its ecosystem services] [nature's contribution to people, including ecosystem services].

RECOMMENDED TEXT

Ensure that all areas under agriculture, aquaculture, forestry, and other productive uses are managed sustainably through the ecological sustainable use of biodiversity; conserving and restoring biodiversity and contributing to the long-term resilience of these systems.

Target 10 must:

- **Incorporate ecological sustainability as a precondition to achieving social and economic aspects of sustainability**

Ecological sustainability allows for maintenance and recovery of natural processes, and safeguards against loss of ecosystem integrity. It is a precondition to achieving the social and economic aspects of sustainability, and therefore key to our long-term ability to provide equitable benefits.

- **Shift away from productivity towards improving food system's and other productive sectors' efficiency**

The Informal Group suggested that the brackets around “efficiency, productivity” could be omitted. However, we do not support using the term ‘productivity’. It leaves room for an increase in perverse incentives for industrialisation, whereas Target 10 should be designed to achieve the opposite.

Target 10 should focus on industrial animal agriculture and its negative impacts on biodiversity, health, local economies, food security, and climate change. In particular, it should help improve food system efficiency by reducing reliance on animal agriculture (mainly industrial systems) while ensuring that agricultural production methods and investments encourage biodiversity through agroecology schemes and associated incentives. We support the suggestion by the Informal Group for this target to promote agro-biodiversity, or biodiversity-friendly approaches and practices, more prominently.

An element of Target 10 should focus on eliminating perverse incentives for the industrialisation of animal agriculture. However, current wording on ‘reducing productivity gaps’ risks the opposite. Animal agriculture is responsible for deforestation and other land use change, increasing GHG emissions and further aggravating biodiversity and climate crises. Investments must align with animal welfare standards for domesticated animals, ensuring more sustainable and viable production methods. Phasing out harmful subsidies is a necessary precondition to achieving Target 10. It should also aim to reduce food loss and waste, particularly of animal-based foods.

The target should consider the development of new technologies in agriculture to improve efficiency and reduce waste. Another aspect the target should consider is the development of sustainable urban agriculture, which not only boosts biodiversity but tackles ‘food deserts’ and reduces food transport.

Target 10. Recommended indicators

The current proposed headline indicator for Target 10 is “**10.0.1 Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture (SDG 2.4.1)**”. We recommend the development of indicators measuring uptake in agro-ecology, agro-environment and organic farming. We also recommend an indicator measuring changes in production and consumption patterns as a way to look at reducing reliance on animal agriculture.

The use of industry-led certification schemes, such as forest area under an independently verified forest management certification scheme (SDG 15.2.1(4,5)) may be relevant, although such private sector certification processes may not provide a definitive indication of sustainability, and may not reflect best practice from an ecological perspective.



**INCORPORATE ECOLOGICAL
SUSTAINABILITY AS A
PRECONDITION**

ABOUT US

The World Federation for Animals is a membership organisation founded by and for national, regional, and international animal protection organisations to advance the interests of animals in international policy fora. We aim to improve the well-being of all animals and end their exploitation and suffering worldwide.

Born Free is a UK-based international charity committed to promoting compassionate conservation to enhance the survival of threatened species in the wild and protect natural habitats, while respecting the needs and safeguarding the welfare of individual animals. As a leading wildlife charity, we oppose the exploitation of wild animals in captivity and campaign to keep them where they belong – in the wild.

CONTACT

World Federation for Animals

Sabine Brels, sabine.brels@wfa.org, Legal Advisor

Born Free Foundation

Adeline Lerambert, adeline@bornfree.org.uk, International Policy Specialist

