

First Meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

Agenda Item 4 – Cluster 2

Thank you, Chair. This statement is on behalf of Friends of the Earth International, ICCA Consortium, World Animal Net, Natural Justice and ETC Group.

Enabling conditions and means of implementation are paramount. They should be attended in a full manner in the post 2020 decisions, and not be relegated to a preamble. Most important to successful implementation is the development of strong governmental structures and systems, – backed by capacity building where needed. Followed by strong constitutional, regulatory and enforcement systems. This aligns with SDG 16 - which includes promoting the rule of law, strengthening institutions and increasing access to justice. Government capacity, linked to political will, need to be strengthened.

Resource mobilisation should comprise predictable, stable and legally protected public funding from public sources, in the frame of Common but differentiated responsibilities as stated in art 20.4 of the Convention. A way of levelling up this funding is by eliminating perverse incentives, turning them into positive incentives for the implementation of the Convention. For example, over \$3 trillion is spent on agricultural subsidies globally, most of it for damaging types of agriculture. Finance from mechanisms that are market-based or financialise Nature, or from other private sources whose core business rely on biodiversity destruction should not be recognised as funding in fulfilment of the obligations of the convention. Let's not forget that there's infinitely more investment in activities that destroy biodiversity, than in its conservation. Investment in large scale infrastructure is planned to triple in the next decades, and investment in agrocommodities such as oil palm and soy keeps on soaring. The current financial and investment system needs to be reformed, or else conservation will be doomed to fail.

One enabling condition needed is prohibition of imports of goods that have a significant impact on biodiversity in third countries. If we stop the demand for biodiversity destruction, conservation will be easy. Taxes could be levied on products and practices harmful to biodiversity (such as meat and dairy products identified in the IPBES report), raising funds that could be earmarked for biodiversity programmes. Other enabling conditions include non-financial support such as legal recognition and protection. Furthermore, voluntary and collective action of indigenous peoples, local communities and civil society organisations contribute significantly to implementation and should be better recognised and reported as non-financial forms of resource mobilisation.

Transfer of technologies, in order to be an effective enabling condition, it has to include enabling access of developing countries and communities to appropriate, environmentally sound, gender responsive and socially just technologies and innovations. Indigenous knowledge and local technologies should be promoted and supported for biodiversity conservation. It is mandatory that the post-2020 Framework should include a mechanism for participatory and transparent assessment of new and emerging technologies to inform Parties and communities with adequate information and early warning on potential impacts of these technologies on biodiversity and communities.

Another so-called enabling condition is communication. Again we want to caution. We are all for the full implementation of Aichi target 1 and increasing awareness raising. However, biodiversity is different in different regions, and people's relationship with it is even more culturally determined. There cannot be a global communication message that helps raising awareness in all local settings. The result may actually be a further estrangement. Thank you, Chair.