



Ensuring a coherent GBF implementation

By Friedrich Wulf, Pro Natura

The monitoring framework (item 3a) can make or break the implementation of the GBF Targets. Indicators need, first and foremost, to faithfully reflect the content of the targets and give an idea of if and how parties are progressing towards them. This is best done by a set of globally agreed quantifiable headline indicators. These will tell exactly and with nuance the progress for each target and for each country. This will reveal where action is needed and which measures to be taken. It will accurately show progress, notably at the second global stocktake.

Unfortunately, there was no agreement on the headline indicators for several targets at COP 15, leaving too many targets with indicators based on sets of yes/no questions only. These binary indicators only give us a crude, sketchy, black-and-white idea of what is happening. Most of them only check the existence of processes that intend to achieve the target, without telling whether this process is sufficient or successful.

For example, in goal B, the question “Does your country have policies or action plans targeting the sustainable use and management of biodiversity?” can be answered with a “yes”, even if it is just a very minor plan for a small sector, or if it is not implemented. This does not do justice to goal B, which aims to achieve truly sustainable use. What the indicator should really reveal is: “Are nature’s contributions to people and ecosystem functions and services maintained and enhanced in the countries?”

Similarly, on target 14, the question is “Does your country have a mechanism for integrating biodiversity values into policies,...”. This does not show the scope of this mechanism or its effectiveness. We want to know how many of the relevant public and private activities and fiscal and financial flows are aligned with the goals and targets of this framework.

On Target 16, the existing indicator for the SDGs (12.2.1), the material footprint could easily be used to track progress.

Item 3b will give recommendations on the review process to SBI and COP. The core of the review needs to be a collaborative discussion among parties, experts, and stakeholders on how to address the shortcomings identified in the national reports and at the global stocktake at COP 17. Where the process is not on track to meet the targets, increased action needs to be planned for. That is the essence of the review.

Preparatory document CBD/SBSTTA/25/3, in paras 10-13, contains a list of possible elements for the global review of progress, including a forum on progress conducted under SBI; Relevant recommendations prepared by the SBs; High-level discussions among Parties under the Presidencies of COP-17 and COP-19; a package of decisions to be used by Parties to take action and a committee for the global review under the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

The review could also include a scientific and technical evaluation of the indicators. The current draft recommendation of the non-paper on this item in 15/3 disappointingly only contains suggestions for the elements that should be considered for the reports but not for the review, which it leaves entirely to SBI. We call on parties to fill this gap and on SBSTTA to look into these elements and include them in the recommendation.

Governments urged to consider the interconnectedness between agricultural biodiversity, farmers' rights, food systems, and climate change.

By the African Centre for Biodiversity

The current global corporate-controlled and industrial food systems have exacerbated fossil fuel-induced climate change and biodiversity loss. Agricultural biodiversity (or the lack thereof) is directly related to climate change: it both drives climate change and is greatly affected by it. To reverse this, it is critical to enhance biodiversity in small-scale farming systems -as an integral part of agroecology. We need to reform and adapt agricultural and food systems, in the context of the multiple intersecting socio-ecological crises. Furthermore, agricultural biodiversity contributes to multiple sustainability dimensions and the Sustainable Development Goals.

The explicit mention of agroecology under Target 10 of the Global Diversity Framework, and the in-situ conservation of agricultural biodiversity implicit in Target 4, makes a compelling case for Parties to develop further work regarding agroecological farming practices. They should also consider their link to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, to address the impacts of climate change and biodiversity loss.

For this, it is essential to place agricultural biodiversity and farmers' rights -which are indeed human rights- at the center of the work. Farmers' rights, including their rights to seed, enhance the functioning of farmer-managed seed systems, which in turn increases agricultural biodiversity, especially landraces, and the availability of adaptable and resilient seeds.

Building climate resilience in the food system leads to transformative resilience, addressing the roots of the vulnerability and tackling the systems and power relations that need changing. In this regard, Parties have three main tasks for building climate resilience in the **food system for a just transition:**

1. Reduce emissions across the food system (mitigation)
2. Make food production and distribution more climate resilient (adaptation)
3. Meet social and nutritional needs.

Read more at: <https://acbio.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/Cultivate-diversity-Africa-food-systems.pdf>



**SBSTTA-25
SIDE EVENT**

Will GBF implementation be equitable, socially and gender just or will false solutions prevail?

**Event details
UNEP Office
CR-10, GRULAC ROOM
17/10/2023
18:15 Nairobi Time**

After the adoption of the KMGBF, its successful implementation is what will make or break the future of biodiversity. There were major gains in the KMGBF targets with the language on the recognition of the rights of Indigenous people and local communities, on gender equality, on participation, and on the protection of human rights defenders, however, the CBD Alliance believes all targets should be implemented in ways that assure a fair, just, equitable, and gender-just implementation.