

Challenges in Mainstreaming Biodiversity

Isaac Rojas, Friends of the Earth International

Mainstreaming biodiversity is an important issue because, as long as biodiversity is respected as a key aspect in decision-making according to participatory and transparent mechanisms, we will have more opportunities to stop its loss. Mainstreaming should not be used to legitimize business. The incorporation will mean in some cases, that businesses such as mining that by definition is unsustainable, should phase out, as it is spoken must happen for fossil fuels.

Mainstreaming biodiversity also plays an essential role in the creation of the post-2020 biodiversity framework, which must lead us towards a system change.

- Voluntary mechanisms such as certification (mentioned in document SBI / 2/4 in paragraph 50): there are many industrial activities that generate a large number of negative impacts on biodiversity as well as on Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Palm oil monoculture is a clear example. One of the most widespread solutions is certification. However, the reality shows that this type of voluntary mechanisms do not work: Nestlé's exit from RSPO is a good example along with hundreds of environmental and social impacts on local communities and Indigenous Peoples in Asia, Latin America and Africa.

- Financialization of Nature: it brings back mechanisms that were taken out of the discussion in the CBD as the innovative financial mechanisms (paragraph 54 of the SBI document cited) after several Parties clearly saw their experimental nature - still in force - it could cause negative impacts in addition to the direction towards the financialization of Nature that it entails.

- The continuous reference to Natural Capital excludes other approaches and concepts necessary in the discussion.

- The role of the market and the damages to biodiversity: Biodiversity loss is because a failure in the market as it entails a specific economic vision that does not coincide with reality and also excludes other economic visions. It is clear that the damage comes from the impact of industries, the non-application of legislation, the validity of voluntary standards among others. It is also clear that

it is necessary to include in the debate other economic views that are not present in the documents prepared for the discussion,

- Greater efforts are needed to eliminate and progressively reduce incentives that are harmful to biodiversity and that in some cases favor industries and sectors such as finance,

- There is a continuous reference to the Paris agreement. While it can be true that in terms of communication there is certain level of success, we can not say that the problem has been solved because we see how this planetary crisis grows every year and continues causing disastrous impacts.

- Scientific literature tells us today that forests under the management and control of communities are richer in biodiversity than others that are protected under traditional approaches such as national parks. Then, it's strengthening - as well as the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities - is key in this discussion about our future,.

- Include all sectors as well as their proposals as this joint construction must be based on what all sectors contribute.

Civil Society Statement SBSTTA 22 - Agenda Item 16

On behalf of: Friends of Nature; ICCA Consortium; Friends of the Earth International, EcoNexus, Global Forest Coalition and several other organizations from civil society present at this meeting.

We welcome the opportunity to shape a truly transformational post-2020 agenda and you can count on civil society to be there the entire way.

If there is going to be a dialogue on transformation, it must be inclusive and allow for a wide variety of voices. We know who is doing the work on the ground for conservation. It is small family farmers, peasants, Indigenous Peoples and local communities alongside their allies in civil society: those are the people who, working together, create and protect biological diversity.

Thus, we are concerned with the role and air-time awarded to the World Economic Forum and to the language used in that space seeping into our documents

coopting language and concepts from the CBD. While we understand the seductive allure of big money and big power, the WEF is populated with the world's largest and most powerful corporations – for whom the paradigm is a constant and ever-increasing growth. We actually need the opposite to that and establish concrete limits to growth and consumption. We need to be alert and not let the concept of transformational change be shifted away from what will make real changes on the ground and from those who do the work of creating, supporting and nurturing biodiversity.

In relation to the decision text:

In the list of activities proposed in Annex 1, we request not only to be included in the programmed regional and global consultations but to add self consultation meetings among the different groups including civil society, indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth. This is in order to include visions outside the financial and economical approaches that tend to see nature as mere resources.

Gender mainstreaming towards a post 2020 Biodiversity Framework

Amelia Arreguín Prado – GYBN México

We, women are human beings and rights holders, as CEDAW (Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women) has determined since 1975. **There is no cultural excuse for not guaranteeing the fulfillment of the rights we have conquered!**

In a context in which most of the cultural systems in which we live hierarchize the genres maintaining men in dominant positions, and imposing defined roles for women and men placing women usually in disadvantaged positions. And understanding that the Convention on Biological Diversity is not only about ecosystems, species and genes but also about cultural relations; it is necessary to work harder to set a common understanding about what the gender perspective is.

During the inter-sessional meetings SBSTTA 22 and SBI 2, we have many chances to improve mainstreaming gender across the CDB processes. We achieve it in some points but the hard work still remains.

The review made by the Secretariat of the CBD on the implementation of the Gender Plan of Action 2015-2020 notes that not even half of the post-Nagoya NBSAPs included a reference to gender or women's issues, and only 5 parties reported back. This evidence creates great concern on whether there is genuine will to develop

sound strategies to apply gender considerations into all processes under the Convention.

In light of this situation it is critically important for the further implementation of the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action, that parties, other governments, and relevant organizations reinforce their work for raising awareness and building capacity on gender-biodiversity linkages so the gender perspective can be fully and effectively integrated in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

One way to do it is sharing and learning from good practices and to make use of the work carried out by the Gender Office of the Secretariat. Professional training courses on gender mainstreaming should be considered to make them mandatory for all government officials and other stakeholders dealing with the implementation of the Convention in order to have a common platform of understanding on these issues.

Therefore, to allocate the necessary budget to address gender issues should be a priority. In that sense, countries must access and seek support from other agencies, including the Global Environment Facility, to close this gap.

During SBI 2, gender mainstreaming could be reflected in many agenda items, for example in the capacity building, resource mobilization and in mainstreaming biodiversity in productive sectors. Bearing this in mind, it must be said that from now to COP15 CBD, stakeholders should work on a revised and strengthened Gender Plan of Action as part of the post-2020 biodiversity framework, integrating gender perspectives as a cross-cutting issue, such as including a gender element in each future goal.

The opinions, commentaries and articles printed in ECO are the sole opinion of the individual authors or organizations, unless otherwise expressed.

Submissions are welcome from all civil society
Email: gadirlavadenz@gmail.com