

15 marzo / 15<sup>th</sup> March



## CBD post-2020 global biodiversity framework

### Discussion:

Grazia: facilitator

Talks about target 5.3:

*Aili:*

What about the economic point of view around this target? How is this target implemented in reality?  
Through the creation of a new tax ?

*Grazia:*

Some practices which are damaging for the environment and for people are funded by major institutions. We are even, as individuals, funding them sometimes without knowing it -> hence the « perverse » aspect  
We are stressing that it's not a target that should be dropped even if not reached yet. We should focus on it.  
Source of the problem ! One of the least implemented goals and targets of the convention, we should pay more attention to it. We should do it at the same time as we're supporting territories of life

*Aili:*

It's such a huge and vague concept that it hasn't been tackled yet.

*Emma:*

Inside the CBD there are some groups (IIFB for instance) working also on this. This target came out recently and it was stressed by all parties that it should be considered in priority

*Grazi :*

We are in alliance, we need to join hands with others. Others focus more than us on the technical aspects of this target, the consortium says it is a priority and that it goes with the support of territories of life.

*Ted:*

We should add the concept of « problems » in substantive issue (a). Ex: identifying that a community has a major problem with palm oil.

*Ysegul:*

Remark: Ecommons (?) partnered with the IUCN and worked on how to better integrate nature in these issues. Important for communities.

*George:*

We should add the concept of violence (ex: WWF in Congo)

*Aslak:*

This text has already been sent. I suggest that we think about the issues we can raise next week for the meeting in Bonn. It will be quite technical (about structural aspects)  
-> 2025 vision of living in harmony with nature. One of the issues is: «what does it mean?», especially in the scope of this biodiversity framework.

*Avelino:*

In Portugal, case wildfires: blaming the wrong people.

*Brigit:*

The European Investment Bank is responsible for many destructive practices, good example of perverse investments.

*Antoine:*

But the EU investment Bank also funds meaningful projects (ex: Rewilding Landscape project in Finland)  
How do we address this schizophrenic attitude?

*Grazia:*

Can we focus on 5.1? Because we have knowledge about this topic  
Question to show the limits : How fast do you think this can be applied in Spain?

*Answer from Spain:*

Difficult to achieve this in this timeframe. Changing the legal aspects takes a lot of time.

*Ted:*

It should be more accurate to describe the self-governance systems to avoid them being dismissed by the institutions.

*Question from Spain:*

We are dealing with many public lands that were commons and are under threat. Is the 50% target reasonable?

*Grazia:*

We should have ambitious goals that make us move forward

*Sergio:*

Is protecting the values of biodiversity etc goes through protecting the governance system or the land itself?  
Ex: Sierra Nevada

We are reproducing the logic of protected areas here: focusing on physical aspects.

*Grazia:*

Very important point. This is something that is a longstanding confusion.

Friends like ILC have focused on land. The Consortium helped them to move from «peasant lands» to «collective lands»

We should here move to the concept of collective governance

*Emma :*

Territories of life is not only a land- but also a governance system. I understand your point but I don't think those concepts are exclusive.

*Grazia:*

Look at the potential indicators: potential of collective lands... Which is exactly what's not working.

*Sergio:*

Many governance systems are based on ownership.

Very western, capitalist approach. We have to focus on the collective aspects.

*Grazia:*

If we want to send a clear message that we stress the importance of governance, we should say in a different way the «percentage «sentence. We should emphasize the local governance as an indicator and replace «land, water etc... » by something else.

*Aslak :*

In the Sami language, «territories» include both lands and waters.

*Emma:*

I suggest «territories and their components»

*Ted:*

What about «ancestral domains» ?

*Sergio:*

Problematic because it implies and ancestral presence. In some areas, people come and go. It excludes them.

*George:*

«life-supporting systems»?

*Grazia:*

We should ask: «what is our ambition?». This target is really blurry.

*Aslak :*

We speak of «traditional territories» in my place.

*Grazia:*

Again, what is really our ambition? Do we want to secure what's already there or expand these concepts?

*Sergio:*

Secure what we have.

*Ysegul:*

Securing well-being

*Aslak:*

The target is clear about expanding these territories of life and their legal recognition.

*Brigit:*

In Ireland, people have banned mountains. Need to develop a new idea for these spaces. Redefine

*Grazia:*

Written on the board: Maintain, secure, enhance the extension of territories of life.

*Sergio:*

We should avoid measuring only a surface. A national park is not better than another because it's bigger.

*Avelino:*

What about the word «respect»?

-> Good idea, added on the board

*George:*

What about «celebrate»?

-> added on the board

*Aslak :*

Necessary to be measurable: how do we measure «celebration»?

*Grazia:*

Let's go back to the question: is that all we want? Think about the local contexts -> Do we want to maintain, respect, secure etc... local governances and territories of life in Spain for instance?

What about «recognize»?

*Sergio:*

It's not something passive. We need other terms

*Grazia:*

«Participate» is too weak

These are targets for the parties of CBD, they're for governments. We should take that into account while redefining the target.

What about « give back the local governance / responsibilities»?

*Sergio:*

We heard in the meeting in Sidney that people want responsibilities.

*Rita:*

In Portugal, there are already laws but they're not respected. First of all, government should be accountable for their own laws.

*Carmen:*

This notion of sharing responsibilities will give hope for moving forward.

*Grazia:*

We have to remember that these goals are not only for Europe. It needs to be short and applicable to many contexts all over the world.

*Francisco:*

There are so many verbs here that it will be difficult to reach a number. We should reduce the number of words in the sentence.

*Grazia:*

Some words are comprised in others, we can shorten the sentence.

*Emma:*

This target is not enough, we don't even acknowledge all collective lands that exist. How can we know then that a given percentage is recognized/protected?

*Sergio:*

These numbers don't make a lot of sense anyway

*Aili:*

We should focus on the essential message and not put random numbers that we can't back up.

*Grazia:*

Good occasion now to put to test what we've been talking about this week. We all need a baseline: what is the potential for the local governance? Without that, how can we reach the 100% goal?

*Ted:*

Why don't we develop this baseline based on the biodiversity targets?

*Rita:*

Unclear if the goal is to bring this target to claim answers from the government or is this an internal thing for the CBD?

*Grazia:*

It's for the governments.

*Rita:*

If it is for the governments, they should define what they recognize as commons themselves.

*Sergio:*

Governments should have some kind of register to know what we're starting from. They should know what they already have. Then we could say : « you are not recognizing this specific commons, you should do something about it »

*Grazia:*

It should not be left in the hands of governments.

*Avelino:*

In my experience, governments don't know what to do. I do the homework and they go there to put the stamp.

*Sergio:*

The categories should be based on governance and not property.

*Rita:*

The state should at least say what rights they recognize to local communities. Then a goal could be for them to respect

*Avelino:*

My approach is to share as much data as possible because it helps public participation.

*Grazia:*

Good idea to ask governments explicitly what they recognize or not because then a debate can start.

Exception of coastal areas: gov would declare they're 100% governmental.

The baseline is going to be controversial anyway.

**Each country establishes a baseline of rights and claims around the local recognition of collective lands, waters and territories of life.**

Out of this baseline, we can start truly engaging.

Discussion closed.

Remarks and questions:

Emma: What about the youth and women in the submission?

Grazia: By 2030, a sizable percentage of this baseline has to be secured, the baseline will not have changed much.

Develop

Sergio: it will be a big change that will open the debate.

However, for the target, I can't find any percentage that makes sense.

Right time in Southern Europe to open this debate.

Grazia: we have to make sure that these percentages make sense in places where this debate has been going on for a while. ASAP: open up the baseline

Then, on a country-by-country basis, a certain percentage of this baseline should be respected. Target of what can be done on reasonable timeframe.

Aili: we should go straight for the 100%