



Policy Brief - SBSTTA 27 Panama City, 20-24 October

Views on Item 5 Biodiversity and Climate Change and
Item 6 on the expanded programme of work on forest biodiversity

Item 5 – Biodiversity and Climate Change

- We note that Section II (Enhancing policy coherence and cooperation across the Rio Conventions) of the Note by the Secretariat does not appear to reflect key points made in the submission by Greenpeace, Wild Heritage, Griffith University, and the Australian Rainforest Conservation Society in response to CBD notification SCBD/SSSF/JL/SS/TT/92042.

Consistent with Decision 16/22 from COP 16 in Cali, this submission emphasized the functional relationships between biodiversity and ecological integrity, and their importance in terms of maximizing both the quantity and quality of ecosystem services, including adaptation, mitigation and climate resilience. We feel that it is important that the synthesis of the submissions reflect these essential elements and that a stronger emphasis be placed on “protecting” ecosystem integrity rather than simply “conserving” to ensure alignment with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (Goal A, Targets 1,2), Decision 16/22.

- We also note Section IV (Recommendations) does not reflect key points from Decision 16/22, and as a result is weaker than the COP 16 decision text in important respects. Decision 16/22 recognized **“that biodiversity and ecosystem integrity play an important role in combatting climate change”** and also the **“the essential role of biodiversity in underpinning the integrity of ecosystems and ecosystem services.”** Crucially, Decision 16/22 also urged governments in para (3a) **“to identify and maximize potential synergies between biodiversity and climate actions”**. However, “ecosystem integrity” is not sufficiently reflected in the Recommendations, the role of biodiversity in underpinning ecosystem integrity and ecosystem services is not emphasized, and the call for maximizing synergies is reduced to national planning rather than included as an overarching multilateral objective. We would therefore recommend the following text in 6(a) of the Recommendations:

To identify and maximize potential synergies through protecting and restoring ecosystem integrity, including through national biodiversity strategies and action plans and relevant national targets, ensuring synergies with other national planning processes, including nationally determined contributions, national adaptation plans and land degradation neutrality targets, as appropriate, and promoting positive impacts and minimizing or avoiding negative impacts on biodiversity, in particular for vulnerable ecosystems and other ecosystems that are irreplaceable and for communities that directly depend on biodiversity;

- We also suggest that Paragraph 12 of the Recommendations be strengthened to include a call for a formal technical process between the Rio Conventions, such as a joint work program a technical experts group. We believe this would be necessary to inform how policy synergies and coherence can be enhanced within and between the Rio Conventions so that the most effective, efficient and mutually reinforcing solutions are implemented, and that climate and biodiversity synergies are maximized.

Item 6: Strategic review of and update to the expanded programme of work on forest biodiversity in the context of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

- We strongly support mention of primary forests in paragraph 14(b)(i) as a key area of focus that should be strengthened going forward and in the preambular text in the Recommendations. However, we feel that both here and in the Annex, the terms “protect” and “protection” should be used rather than “conserve” or “conservation”. As primary forests are irrecoverable by 2030 or 2050 (or even by 2100) if cleared or degraded, the strongest terminology with clear and unambiguous meaning is needed to ensure consistency with fast-approaching UN global goals to end deforestation and forest degradation by 2030, with Goal A and Targets 1 and 2 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (K-M GBF), and with Decision 16/22.
- We strongly support Recommendation 7(b) regarding liaising with the executive secretaries of the Rio Conventions.
- As with Item 5, we believe ecosystem integrity and maximizing synergies should have greater emphasis to ensure full alignment with the K-M GBF, Decision 16/22, and the UN Forest Goals.

*** Specific text suggestions are included in the Item 5 and 6 texts included below.***

Cyril Kormos (cyril@wild-heritage.org)

Virginia Young (viriniayoung9@gmail.com or v.young@griffith.edu.au)

Professor Brendan Mackey (b.mackey@griffith.edu.au)