

Position Paper ver.2 "By 2020, eliminate the loss of biodiversity to zero!"
Biodiversity on the Brink September 4, 2010

【Summary】

This paper expresses the position and opinions concerning the New Strategic Plan (Post-2010 Target) for the 10th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (henceforth, COP10).

It is our opinion that the Japanese government should propose to:

-

Establish a short-term goal seeking "By 2020, eliminate the loss of biodiversity to zero"

Establish specific targets, such as numerical figures, for individual benchmarks (Targets 5, 6, 10, 11) within Post-2010 Targets

Our existence and lives majorly depend on the ecosystem services which are blessing achieved from biodiversity. Additionally, the accumulated intelligence created by the massive adaptive strategy as a result of 4 billion years of evolution of species, has the possibility of contributing to the sustainability of us, the human race. On the other hand, during recent years along with the activation of human activities, the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of the ecosystem services have become remarkable. 40,000 species are estimated to become extinct every year, and the rate of human-induced extinction of species has accelerated to a maximum of 1000 times compared to the natural state.

At the present day it is applied to be the 6th mass extinction period since the birth of life, but it is induced by a certain species (human). Additionally it was reported that within the past 50 years, 60% of the ecosystem services of the world have degraded. Moreover in the future, the loss of vital biodiversity is anticipated. For example, there is a high possibility that about 20~30% of the plant and animal species that have been accounted will become extinct and the wipe out of coral reefs in wide ranges is predicted.

In order to handle the increasing issue of the loss of biodiversity, the Convention on Biological Diversity was ratified at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (1992). Subsequently, at the 6th Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, the "2010

Target" was decided upon to achieve the Convention's goals. However only stating "to achieve a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss", it did not include any numerical goals and was ambiguous. According to the GBO3 that was presented on May the 10th 2010, the achievement of the "2010 Target" had all failed and most of the indexes are getting worse. The "2010 Target" was not able to put a stop to the loss of biodiversity.

At COP10 which is going to be held in October 2010 in Nagoya, a review of the 2010 Target and a new target for after the year of 2010, the "Post-2010 Target" is going to be decided upon as a new strategic plan. The dangers of which irreversible changes and regime shifts in the ecosystem result in ecosystem services being lost in a stroke, are increasing on a daily basis. The significance of effective target setting and its secure achievement is increasing.

Concerning the discussions at COP10 and the approaches after COP10, a failure such as the "2010 Targets" because of its ambiguous target setting cannot be permitted to be repeated again. Nevertheless, the contents of "Post-2010 Target" that is currently being discussed are not enough to put a halt to the loss of biodiversity. If this goes on, the future of us youth who is going to carry on living in the ages to come is at stake.

A healthy biodiversity is requisite for our existence. Furthermore the loss of biodiversity that is being debated now is not something that is going vaguely effect us in the far future, but is an urgent issue that determines our own lives for tomorrow. The "Post-2010 Target" should be something that includes numerical figures with no ambiguity, indicate concrete actions and sets a definite time frame.

We "The Brink of Biodiversity Campaign Planning Committee" aspire the "Post-2010 Target" be a target that is valid and definitive for the conservation of biodiversity and our own futures, and propose that the target be established "by 2020, eliminate the loss of biodiversity to zero".

| |
|---|
| *Short-term target: Mission |
| *Present Proposal |
| [Take effective and urgent action [to halt][towards halting] the loss of biodiversity [by 2020*[provided a fifty-fold increase in funding is made available, in accordance with the principle of 'common but differentiated responsibility and article 20 of the Convention]] in order to contribute to |

human well-being, and poverty eradication, and to secure the planet's variety of life, and [by 2020] to have reduced the pressures on biodiversity, avoided tipping points, used biological resources sustainably, restored ecosystems and sustain ecosystem services, shared the benefits of biodiversity equitably, and mainstreamed biodiversity issues, and to have ensured that all Parties have the means to do so.]

*Youth Proposal in the same format as the Present Proposal

Take effective and urgent action to halt the loss of biodiversity by 2020. This is meant to provide for an increase in funding is made available, in accordance with the Rio Principle and article 20 of the Convention. To contribute to human well-being, and poverty eradication, and to secure the planet's variety of life by 2020 and to have reduced the pressures on biodiversity, avoided tipping points, used biological resources sustainably, restored ecosystems and sustain ecosystem services, shared the benefits of biodiversity equitably, and mainstreamed biodiversity issues, and to have ensured that all Parties have the means to do so.

*Point of Argument

We support option 1 with a specific time frame "by 2020" As for the increase in funding, a fifty-fold is not realistic and does not have a numerical basis, so concerning this point we support the option of not clarifying the numeric values. In addition, we support the sentence 'and to have ensured that all Parties have the means to do so.' Because no action can be taken towards halting the loss of biological diversity by 2020 until this is enforced.

In order to achieve the short-term goal (Mission), we argue that the four points below should be built in into the Post-2010 Targets. Below enumerate the present proposal for the Post-2010 Target and we the youth's argument and request, also their differences.

*The Target for the present proposal is a translation by the Ministry of Environment of Japan. Refer to UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4 for the latest edition in English.

Four individual targets that are thought of to be especially important in order to achieve the short-term goal (Mission)

| |
|--|
| *Target 5: To decrease the rate of loss of natural habitats including forest. |
| *Present Proposal |
| By 2020, the rate of loss and degradation, and fragmentation, of natural habitats, [including forests], is [at least halved][brought close to zero]. |
| *Youth Proposal |
| By 2020, the rate of loss and degradation and fragmentation of natural habitats, including forests is brought close to zero. |
| *Point of Argument |
| Forests include more than half of the continental area's fauna and flora, therefore they are significantly important upon conserving natural habitats. Thus, there is the need to emphasize forests within the mission statement. In addition in order to accomplish other targets (such as Target 12), it is necessary to ratify the phrase "brought close to zero. For example, in Target 12 it is stated, "the extinction and decline of known threatened species has been prevented", however species and natural habitats have a fixed correlation, so if the loss and degradation of natural habitats is not halted, the extinction and decline of known threatened species cannot be prevented. |
| *Target 6: Overfishing is ended/All fisheries are managed sustainably |
| *Present Proposal |
| [By 2020, overfishing is ended, destructive fishing practices are eliminated, and all fisheries are managed sustainably.] or [By 2020, all exploited fish stocks and other living marine and aquatic resources are harvested sustainably [and restored], and the impact of fisheries on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems are within safe ecological limits] |
| *Youth Proposal(Ideal Proposal) |
| By 2020, overfishing is ended, destructive fishing practices are eliminated. All marine and aquatic resources are harvested sustainably and become convalescent. |
| *Youth Proposal (In the same format as the Present Proposal) |
| By 2020, overfishing is ended, destructive fishing practices are eliminated, and all fisheries are managed sustainably. |
| *Point of Argument |
| A precise target that is action oriented and treats the direct cause needs to be ratified. |

| |
|---|
| *Target 10: To minimize the pressures by climate change or other adverse effects |
| *Present Proposal |
| By [2020][2015], to have minimized the multiple pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning. |
| *Youth Proposal |
| By, 2015 to have minimized the multiple pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning. (Points of concern: To not conduct any climate change policies that have the possibility of impacting adverse effects on biodiversity until sufficient scientific evidence is established.) |
| *Point of Argument |
| The numerical goals for time frame upon accomplishment has to be more contingent, and desired to be in the same format as the target setting of the emission limitation of CO2 in UNFCC(United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change). Also easing and adaptation measures(REDD+, geo-engineering) for climate change that have been pointed out to impact adverse effects on biodiversity need to be treated with care hereafter. |
| *Target 11: To conserve biodiversity through protected areas. |
| *Present Proposal |
| By 2020, at least [15%][20%] of terrestrial, inland- water and [X%] of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through comprehensive, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of effectively managed protected areas and other means, and integrated into the wider land- and seascape. |
| *Youth Proposal |
| By 2020, at least 20% of terrestrial, in-land water areas also 15% of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through comprehensive, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of effectively managed protected |

areas and other means, and integrated into the wider land- and seascape.

*Point of Argument

Currently despite the fact that the area of protected terrestrial areas is 13%, many important areas are outside of protected areas, and those areas need to be covered. As for coastal and marine areas, there is the need to accelerate the rate of appointment of protected areas by international political decisions, so we chose 15% that has the highest numerical values in the proposal being discussed. In addition the securing the condition of the protected areas (effective management, representation, comprehensiveness, and well-connectedness) needs to be emphasized.

¹ Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Board(2005), Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Global Assessment Reports .
<http://www.millenniumassessment.org/en/Condition.aspx>

¹ 日本学術会議 (2010) 『生物多様性の保全と持続可能な利用 ～学術分野からの提言～』 ,

<http://www.scj.go.jp/ja/info/kohyo/pdf/kohyo-21-t90-1.pdf>

¹ 鷲谷いづみ・矢原徹一 (1996) , 『保全生態学入門』 文一総合出版

¹ i)

¹ 『朝日新聞』2010年4月20日(日刊)23面「今6回目の危機か かつてない速度」(鷲谷いづみ)

¹ i)

¹ IPCC 第2作業部会(2007), 『IPCC 第4次評価報告書第2作業部会報告書政策決定者向け要約(環境省各締訳)』 ,http://www.env.go.jp/earth/ipcc/4th/wg2_spm.pdf

¹ ibid

¹ Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity(2010), *Global Biodiversity Outlook 3*,2010.

¹ □)

¹ 『新戦略計画ポスト2010年目標 環境省仮訳』

http://www.env.go.jp/press/file_view.php?serial=15782&hou_id=12568

¹ CBD (2010), UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4, Official Document, 6 June, 2010.

<http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=cop-10>