

---

## THE ELEPHANT PROTECTION INITIATIVE FOUNDATION RESPONSE TO THE UPDATED FIRST DRAFT OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

### ABOUT THE FOUNDATION

The Elephant Protection Initiative (EPI) was launched in 2014 by the leaders of 5 countries: Gabon, Chad, Tanzania, Botswana, and Ethiopia. Since then, it has grown to 21 member countries, across Francophone, Lusophone, and Anglophone Africa. The EPI aims to secure the harmonious coexistence of people and elephants with herds able to travel across their range. The EPI is supported by a small but effective Secretariat, the [EPI Foundation](#).

#### **For general inquiries, please contact:**

Andrew Crichton (acrichton@elephantprotectioninitiative.org)  
Head of Operations, EPI Foundation

#### **For specific inquiries regarding this document, please contact:**

John Scanlon AO (jscanlon@elephantprotectioninitiative.org)  
CEO, EPI Foundation

The EPI Foundation welcomes the publication of the First Draft of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework ([CBD/WG2020/3/3](#)) ('the First Draft') and congratulates the Co-Chairs of the Open Ended Working Group, its members and the Executive Secretary on their work to date.

The EPI Foundation supports the 2050 Vision and Goals, and the 2030 Mission and Milestones, outlined in the First Draft, and welcomes the inclusion of important 2030 Action Targets in the draft framework, such as the effective protection and restoration of key habitats for biodiversity conservation, the significant reduction of pollution, and an increased contribution to climate change mitigation and adaptation.

The EPI Foundation notes that the content of the First Draft was crafted before the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic. This devastating pandemic has fundamentally altered the way the world perceives a number of key wildlife-related issues, and in particular the threat to human health posed by certain wildlife trade, markets and consumption, be it legal, illegal or unregulated.

The EPI is an African-led response to the elephant crisis and the EPI Foundation's '[Vision 2030](#)' is designed to recognise and address the challenges African nations face as a result of wildlife and people coming into increasingly close proximity as a result of Africa's growing human populations and economic development. It has a particular focus on human-elephant conflict, which we believe is now a major threat to elephant conservation. However, we remain committed to supporting the international moratorium on elephant ivory trade and preventing Africa's ivory stockpiles from leaking onto the illegal market. In this regard, the EPI Foundation is lending its support to the submission made by the Global Initiative to End Wildlife Crime (EWC) on the First Draft. The EPI Foundation is an EWC International Champion.



We also support our 21 member countries to develop National Elephant Action Plans (NEAPs), aligned to the eight generic objectives of the African Elephant Action Plan (AEAP), which was agreed by all African elephant range states in 2010. NEAPs include priority actions, monetary requirements and monitoring and evaluation plans for countries to protect their elephants and benefit people who live alongside them.

Issues of human-elephant conflict, and human-wildlife conflict more generally, have been brought to public attention by the migration of a herd of 15 wild elephants in China, which made their way close to the venue for CBD CoP15, the City of Kunming, which was highlighted during the first stage of the CoP15 held in October 2021. The EPI Foundation has been working closely with colleagues and counterparts in China, offering them the benefit of its experience in managing human-elephant conflict on the African continent.

The EPI Foundation welcomes the reference to human-wildlife conflict in Target 4, but considers that the text of the Target should be further improved.

## OUR RECOMMENDATIONS

### E. 2030 Action Targets:

EPI Foundation **supports** the reference to human-wildlife conflict in Target 4 and encourages Parties to retain the reference in the final document, with minor changes.

Target 4. *“Ensure active management actions to enable the recovery and conservation of species and the genetic diversity of wild and domesticated species, including through ex situ conservation, and effectively manage human-wildlife interactions to avoid or reduce human-wildlife conflict **to facilitate coexistence of people and wild animals**”.*

EPI Foundation **supports** the reference to spatial planning in Target 1, which is critically important to avoiding (or preventing) future human-wildlife conflict and encourages Parties to retain the reference in the final document, with minor changes.

Target 1. *“Ensure that all land and sea areas globally are under integrated biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning, addressing land- and sea-use change, **placing emphasis on retaining existing intact and wilderness areas**.”*

EPI Foundation **aligns itself** with the proposed changes made by the EWC to Target 5, namely for Target 5 to be amended to read:

**Target 5:** *“Ensure that the exploitation, trade and use of wild species is ecologically sustainable, legal, and safe for human ~~health~~ **and animal health, and take measures to combat and prevent illicit wildlife trafficking**.”*

### Proposed indicators for measuring Target 4:

The ‘Proposed Headline Indicators of the Monitoring Framework for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework’ ([CBD/WG2020/3/3/Add.1](#)) include a headline indicator for Target 4 as the “proportion of species populations that are affected by human-wildlife conflict.” As yet, we are not



aware of any draft component or complementary indicators. This headline indicator is too generic and difficult to measure. Some other possibilities include:

‘The proportion of key populations of potentially destructive and dangerous species that are affected by human-wildlife conflict’ or ‘The proportion of people affected by human-wildlife conflict’ or ‘The proportion of intact wilderness areas under biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning’.

Indicators should reference the use of effective mitigation measures, as well as strategic and long-term spatial planning instruments applied to reduce and/or prevent human-wildlife conflict, facilitate coexistence of people and wildlife, and address climate change.

There should be indicators on trends in the adoption of national policies, laws and regulations, and their implementation, as well as measuring the status of all species of wild animals, terrestrial and marine, and the trend in the number of people affected by human-wildlife conflict.

The EPI Foundation will contribute towards the work of the IUCN Human-wildlife Conflict Specialist Group in formulating an appropriate set of indicators.

## **G. Enabling Conditions**

Addressing human-wildlife conflict will require additional financial resources from all international and domestic sources, as is captured in Target 19. The EPI Foundation recommends that enabling conditions also include the effective deployment of land use and strategic planning tools to help solve, mitigate, or prevent human-wildlife conflict, and to increase resilience of species and systems under accelerating climate change, and although such tools are often the responsibility of sub-national governments, they must be strictly aligned to national level spatial and strategic plans.

The EPI Foundation also notes the absence of references to appropriate legal frameworks under Enabling Conditions, which should be rectified.

### **We recommend that Paragraph 14 be amended as follows to include:**

**14. “The implementation of the global biodiversity framework requires integrative governance and whole-of-government approaches to ensure *law and policy coherence and effectiveness, political will and recognition at the highest levels of government, including through appropriate legal frameworks and the effective deployment of land use and strategic planning tools, harmonized at all levels of government.*”**

The active involvement of all governments, including subnational governments, cities and other local authorities, and a recognition of their competence and specific roles for the implementation of the framework, and more specifically the use of spatial and infrastructural planning to maintain and/or create large areas of contiguous habitat for wildlife species that require vast areas to survive in the long term, taking into account the impacts of accelerating climate change. Such planning should limit further fragmentation and minimize the human-wildlife interface, preventing, reducing, or mitigating human-wildlife conflict, while contributing to climate change reduction.