



**Friends of
the Earth
Europe**



Biodiversity: under-funded and under threat

Assessment of progress towards international Aichi targets to halt biodiversity loss by 2020

Prepared by Friedrich Wulf, Agnes Zolyomi and Eduard Nedelciu | October 2013

Friends of the Earth Europe gratefully acknowledges financial assistance from all its donors. Detailed information about Friends of the Earth Europe's funding can be found at: www.foeeurope.org/about/english.htm The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of Friends of the Earth Europe and cannot be regarded as reflecting the position of the funders mentioned above. The funders cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information this document contains.

Biodiversity: under-funded and under threat

Introduction

Three years on from international agreements to halt biodiversity loss, European biodiversity remains under threat. This document, drawing on the table in annex 1 (p.5), assesses progress towards halting global biodiversity loss, and towards achieving international [‘Aichi’ biodiversity targets](#).

Aichi target progress assessment

Aichi target 1 – Awareness-raising

- All EU countries are working on awareness-raising, but there is no coherent strategy, or it is still not implemented. Only one of the assessed non-EU countries (Albania) has an awareness-raising strategy for biodiversity.
- Awareness that domestic biodiversity loss is a serious problem is high in most countries (50%-87%), but low in Switzerland and Albania (ca. 20%).
- Conclusion: the target’s implementation needs more progress. In policy terms Switzerland, Norway, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and Ukraine, and in Albania in terms of practical implementation.

Aichi target 3 – Abolition of subsidies harmful to biodiversity

- There are some initial studies to identify subsidies detrimental to biodiversity, but they are often too general or the definition of subsidies is too narrow. Perverse subsidies are not phased out in any of the analysed countries. This is disappointing given the importance and agreement this has received at the COP for improving the funding situation and it certainly is the target which needs the most attention.

Aichi target 5 - Habitats

- In general, the majority of protected habitats (i.e. those listed in the annexes of the Berne Convention and the EU Habitats Directive) are in unfavourable conservation status (56%-100%). But there are differences: in some countries such as Slovenia and Estonia, almost half of the Natura 2000 habitats are estimated to be in favourable conservation status (FCS). Germany and Latvia, with around 1/3 of habitats in FCS, are also doing comparatively well. On the other hand, Hungary, Czech Republic and UK only have around 12% of habitats in FCS. There is little if any information on the conservation status for non-EU countries – only Bosnia submitted precise data (1% of habitats in FCS).
- Conclusion: more efforts are needed to stop the loss of habitats and achieve FCS for all these habitats.

Aichi target 7 – Sustainable use

- Organic farming contributes to biodiversity, is globally widespread and has agreed standards –contributing to sustainable use of agricultural land. While in some countries such as Estonia, Switzerland and the Czech Republic, more than 10% of their arable land is organically farmed, certified organic farming has not yet arrived in South-East Europe. On the other hand, there is still a lot of traditional agriculture in this region, which also contributes to biodiversity conservation. Therefore, more suitable indicators are needed for better analysis of agricultural sustainability.
- The European forestry sectors are also falling behind, with only Estonia maintaining a healthy level of undisturbed forests, almost half of the nation's forest. Undisturbed forests are essential to the existence of sensitive animals such as the Capercaillie or species that live from big trees and dead wood, such as woodpeckers, bats, beetles and fungi.

Aichi target 11 - Protected Area networks

- All European countries have committed to contributing to the Pan-European network of protected areas under the EU Habitats Directive or the Berne Convention (Emerald network). Due to a clear mandatory approach and a clear governance structure from the EU (Commission/EU Court of Justice), the EU has almost completed its network. By contrast, the non-EU countries have not yet completed Emerald designation with the exception of Switzerland, which has designated 37 sites, representing the whole existing network. However, there is an agreed calendar with various stepping stones so the network can be regarded as complete in 2020.
Most countries are also in the process of establishing management plans for their networks, and the UK has even finalised them for all protected areas. Funding for Protected Areas is insufficient everywhere. Unfortunately, the target to connect sufficiently these areas has not been completely reached anywhere.

Aichi target 16 - Access and benefit sharing (ABS)

- Norway is the first industrialised country to ratify the Nagoya Protocol (August 2013). Switzerland is set to follow by end of 2013 as well; EU member states will ratify once the EU has agreed to a community regulation, which is expected in 2014. A lot depends on the quality of the EU regulation which may fall short of the Protocol, reflecting the position the EU had before signing. This concerns issues such as the trigger for a mutual agreement (utilisation instead of only access).

Aichi target 17 – National biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAP) that reflect the CBD Strategic plan

- All but three countries have NBSAPs which fully reflect the CBD Strategic plan. Exceptions are Norway and Bosnia and Herzegovina, which still have to update their old NBSAPs. Germany also has not updated its NBSAP since 2007 but it is very clear and detailed, and it is putting a lot of efforts into its implementation. In fact, the German NBSAP has been a model for other countries.
But generally, implementation of the NBSAPs still leaves a lot to be desired.

Aichi target 20 - Finance / Resource mobilisation

- While some countries have produced a spending assessment for biodiversity, these are often different in methodology and it is difficult to compare them. For most countries, there is no data available on how biodiversity spending relates to GDP per capita; where we have numbers, it is well below 0.1%, with only Norway (0.4%) and Switzerland (0.2%) spending more. Given the importance of stopping biodiversity loss, these small numbers are very worrying; NGOs expect 1% of GDP to be pledged to fight biodiversity loss.

Conclusion

Friends of the Earth Europe's and CEEWeb's study on progress in 18 European Countries (see overview table in annex 1, p.5) shows the following key findings:

Funding for biodiversity has stagnated, and Friends of the Earth Europe are calling on states to double spending by 2015, as agreed at the international biodiversity talks in Hyderabad last year.

Harmful subsidies continue to devastate biodiversity across Europe, despite international agreement that they should be phased-out, or redirected into biodiversity-supportive subsidies.

The European forestry sectors are also falling behind, with only Estonia maintaining a healthy level of undisturbed forests, almost half of the nation's forest. Undisturbed forests are essential to the existence of sensitive animals such as the Capercaillie or species that live from big trees and dead wood, such as woodpeckers, bats, beetles and fungi.

Habitats and protected areas crucial for maintaining biodiversity are also under pressure, with the majority across Europe in unfavourable conditions. Funding crucial to the management and protection of these sites is lacking in all states, despite established networks like Natura 2000 and the Emerald network.

Friends of the Earth Europe is calling on states to scale-up funding and action on biodiversity – to salvage hopes of meeting 2020 biodiversity targets, and halting biodiversity loss.

More and updated information is available at www.foeeurope.org/biodiversity and www.ceeweb.org/

Friedrich Wulf, Friends of the Earth Europe, Friedrich.Wulf@pronatura.ch
Agnes Zolyomi, CEEweb for biodiversity, zolyomi@ceeweb.org

Annex 1

Target/indicator(s) ↓	D	CH	UK	N	HU	BG	CZ	EE	LV	LT	PL	RO	SK	SLO	BIH	RS	UA	AL	
Country (Red=EU, Blue: non-EU) →	Red	Blue	Blue	Blue	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Blue	
Target 1 (Awareness of the values of biodiversity) An Awareness raising strategy for Biodiversity values exists People who say domestic biodiversity loss is a serious problem (%)	partly 87	no 20	partly 79	no n.a.	partly 86	partly 87	partly 74	partly 83	partly 72	partly 83	partly 80	partly 89	partly 74	partly 78	no 40%*	no 50%**	no >60%	no 25%*	
Target 3 (Elimination and redirection of Subsidies harmful for biodiversity) Perverse subsidies are identified Perverse subsidiease are phased out	partly no	partly no	yes no	partly no	no no	no no	no no	no no	no no	no no	no no	no no	no no	no no	no no	no no	n.a. n.a.	partly partly	
Target 5 (Habitat loss is halved or (where feasible) - stopped) Habitat types of community interest in good status (%) Fragmentation (Number of meches per 1 000 km ²)	34 42	n.a. 13	12 4	n.a. 0.4	11 9	n.a. 4	12 23	42 9	33 9	20 13	21 17	n.a. 0.6	29 5	44 10	14% medium	n.a. n.a.	n.a. n.a.	n.a. n.a.	
Target 7 (All Areas under agriculture, forestry, fishery used sustainably) Area Organically farmed (% of total agricultural area) Deadwood (m ³ /ha of Forest) Forest undisturbed by man (%of total Forest area)	5.93% 15 0%	11.37% 21 3.05%	4.24% 4 0%	5.53% n.a. 1.38%	3.02% 7.16 n.a.	0.80% n.a. 8.60%	10.50% 11.8 0%	12.50% 11.7 45.40%	9.40% 16.2 0%	5.40% 23 0%	3.40% 5.5 0%	1.30% n.a. 4.50%	9.00% 40.6 1.20%	6.80% 19 9%	0% 20 0%	0.72% 11 0%	0.80% 27 0%	0% 0.48 10.80%	
Target 11 (17% of land designated as protected areas, representative, well-managed) Natura 2000/Emerald site designation process completed Management plans exist for all these areas Funding is sufficient for adequate protected area management There is a network of corridors to link these protected areas together	yes partly no partly	partly no no partly	partly yes no partly	no partly no no	yes partly no partly	partly partly no partly	yes partly no partly	yes partly no partly	yes partly no partly	yes partly no partly	yes partly no partly	yes partly no partly	yes partly no partly	yes partly no partly	yes partly no partly	yes partly no partly	yes partly no partly	yes partly no partly	
Target 16 (Biopiracy is abolished, sharing of benefits from the use of genetic resources is clearly regulated) The Nagoya Protocol is signed by the state The Nagoya Protocol is ratified by the state	yes no	yes partly	yes no	yes yes	yes no	yes no	yes no	yes no	yes no	yes no	yes no	yes no	yes no	yes no	yes no	yes no	yes no	yes no	
Target 17 (Every country has an updated National Biodiversity Strategy) The National Biodiversity Strategy reflects the Aichi targets The National Biodiversity Strategy is being implemented	partly yes	yes partly	yes yes	no no	yes partly	yes partly	yes partly	yes partly	yes partly	yes partly	yes partly	yes partly	yes partly	yes partly	yes partly	yes partly	yes partly	yes partly	
Target 20 (Substantial Increase of Money available for Implementation of Strategic plan) An assessment of how much money is spent for Biodiversity exists % of GDP spent for Biodiversity	partly > 0.026%	yes 0.20%	yes 0.03%	yes 0.40%	partly n.a.	partly >0.03%	yes >0.03%	no n.a.	partly n.a.	partly n.a.	partly n.a.	no n.a.	partly n.a.	partly n.a.	partly n.a.	partly n.a.	partly n.a.	no 0.03%*	no n.a.

*estimation from the MoE
** estimation of CEEweb member
Colours are selected to show differences in implementation; green: good (absolutely or by comparison), red: bad, yellow: intermediate



**Friends of
the Earth
Europe**

Friends of the Earth Europe

Member Groups

Austria	Global 2000
Belgium (Wallonia & Brussels)	Les Amis de la Terre
Belgium (Flanders & Brussels)	Friends of the Earth
Bulgaria	Za Zemiata
Croatia	Zelena Akcija
Cyprus	Friends of the Earth
Czech Republic	Hnutí Duha
Denmark	NOAH
England, Wales & Northern Ireland	Friends of the Earth
Estonia	Eesti Roheline Liikumine
Finland	Maan Ystävät Ry
France	Les Amis de la Terre
Georgia	Sakhartvelos Mtsvaneta Modzraoba
Germany	Bund für Umwelt und Naturschutz Deutschland (BUND)
Hungary	Magyar Természetvédők Szövetsége
Ireland	Friends of the Earth
Italy	Amici della Terra
Latvia	Latvijas Zemes Draugi
Lithuania	Lietuvos Zaliuju Judėjimas
Luxembourg	Mouvement Ecologique
Macedonia	Dvizhenje na Ekologistite na Makedonija
Malta	Friends of the Earth Malta
The Netherlands	Milieudefensie
Norway	Norges Naturvernforbund
Poland	Polski Klub Ekologiczny
Scotland	Friends of the Earth Scotland
Slovakia	Priatel'ia Zeme
Spain	Amigos de la Tierra
Sweden	Jordens Vänner
Switzerland	Pro Natura
Ukraine	Zelenyi Svit

Friends of the Earth Europe campaigns for sustainable and just societies and for the protection of the environment, unites more than 30 national organisations with thousands of local groups and is part of the world's largest grassroots environmental network, Friends of the Earth International.