

Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework
**Information document on the inclusion of a target on
Human-wildlife conflict in the framework**

7 July 2021

The Convention on Biological Diversity's 2050 Vision of *Living in harmony with nature* envisages a world in which environmental conflicts are much reduced and “*humanity lives in harmony with nature and in which wildlife and other living species are protected.*” This inherently entails giving a high priority to reducing conflicts that exist over natural resources, including wildlife, protected areas, access, use, and many other aspects of conservation.

Among these biodiversity conflicts, [human-wildlife conflict](#) (HWC) is a rapidly growing, serious and widespread concern for conservation and local sustainable livelihood initiatives and development more generally, worldwide. Human-wildlife conflict typically occurs when wildlife poses a direct or indirect and recurring threat to the livelihoods or safety of people, leading to the persecution of the wildlife. A great number of species are affected by HWC, from invertebrates to the largest mammals, and much media and political attention is drawn particularly to conflicts involving large, iconic wildlife species such as elephants, large cats, bears, crocodiles and sharks, which require large areas and often cannot survive only inside protected areas. To enable nature-friendly agriculture and ensure food security alongside biodiversity conservation, the international community must look closely at how communities can live sustainably alongside wildlife, and shift a greater focus onto developing ways to coexist with these and many other species outside of protected areas.

At a global scale, HWC is rapidly escalating to a point where it triggers deeper conflicts over conservation, social change and inequalities. We must have the foresight to anticipate emerging conflicts over biodiversity which risk undermining many of the excellent successes of conservation efforts so far. **It is essential therefore to include HWC explicitly in the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework text.**

Related to this, the [IUCN Resolution \(WCC 2020 Res 101\) on Addressing Human-Wildlife Conflict](#) calls on the global community to recognise HWC as a rapidly growing cause of wildlife declines and population disruptions in the freshwater, marine and terrestrial realms, as well as a threat to sustainable development, food security, public safety, the rights of wildlife to exist in the landscape, and biodiversity conservation.

Human-wildlife conflict is currently included in the Updated Zero Draft of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework ([CBD/POST2020/2/1](#)), which states:

Target 3. By 2030, ensure active management actions to enable wild species of fauna and flora recovery and conservation, and reduce human-wildlife conflict by [X%].

Here we outline our recommendations related to this target.

1) We recommend a change to the wording of this target:

We propose to **retain the target but improve its language** to reflect a more realistic goal. Assigning a percentage total reduction as the universal target for all parties may not be the most helpful way to enable countries to meet their target of reducing HWC. This is because HWC comprises impacts on wildlife, areas, local livelihoods, human well-being, and social inequalities. Summing all these effects, which will vary by region, into a single percentage would be both very difficult to calculate and too vague to be meaningful.

While certain impacts, such as losses of crops, livestock, loss of human life, killing of wildlife, and habitat alterations can be quantified, several other very important aspects of HWC (such as behaviour alterations, gradual species range changes, effects on human wellbeing and livelihoods, local economic multiplier effects, political effects, cultural influences) do not lend themselves to straightforward quantitative analysis. Many of these broader aspects can, however, be assessed qualitatively, and changes can be tracked and monitored.

The impacts of HWC vary greatly in severity, and while almost all countries struggle with the issue (indeed more than a third of all NBSAPs list HWC as a serious concern), some do so much more than others. Countries such as India, Kenya, Gabon, Sri Lanka, Brazil and many more face very high-pressure and high-profile HWC challenges, while some others do so much less.

We recommend the target should be for countries to *mitigate, manage and prevent* HWC effectively and sustainably, using a combination of quantitative and qualitative measures to demonstrate progress in reducing HWC. Such a combination of indicator tools is feasible and can be developed together with the parties.

We therefore suggest the target language be modified to:

Target 3. By 2030, ensure active management actions to enable wild species of fauna and flora recovery and conservation, and effective, quantifiable measures to reduce human-wildlife conflict have been implemented.

2) Indicators for the target are already in development

In reference to the [Co-chairs' text on item 3 Annex](#) of the Scientific and Technical Advice on Updated Goals and Targets, and Related Indicators and Baselines, of The Updated Zero Draft of The Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, which states:

(64) Target 3: It was identified that human-wildlife conflict, while important, is problematic given the lack of information to establish a baseline and to monitor progress. Because of these some suggested removing this issue from the proposed target while others suggested removing the quantitative element.

We would like to draw attention to current efforts underway to provide precisely such baseline and progress monitoring. Methods to measure and monitor HWC certainly do exist and have been carried

out by many researchers at local, community, regional and sub-national scales. The IUCN SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict Task Force together with the GEF-financed, World Bank-led Global Wildlife Program and several other organisations is working on developing a **Global Assessment of Human-Wildlife Conflict**, with the primary purpose of providing baseline and monitoring data for the Post 2020 GBF and towards the 16th Conference in 2030.

This was initially proposed at the First meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group in Nairobi, 27-30 August 2019, and is detailed in Annex 4 of the [Workshop Proceedings: Sustainable Wildlife Management Beyond 2020 – Report Of The Consultative Workshop, 25-26 June 2019](#) and the following outline indicators were suggested.

Updated 2030 Targets	A. Components of the 2030 targets	B. Monitoring Elements	C. Indicators	D. Period of availability of baseline data and frequency of updates
Target 3 By 2030, ensure active management actions to enable wild species of fauna and flora recovery and conservation, and reduce human-wildlife conflict by 30%	T3.2. Reduced human-wildlife conflicts and increased, sustainable coexistence	Trends in human-wildlife conflicts, including: a) Species and conservation areas b) People and communities c) Economic impacts d) Capacity & knowledge e) Policy & resources	a) Proportion of species populations that are affected by HWC b) Number of people affected by HWC in various ways c) Economic and livelihood costs of HWC d) Capacity of communities, governments, NGOs & other actors to manage HWC e) Policies & strategies at national levels, and resources for HWC management & prevention	Baseline: 2020-2021 Global Assessment of HWC M&E Updates: Global HWC monitoring & learning framework and sub-studies reports 2022-2028 Follow-up: 2029-2030 Global Assessment of HWC

Target 3 monitoring for HWC component, as recommended by the IUCN SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict Task Force in 2019

3) Addressing human-wildlife conflict facilitates the enabling conditions of the framework

The [IUCN SSC Position Statement on the Management of Human–Wildlife Conflict](#) “urges governments, non-governmental organizations, researchers, practitioners, community leaders, environmental agencies, and others to ensure that efforts to manage human–wildlife conflicts are pursued through well-informed, holistic, and collaborative processes that take into account underlying social, cultural and economic contexts”.

Central to the effective mitigation and prevention of HWC are the **Enabling Conditions** required for the implementation of the framework, which contribute to the attainment of other societal conditions, as outlined in Paragraph 14 of Section G (page 7) of the Update of the Zero Draft of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Note by the Co-Chairs ([CBD/POST2020/PREP/2/1](#)). **Best practice in HWC management not only requires but also enables and facilitates** all of the conditions listed in Paragraph 14:

- (a) The participation of indigenous peoples and local communities and a recognition of their rights in the implementation of the framework;
- (b) The participation of all relevant stakeholders, non-governmental organizations, youth, civil society, local and subnational authorities, the private sector, academia and scientific institutions through a whole-of-society approach and through inclusive and representative multi-stakeholder and multisectoral platforms;
- (c) Gender equality, gender-responsive approaches and empowerment of women and girls;
- (d) Recognition of intergenerational equity, including the transmission of knowledge, language and cultural values associated with biodiversity, especially by IPLCs;
- (e) Synergies among relevant multilateral environmental agreements and other relevant international processes, including the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and instruments at the global, regional and national levels, including the strengthening or establishment of cooperation mechanisms;
- (f) Partnerships to leverage sustainable activities and programmes at local, national, regional and global levels;
- (g) Inclusive and integrative governance and whole-of-government approaches to ensure policy coherence and effectiveness for the implementation the framework;
- (h) Mainstreaming biodiversity in all sectors;
- (i) The engagement of private sector, academic institutions and civil societies;
- (j) Safety and security in use of biodiversity to prevent spillover of zoonotic diseases, spread of invasive alien species and illegal trade in wildlife;
- (k) Political will and recognition at the highest levels of government of the urgent need to halt biodiversity loss;
- (l) The active involvement of subnational governments, cities and other local authorities and a recognition of their competence and specific roles for the implementation of the framework;
- (m) Consider and recognize, where appropriate, the rights of nature

4) Technical advisory support is available to parties

Governments, non-governmental organizations, communities, companies, research institutions and individuals around the world are working to understand and address human-wildlife conflicts more efficiently and sustainably. The [IUCN SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict Task Force](#) is an interdisciplinary global advisory group that support organisations, governments and professionals working to resolve conflicts in biodiversity conservation. It was created to foster links between policy, science, and communities, and assimilate knowledge and capacity for HWC management.

The Task Force is available to assist with technical support to all parties and able to advise on the operationalization of a monitoring framework for the HWC component of Target 3 as part of a technical expert group, in accordance with Paragraph 11 of the Draft Recommendations submitted by the Chair regarding the [Scientific and Technical Information to Support the Review of the Updated Goals and Targets, and Related Indicators and Baselines](#) (26 May 2021).

Managing human–wildlife conflict and coexistence is a field of continuous learning that requires collaborative processes tailored to social and cultural contexts. To this end the IUCN SSC Human–Wildlife Conflict Task Force is currently in the final stages of preparing comprehensive practical guidance to assist practitioners, researchers, communities, and decision-makers in navigating human–wildlife interactions. The [IUCN Guidelines on the Management of Human-Wildlife Conflict](#) which provide comprehensive practical advice, is expected to be piloted in late 2021 with governments, conservation organisations, communities, and projects around the globe.



Citation: IUCN SSC HWCTF (2021). *Information document on the inclusion of a target on Human-wildlife conflict in the framework*. IUCN Species Survival Commission (SSC) Human-Wildlife Conflict Task Force. Available at: www.hwctf.org/policies

About the IUCN SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict Task Force

The [IUCN SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict Task Force](#) is an interdisciplinary global advisory group that support organisations, governments and professionals working to resolve conflicts in biodiversity conservation. It was created to foster links between policy, science, and communities, and assimilating knowledge and capacity for this human-wildlife conflict management.

The Task Force is working to help enable the following outcomes:

1. **increase understanding** and awareness of the complexities of conflict
2. **facilitate more collaboration** between practitioners and policy, science and community
3. **catalyse more resources** and effort committed to good human-wildlife conflict management
4. **encourage preventive mitigation** of emerging human-wildlife conflicts
5. **integrate effective policies** into global biodiversity and development agendas

Key resources:

[IUCN Human-Wildlife Conflict Resource Library](#)

[IUCN SSC Position Statement on the Management of Human-Wildlife Conflict](#)

[IUCN SSC Guidelines on the Management of Human-Wildlife Conflict](#)

[International Conference on Human-Wildlife Conflict and Coexistence](#)

For further information please contact:

Dr Alexandra Zimmermann, alex.zimmermann@ssc.iucn.org

Chair, IUCN SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict Task Force

Dr James Stevens, info@hwctf.org

Programme Officer, IUCN SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict Task Force

www.hwctf.org