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| **Summary statement –**  CBD Goal B addresses all of nature’s contributions to people. One of nature’s contributions to people, “maintenance of options” (NCP18) importantly includes “biodiversity option value”. This contribution is valued by society *now* because biodiversity-as-variety maintains possible *future* uses and benefits. This ethical concern for future generations provides a critical link between the CBD vision/goals and a core requirement for sustainable development. A key aspect of biodiversity, phylogenetic diversity, has been recognised by IPBES and others as capturing biodiversity option value, and CBD adoption of an existing indicator (expected loss of phylogenetic diversity) will be critical for assessing progress on these CBD/SDG goals.  **Details –**  My comments on the “Linkages between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and 2030 agenda for sustainable development” primarily relate to the identified issues in section IV concerning “A. Positioning people in the Global Biodiversity Framework” and “B. Intergenerational and Intragenerational equity”.  The need for “positioning people in the Global Biodiversity Framework” is well-served by recognising that a core value of biodiversity-as-variety is its maintenance of options for future generations. CBD Goal B says “Nature’s Contributions to People have been valued, maintained or enhanced through conservation”. Here, “biodiversity values” are to include “diverse considerations from economic, cultural, social and intrinsic perspectives” (see CBD/SBSTTA/24/INF/11). My submitted comments on the monitoring framework (see copy at <https://danielpfaith.wordpress.com/more-on-biodiversity/review-comments-on-the-draft-monitoring-framework-for-the-post-2020-global-biodiversity-framework/>) highlighted an existing phylogenetic diversity indicator (see also the submission at <https://www.cbd.int/api/v2013/documents/6445B22E-1BA7-18B7-6D28-61A95052E841/attachments/IUCN-6.docx> by the IUCN SSC Phylogenetic Diversity Task Force, in response to CBD notification 2019-108) addressing one of Nature’s Contributions to People, “maintenance of options” (“NCP18”). NCP18 includes biodiversity “option value” (“the value of maintaining living variation in order to provide possible future uses and benefits”; IPBES Conceptual Framework, Díaz et al. 2015).  This important option value of biodiversity establishes a strong link between CBD goals and SDGs. The early discussions of the value of biotic diversity, in the writings of Myers and others [**\*background]**, influenced the Brundtland Report, the landmark United Nations report on sustainable development (WCED 1987). This report contains the much-quoted definition: “Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”.  This is followed in the Report by a key requirement:  *“The loss of plant and animal species can greatly limit the* ***options of future generations****; so sustainable development requires the conservation of plant and animal species.”*  Thus, the commitment by the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to Goal B regarding consideration of all NCP, and the adoption of the existing phylogenetic diversity indicator for NCP18, would serve this core requirement for sustainable development.  An IPBES publication (Diaz et al 2019) refers to NCP18 and the phylogenetic diversity indicator used by IPBES (described in Faith et al 2018). Diaz et al also link the Faith et al NCP18 indicator to other NCP (including food and medicine (NCP14) and learning (NCP15)). This highlights how the wide range of possible future benefits covered broadly under “maintenance of options” may fall under various other NCPs. This wide range of future options covered under NCP18 highlights its fundamental importance for sustainable development’s integration of multiple needs of society, including needs of future generations.  Diaz et al conclude “Declines in nature and its contributions to people therefore compromise our ability to meet the SDGs”. Progress regarding NCP18 will be informative about these linked goals.  [**\*background]** (extracted from Faith in press, "Biodiversity", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*) The term “biodiversity” was coined around 1985, but the conceptual, and political, foundations for the new term were developed over at least the previous decade. The link between biotic diversity and human well-being is clear in the “pre-history” of the term “biodiversity” (roughly, the history of the term before it was invented; see Faith 2017). Much of the early work recognising a species extinction crisis naturally focussed on the values of individual species to humanity, in addition to their intrinsic value (for reviews, see Farnham 1997, Mazur and Lee 1993). Discussions by Myers (1976) and others broadened this focus to include a concern about the consequent overall loss of variety, and why such a loss of variety itself matters to humanity. Haskins (1974, p. 646) summarised an important discussion meeting where participants called for “an Ethic of Biotic Diversity in which such diversity is viewed as a value in itself and is tied in with the survival and fitness of the human race”. Haskins (1974, p. 646) argued, “Plants and animals that may now be regarded as dispensable may one day emerge as valuable resources” and that extinction “threatens to narrow down future choices for mankind” (see also Raven 1974). Similarly, Roush (1977, p. 9) argued that “diversity increases the possibility of future benefits” (for review, see Farnham 1997). Myers (1976) arguments for a greater focus on the overall loss of variety appeared in his paper, “An Expanded Approach to the Problem of Disappearing Species”. He argued that “…the spectrum of species can be reckoned a repository of some of society's most valuable raw materials. Moreover, loss of species will affect generations into the indefinite future, whose options to utilize species in ways yet undetermined should be kept open” (see also Josephson 1982). Myers and Ayensu (1983) similarly argued that the possible discovery of benefits for humans is a primary justification for conservation of biological diversity (see also Myers’ 1979 book, *The Sinking Ark*).  Option value of biodiversity provides the important consideration of intergenerational equity or justice that links CBD and SDG. Haskins (1974) had called for “an Ethic of Biotic Diversity”, in which variety’s benefit has ethical import because we care about the well-being of future generations. Similarly, when IUCN (1980, Section 3) reviewed the arguments for the conservation of biotic diversity, they linked this to moral principles. Early discussions linked biodiversity’s option value to ethical/moral obligations to future generations, and this anticipated the rationale for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Schroeder and Pisupati (2010, p. 9) in “Ethics, Justice, and the Convention on Biological Diversity,” noted that the CBD objective to conserve biodiversity is is about attaining intergenerational justice, because to “leave to future generations a world which severely limits their options, is unjust.”  These arguments support the idea that biodiversity is valued (now) because we care about the welfare of future generations; thus, we see a current benefit, and a link to inter-generational justice, in biodiversity’s maintenance of options for future generations.  **References –**  Díaz, S., Demissew, S., Carabias, J., Joly, C., Lonsdale, M., Ash, N., . . . Zlatanova, D., 2015, “The IPBES Conceptual Framework: Connecting nature and people”, Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 14: 1–16.  Díaz, S., Pascual, U., Stenseke, M., Martín-López, B., Watson, R. T., Molnár, Z., . . . Shirayama, Y. 2018, “Assessing nature’s contributions to people”, Science, 359(6373), 270–272.  Diaz et al, (2019) <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/366/6471/eaax3100> <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/suppl/2019/12/11/366.6471.eaax3100.DC1>  Ehrenfeld, D. W., 1970. Biological conservation. Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York, New York, USA.  Faith, D.P., 2017, “A general model for biodiversity and its value”, Pages 69-85 in J. Garson, A. Plutynski, and S. Sarkar, editors. The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Biodiversity Routledge, London, UK.  Faith D. P. et al., (2018) in Phylogenetic Diversity: Applications and Challenges in Biodiversity Science, R. A. Scherson, D. P. Faith, Eds. (Springer International Publishing, 2018), pp.73–91; https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93145-6\_4.Faith DP in press, "Biodiversity", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Edward N. Zalta (ed.)  Farnham, T. J., 2007, Saving nature’s legacy: origins of the idea of biological diversity. Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut, USA.  Francis, 2015, Encyclical letter Laudato Si’ of the Holy Father Francis: On care for our common home [English language version]. The Vatican.  Haskins, C., 1974, “Scientists talk of the need for conservation and an ethic of biotic diversity to slow species extinction”, Science, 184:646-647. http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.184.4137.646  Iltis, H. H. 1972, “Shepherds leading sheep to slaughter: the extinction of species and the destruction of ecosystems”, American Biology Teacher 34:201-221. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/4443886  IUCN, 1980, World Conservation Strategy: living resource conservation for sustainable development. International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN). https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/html/WCS-004/cover.html  Josephson, J., 1982, “Why maintain biological diversity?” Environ. Sci. Technol., 16 : 94A–97A. DOI: 10.1021/es00096a717  Lovejoy, T. E., 1980, “Changes in Biological Diversity”, In The Global 2000 Report to The President, vol. 2 (The Technical Report), G. O. Barney, ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.  Mazur, A., and Lee, J., 1993, “Sounding the global alarm: environmental issues in the US national news”, Social Studies of Science 23:681-720. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/030631293023004003  Myers N., 1976, “An Expanded Approach to the Problem of Disappearing Species”, Science, 193: 198-202.  ----- 1979, The Sinking Ark: A New Look at the Problem of Disappearing Species Pergamon Press.  Myers, Norman, and Edward S. Ayensu. 1983, “Reduction of Biological Diversity and Species Loss.” Ambio, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 72–74..  Raven, P, 1974, “Trends, Priorities, and Needs in Systematic and Evolutionary Biology”, Systematic Biology, 23: 416-39.  Roush, G., 1977, “Why save diversity?” Nature Conservancy News 21: 9-12.  Schroeder D, Pisupati B., 2010, “Ethics, Justice and the Convention on Biological Diversity”, United Nations Environmental Program.  WCED, 1987, Our Common Future, Oxford University Press, Oxford. | | | |
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*Comments should be sent by e-mail to* [*secretariat@cbd.int*](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int) *by 25 July 2020*