Contribution ID: a1958fdd-79b4-4320-8b59-da25c1c36b90

Date: 01/04/2021 15:03:31

# Public consultation on EU biodiversity policy initiatives

Evaluation of the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020, review of the application of the EU Regulation on Invasive Alien Species, and development of binding EU nature restoration targets for 2030

Fields marked with * are mandatory.	
-------------------------------------	--

### Introduction

The Commission is carrying out a public consultation to inform several key biodiversity initiatives:

- 1. The evaluation of the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 (2011-2020),
- 2. The review of the application of the EU Regulation on Invasive Alien Species,
- 3. The development of legally binding EU nature restoration targets: a key commitment of the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030.

This consultation covers three distinct surveys: one under each of these headings.

You may choose to answer the questions under all, or under only one or two of these headings, depending on their relevance for you or for your organisation.

The above policy initiatives are interconnected. The EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 set the EU biodiversity policy framework for the period 2011-2020. This Strategy is currently undergoing an evaluation. The EU Regulation on Invasive Alien Species was adopted in implementation of Target 5 of the 2020 Biodiversity Strategy. The review of its application will provide insights for improving its implementation, as well as for the evaluation of Target 5.

In May, the Commission published a Biodiversity Strategy for 2030, with the aim to put EU biodiversity on the path to recovery by 2030. One of the core commitments in the Strategy is to propose, by the end of 2021, a legally binding instrument setting EU targets to restore damaged ecosystems by 2030.

Lessons learnt from the policy period 2011-2020 will be considered in the implementation of the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030, in order to improve the design and delivery of key actions.

### To help us analyse your reply

- please keep your answers concise
- the 'extra comments' boxes have limited characters as specified, but you can include documents and URLs to relevant online content
- although you can respond 'I don't know / no opinion' to any question, please give specific answers as much as possible (to help us gather solid evidence).

### Saving and submitting

If you click 'Save as Draft' (to break off and finalise your response later), you must save the link that you receive from the EUSurvey tool on your computer. Without it, you won't be able to access the draft again.

After submitting your finalised response, you'll be able to download a copy.

Questions marked with an asterisk (\*) are mandatory. To see how we will protect your data, read the attached privacy statement.

#### **Contacts**

For technical problems, please contact our CENTRAL HELPDESK.

#### Still got questions?

You may contact us via the functional mailbox ENV-BIODIVERSITY@ec.europa.eu.

#### Who are we consulting?

The consultation is open to any interested public or private organisation or individual.

We are particularly interested in feedback from bodies and individuals that are either engaged in the management, restoration and protection of biodiversity, or that are affected by different aspects of EU biodiversity policy, such as all levels of government and managing authorities, non-governmental organisations, academia, consultancy, land managers, planners and developers, industry, business and finance sector representatives.

### About you

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian

0	Finnish
	French
	German
	Greek
	Hungarian
	Irish
	Italian
	Latvian
	Lithuanian
	Maltese
	Polish
	Portuguese
	Romanian
	Slovak
	Slovenian
	Spanish
	Swedish
*lom	giving my contribution as
	giving my contribution as  Academic/research institution
_	Business association
	Company/business organisation
	Consumer organisation
	EU citizen
	Environmental organisation
	Non-EU citizen
	Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
	Public authority
	Trade union
	Other
Pleas	se specify your area of activity
	Agriculture
	Aquaculture (including algae)
	Civil protection

	Construction
	Culture
	Education
	Energy
	Environment
	Fisheries and aquaculture
	Food
	Forestry
	Health
	Industry
	Insurance
	International cooperation
	Mining
	Spatial planning - terrestrial
	Spatial planning - land
	Tourism and leisure
	Trade
	Transport
	Waste management
	Water management
	Other
Otl	ner - please specify
23	character(s) maximum
	Industry association
* Fir	st name
	The Bioenergy Association
* Su	name
	of Finland
*En	ail (this won't be published)
	info@bioenergia.fi

### \*Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

icas	e add yddi cddilliy di diig	iii, or that or your organisa	ttiOii.			
	Afghanistan	Djibouti		Libya	0	Saint Martin
0	Åland Islands	Dominica	0	Liechtenstein	0	Saint Pierre and Miquelon
	Albania	Dominican		Lithuania	0	Saint Vincent
		Republic				and the
						Grenadines
	Algeria	Ecuador	0	Luxembourg	0	Samoa
	American	Egypt		Macau	0	San Marino
	Samoa					
	Andorra	El Salvador	0	Madagascar	0	São Tomé and
						Príncipe
	Angola	Equatorial	0	Malawi	0	Saudi Arabia
		Guinea				
0	Anguilla	Eritrea	0	Malaysia		Senegal
0	Antarctica	Estonia		Maldives		Serbia
0	Antigua and	Eswatini	0	Mali	0	Seychelles
	Barbuda					
0	Argentina	Ethiopia	0	Malta	0	Sierra Leone
0	Armenia	Falkland Islands	s <sup>©</sup>	Marshall	0	Singapore
				Islands		
0	Aruba	Faroe Islands	0	Martinique	0	Sint Maarten
0	Australia	Piji	0	Mauritania	0	Slovakia
0	Austria	Finland	0	Mauritius	0	Slovenia
0	Azerbaijan	France	0	Mayotte	0	Solomon
						Islands
	Bahamas	French Guiana	0	Mexico		Somalia
0	Bahrain	French	0	Micronesia	0	South Africa
		Polynesia				
	Bangladesh	French		Moldova		South Georgia
		Southern and				and the South
		Antarctic Lands				Sandwich
0	Barbados	Gabon	0	Monaco	0	Islands South Korea
0	Belarus	© Georgia	0	Mongolia	0	South Sudan
	DEIaius	- Georgia	_	iviuiiquila		Suum Suuan

<ul><li>Belgium</li><li>Belize</li><li>Benin</li><li>Bermuda</li><li>Bhutan</li></ul>	<ul><li>Germany</li><li>Ghana</li><li>Gibraltar</li><li>Greece</li><li>Greenland</li></ul>	<ul><li>Montenegro</li><li>Montserrat</li><li>Morocco</li><li>Mozambique</li><li>Myanmar</li></ul>	Spain Sri Lanka Sudan Suriname Svalbard and
<ul><li>Bolivia</li><li>Bonaire Saint</li><li>Eustatius and</li><li>Saba</li></ul>	<ul><li>Grenada</li><li>Guadeloupe</li></ul>	/Burma  Namibia  Nauru	Jan Mayen Sweden Switzerland
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Guam	Nepal	Syria
<ul><li>Botswana</li><li>Bouvet Island</li><li>Brazil</li><li>British Indian</li></ul>	<ul><li>Guatemala</li><li>Guernsey</li><li>Guinea</li><li>Guinea-Bissau</li></ul>	<ul><li>Netherlands</li><li>New Caledonia</li><li>New Zealand</li><li>Nicaragua</li></ul>	<ul><li>Taiwan</li><li>Tajikistan</li><li>Tanzania</li><li>Thailand</li></ul>
Ocean Territory  British Virgin Islands	Guyana	Niger	The Gambia
<ul><li>Brunei</li><li>Bulgaria</li></ul>	<ul><li>Haiti</li><li>Heard Island</li><li>and McDonald</li><li>Islands</li></ul>	<ul><li>Nigeria</li><li>Niue</li></ul>	<ul><li>Timor-Leste</li><li>Togo</li></ul>
<ul><li>Burkina Faso</li><li>Burundi</li></ul>	<ul><li>Honduras</li><li>Hong Kong</li></ul>	<ul><li>Norfolk Island</li><li>Northern</li><li>Mariana Islands</li></ul>	<ul><li>Tokelau</li><li>Tonga</li></ul>
Cambodia	Hungary	North Korea	Trinidad and Tobago
Cameroon	Iceland	North Macedonia	Tunisia
Canada	India	Norway	Turkey
<ul><li>Cape Verde</li><li>Cayman Islands</li></ul>	<ul><li>Indonesia</li><li>Iran</li></ul>	<ul><li>Oman</li><li>Pakistan</li></ul>	<ul><li>Turkmenistan</li><li>Turks and</li><li>Caicos Islands</li></ul>

Central African Republic	Iraq	Palau	Tuvalu
Chad	Ireland	Palestine	Uganda
Chile	Isle of Man	Panama	Ukraine
China	Israel	Papua New	United Arab
		Guinea	Emirates
Christmas	Italy	Paraguay	United
Island			Kingdom
Clipperton	Jamaica	Peru	United States
Cocos (Keeling)	Japan	Philippines	United States
Islands			Minor Outlying
			Islands
Colombia	Jersey	Pitcairn Islands	Uruguay
Comoros	Jordan	Poland	US Virgin
			Islands
Congo	Kazakhstan	Portugal	Uzbekistan
Cook Islands	Kenya	Puerto Rico	Vanuatu
Costa Rica	Kiribati	Qatar	Vatican City
Côte d'Ivoire	Kosovo	Réunion	Venezuela
Croatia	Kuwait	Romania	Vietnam
Cuba	Kyrgyzstan	Russia	Wallis and
			Futuna
Curaçao	Laos	Rwanda	Western
			Sahara
Cyprus	Latvia	Saint	Yemen
		Barthélemy	
Czechia	Lebanon	Saint Helena	Zambia
		Ascension and	
		Tristan da	
		Cunha	
Democratic	Lesotho	Saint Kitts and	Zimbabwe
Republic of the		Nevis	
Congo			
Denmark	Liberia	Saint Lucia	

<sup>\*</sup>Organisation name

Bioenergia ry - the Bioenergy Association of Finland

### \*Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

### Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the <u>transparency register</u>. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

174042620514-51

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. Fo r the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association, 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published. Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

### \*Contribution publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

### Anonymous

Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

### Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

### I. Evaluation of the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020

#### Introduction

Biodiversity - the variety of life on Earth - is essential for human wellbeing, socio-economic development and for mitigating and adapting to the impacts of climate change. However, biodiversity in the EU and globally is under immense pressure from human-driven land- and sea use changes, the overexploitation of biological resources, pollution, natural and man-made disaster risks, climate change and the spread of invasive alien species. Biodiversity is eroding at unprecedented rates in the EU and globally. This is reducing the capacity of the Earth's ecosystems to continue providing for human needs, and to mitigate and adapt to climate change.

The <u>EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020</u> (2011-2020) was aimed at halting and reversing biodiversity loss in the EU, and helping to avert global biodiversity loss by 2020 – and thereby maintaining the capacity of ecosystems to provide for human needs. In order to achieve this, the Strategy set six targets:

- Target 1. Fully implement the EU Birds and Habitats Directives
- Target 2. Maintain and restore ecosystems and their services
- Target 3. Increase the contribution of agriculture and forestry to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity
- Target 4. Ensure the sustainable use of fisheries resources and marine ecosystems
- Target 5. Combat invasive alien species
- Target 6. Help avert global biodiversity loss

Each target was broken down into several actions. The Strategy also included cross-cutting measures to mobilise resources for nature and biodiversity, to strengthen knowledge and to develop partnerships with stakeholders for its implementation.

The Commission is carrying out an <u>evaluation of the Strategy</u>, looking into its effectiveness, efficiency, coherence with other policies, relevance and EU added value. The Commission will publish its report on the evaluation in 2021. A synopsis of the consultation activities and results will be enclosed to the Commission report.

#### Why are we consulting?

This public consultation is part of the evaluation. We would like to know your views on how the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 was implemented, its main achievements and failures, success factors and obstacles; how it has interacted with other policies; and how you have been engaged, or impacted in positive or negative ways. Lessons learned from this evaluation will inform the design and implementation of actions and measures to achieve the commitments of the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030.

A summary of our findings from the consultation will be published here in 2021.

### Questions on the evaluation of the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020

# 1. The 2020 Biodiversity Strategy set six targets, which together should have enabled the EU to halt and reverse the loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services. How familiar are you with these targets?

	Very familiar	Moderately familiar	Slightly familiar	Not at all familiar
Target 1. Fully implement the EU Birds and Habitats  Directives	0	0	0	0
Target 2. Maintain and restore ecosystems and their services	0	0	0	0
Target 3. Increase the contribution of agriculture and forestry to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity	0	0	0	0
Target 4. Ensure the sustainable use of fisheries resources and marine ecosystems	0	0	0	0
Target 5. Combat invasive alien species	0	0	0	0
Target 6. Help avert global biodiversity loss	0	0	0	0

2.	To what extent has the EU met the objective of halting biodiversity loss
and	the degradation of ecosystem services in the EU by 2020, and restoring
then	n as far as feasible?

F	u	II	V
•	ч	•••	y

### 3. To what extent has the EU achieved the following targets?

	Fully	Partially	Poorly	Not at all	I don't know / no opinion
Target 1. Fully implement the EU Birds and Habitats  Directives	0	0	0	0	0
Target 2. Maintain and restore ecosystems and their services	0	0	0	0	0
Target 3. Increase the contribution of agriculture and forestry to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity	0	0	0	0	0
Target 4. Ensure the sustainable use of fisheries resources and marine ecosystems	0	0	0	0	0

Partially

Poorly

Not at all

I don't know / no opinion

Target 5. Combat invasive alien species	0	0	0	0	0
Target 6. Help avert global biodiversity loss	0	0	0	0	0

3a.	Please highlight significant achievements of the strategy and related
succe	ess factors :

2	50 character(s) maximum

3b. Please highlight significant gaps in the implementation of the strategy and reasons for failure:

2	50 character(s) maximum

- 4. Have you identified, since 2011, significant impacts on your sector, field of activity or living area that have resulted from the implementation of the strategy?
  - Yes positive
  - No
  - Yes negative
  - I don't know / no opinion

# 5. Has funding been sufficient to support the implementation of the EU 2020 biodiversity targets?

	Fully	Partially	Poorly	Not at all	I don't know / no opinion
Target 1. Fully implement the EU Birds and Habitats <u>Directives</u>	0	0	0	0	0
Target 2. Maintain and restore ecosystems and their services	0	0	0	0	0
Target 3. Increase the contribution of agriculture and forestry to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity	0	0	0	0	0
Target 4. Ensure the sustainable use of fisheries resources and marine ecosystems	0	0	0	0	0
Target 5. Combat invasive alien species	0	0	0	0	0
Target 6. Help avert global biodiversity loss	0	0	0	0	0

# 6. To what extent have the EU biodiversity targets to 2020 been integrated in the design and implementation of the following EU policies?

	Fully	Partially	Poorly	Not at all	I don't know / no opinion
Air quality	0	0	0	0	0
Banking and finance	0	0	0	0	0
Business and industry	0	0	0	0	0
Chemicals	0	0	0	0	0
Circular economy	0	0	0	0	0
Climate action	0	0	0	0	0
Common agricultural policy	0	0	0	0	0
Common fisheries policy	0	0	0	0	0
Development cooperation and external action	0	0	0	0	0
Disaster risk reduction and management	0	0	0	0	0
Education and training	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	0	0	0	0	0
Forest Strategy	0	0	0	0	0
Integrated maritime policy	0	0	0	0	0
Investment	0	0	0	0	0
Marine	0	0	0	0	0
Regional policy	0	0	0	0	0
Research and innovation	0	0	0	0	0
Trade	0	0	0	0	0
Transport	0	0	0	0	0
Water	0	0	0	0	0

# 7. To what extent has the strategy contributed to the objectives of the following EU policies?

	Fully	Partially	Poorly	Not at all	I don't know/ no opinion
Air quality	0	0	0	0	©
Business and industry	0	0	0	0	0

	Circular economy	0	0	0	0	©
	Climate action	0	0	0	0	©
	Common agricultural policy	0	0	0	0	©
	Common fisheries policy	0	0	0	0	©
	Development cooperation and external action	0	0	0	0	0
	Disaster risk reduction and management	0	0	0	0	©
	Education and training	0	0	0	0	©
	Forest Strategy	0	0	0	0	©
	Integrated maritime policy	0	0	0	0	©
	Investment	0	0	0	0	©
	Marine	0	0	0	0	©
	Public health	0	0	0	0	©
	Regional policy	0	0	0	0	©
	Research and innovation	0	0	0	0	©
	Trade	0	0	0	0	©
	Water	0	0	0	0	0
8. ma	To what extent has the EU Bictin biodiversity needs and issue Fully Partially Poorly Not at all I don't know / no opinion		-	tegy to	2020 re	sponaea to tne
the	ease indicate what further issues, EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 To what extent has the EU Bio	)				
J.	TO WHAT CALCITE HAS THE LO DI		only on a		_0_0 11C	

	Fully	Partially	Poorly	Not at all	I don't know/ no opinion
High-level political commitment to protect and restore biodiversity	0	0	0	0	0
A strategic approach to biodiversity protection and restoration across the EU	0	0	0	0	0
Cross-border cooperation on biodiversity protection and restoration	0	0	0	0	0
Integration of biodiversity in other EU policies and in related EU funding instruments	0	0	0	0	0
Cooperation and learning on biodiversity among the Member States	0	0	0	0	0
Cooperation and learning on biodiversity between the EU and third countries.	0	0	0	0	0

### 10. Should any aspects of the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 have been dealt with at national, regional or local level, rather than at the EU level?

	Vac
$\sim$	res

No

I don't know / no opinion

11. The EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 established a <u>common</u> <u>implementation framework</u> to track progress in reaching the targets and ensure coordinated implementation at all levels. To which extent has this framework ensured:

	Fully	Partially	Poorly	Not at all	I don't know/ no opinion
Accountability by the main actors, sectors and institutions responsible for its implementation	©	0	0	0	0
Regular progress review and strengthening of efforts if needed	0	0	0	0	0
Coordinated efforts at all levels (sub-national, national, EU and global)	0	0	0	0	0
Effective use of EU funding opportunities for biodiversity in the Member States	0	0	0	0	0

and implementation of EU biodiversity policy					
Public access to information on the state of biodiversity and on the key drivers of biodiversity loss in the EU	0	0	0	0	0
Contribution of research and knowledge to the implementation and monitoring of biodiversity targets	0	0	0	0	0
Building the capacities of national and sub-national actors for biodiversity action	0	0	0	0	0
se explain if necessary  character(s) maximum  To which extent has the monitoring f	ramew	ork for th	ne EU B	iodive	ersity
tegy to 2020 enabled the tracking of p	rogress	s in reacl	Poorly	Not at	I dor knov
	Fully			all	opin
Target 1. Fully implement the EU Birds and Habitats  Directives	C	0	©	all	opini
	Pully	© ©	© ©		opini
Directives  Target 2. Maintain and restore ecosystems and their	0		0	0	opini
Target 2. Maintain and restore ecosystems and their services  Target 3. Increase the contribution of agriculture and	0		0 0	0	opini
Target 2. Maintain and restore ecosystems and their services  Target 3. Increase the contribution of agriculture and forestry to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity  Target 4. Ensure the sustainable use of fisheries			0	0	opini

### You may attach relevant supporting documents to this questionnaire.

The maximum file size is 10 MB

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

#### THANK YOU FOR RESPONDING TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

### II. Review of the application of the EU Regulation on Invasive Alien Species

#### Introduction

Invasive alien species are animals and plants that have been introduced accidentally or deliberately to a new natural environment from other parts of the world, and that have started to spread and reproduce excessively in this new environment, disrupting the natural balance and changing ecosystems. Invasive alien species are one of the main drivers of global species extinction and biodiversity loss. They also cause damage amounting to many billions of euros to the European economy every year, and some have a detrimental impact on human health. Invasive alien species can easily spread across borders.

The <u>EU Regulation on Invasive Alien Species</u> entered into force in January 2015. Its adoption was a key action under Target 5 of the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020. At the core of the Regulation is a list of invasive alien species of Union concern (the Union list). This list includes species that cause, or could cause, such damage to native biodiversity that justifies concerted action and measures for their control at EU level. The Regulation imposes restrictions on the keeping, importing, selling, breeding and growing of the listed species. Member States must also take measures for their early detection and rapid eradication, and manage populations that are already widely spread in their territory. Prevention is the priority because established populations can be expensive to manage, and difficult or impossible to eradicate.

The provisions of the Regulation entered into force gradually over a period of three years from the adoption of the first list of invasive alien species of Union concern in July 2016.

The Commission is currently reviewing the application of the IAS Regulation, in line with the reporting and review obligations set out in Article 24. The Commission will submit its report on the review in 2021.

### Why are we consulting?

We would like to collect evidence and views on the application of the Regulation. This will inform its review as well as possible future measures to step up its implementation in the period to 2030. Relevant insights from this consultation will also be taken into account in the evaluation of Target 5 of the EU Biodiversity  $S\ t\ r\ a\ t\ e\ g\ y$ 

A summary of our findings from the consultation will be published <a href="here">here</a> in 2021.

### Questions on the EU Regulation on Invasive Alien Species

### 1. How familiar are you with the EU Regulation on Invasive Alien Species?

Very familiar

4.3.	The restrictions on breeding and growing the listed species
0	Fully
	Partially
0	Poorly
0	Not at all
0	I don't know / no opinion
4.4.	The management of pathways of unintentional introduction and spread
0	Fully
0	Partially
0	Poorly
0	Not at all
0	I don't know / no opinion
4.5.	The surveillance system
	Fully
	Partially
	Poorly
0	Not at all
0	I don't know / no opinion
4.6.	The official customs controls
	Fully
0	Partially
0	Poorly
	Not at all
0	I don't know / no opinion
4.7.	The rapid eradication at an early stage of invasion
0	Fully
0	Partially
0	Poorly
	Not at all
0	I don't know / no opinion

4.8. The management of widely spread invasive alien species

sive alien species:	100 01 1110	following f		oombattii	-9
	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important	l do knov no opin
Knowledge and research on effective control methods	0	0	0	0	0
Availability of funding for control	0	0	0	0	0
Capacities of public authorities to design, implement and enforce control measures	0	0	0	0	0
Knowledge and skills of private actors	0	0	0	0	0
Engagement of key sectors in efforts to limit intentional introductions of invasive alien species into the environment (e.g. pet trade, horticulture and forestry)	0	0	0	0	0
Public awareness	©	0	©	©	0

5. In your experience, are the costs of controlling invasive alien species of

Union concern (i.e. restrictions, surveillance, eradication and management)

proportionate to the benefits for biodiversity, human health and the

Fully

Partially

Not at all

I don't know / no opinion

Poorly

economy?

Fully

Partially

Poorly

250 character(s) maximum

### You may attach relevant supporting documents to this question.

The maximum file size is 1 MB
Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

# 7. To what extent have the objectives of the Regulation been integrated in the design and implementation of the following EU policies:

	Fully	Partially	Poorly	Not at all	l don't know / no opinion
Animal health legislation	0	0	0	0	0
Business and industry	0	0	0	0	0
Climate action	0	0	0	0	0
Common agricultural policy	0	0	0	0	©
Common fisheries policy	0	0	0	0	©
Education and training	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	0	0	0	0	0
External action and development cooperation	0	0	0	0	0
Disaster risk reduction and management	0	0	0	0	0
Forest strategy	0	0	0	0	0
Integrated maritime policy	0	0	0	0	0
Investment	0	0	0	0	0
Marine	0	0	0	0	0
Plant health legislation	0	0	0	0	0
Public health	0	0	0	0	©
Regional policy	0	0	0	0	0
Research and innovation	0	0	0	0	0
Trade	0	0	0	0	0
Transport	0	0	0	0	0
Water	0	0	0	0	0

# 8. In your view, what needs to be done to improve the implementation of the Regulation so that the impact of invasive alien species is minimised? 450 character(s) maximum

Is there ar	ovthing else you	would like to add?	2	
1000 character(s)		would like to add:	•	

You may attach relevant supporting documents to this questionnaire.

The maximum file size is 10 MB Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

#### THANK YOU FOR RESPONDING TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

### III. Development of legally binding EU nature restoration targets

### Introduction

Biodiversity loss in the EU is continuing at an alarming rate. According to the 2020 State of Nature in the EU report, 39% of wild bird species assessments and 63% of protected non-bird species' assessments show poor or bad status. Only 15% of protected habitats' assessments show a good status. As ecosystems degrade, so does their capacity to provide benefits to society. According to the first EU-wide assessment of ecosystems, most ecosystem types in the EU (urban, agroecosystems, woodland and forests, heathland and shrub, sparsely vegetated lands, wetlands, freshwater and marine ecosystems) show deteriorating trends. The report concludes that the current potential of ecosystems to deliver flood protection, crop pollination, timber and nature-based recreation is equal to or lower than it was in 2010.

### An EU Nature Restoration Plan and binding EU restoration targets

The <u>EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030</u> aims to put Europe's biodiversity on the path to recovery by 2030 for the benefit of people, the planet and climate, and to encourage global action so that by 2050, all of the world's ecosystems are restored, resilient and adequately protected.

To help halt and reverse biodiversity loss, the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030 outlines an **EU Nature Restoration Plan**. A key element of this plan is a commitment by the Commission to propose, in 2021, **bind ing EU nature restoration targets**. The aim is to restore degraded ecosystems, in particular those with the most potential to capture and store carbon (carbon-rich ecosystems) and to prevent and reduce the impact of the propose of the pro

Sometimes, reducing key pressures (such as pollution or over-exploitation) is sufficient to help ecosystems recover by themselves. Heavily damaged ecosystems may also need active restoration measures (for example by introducing native species, changing landscape/seascape features, or by increasing the extent

of ecosystems). The restoration of degraded ecosystems can address various elements (for example specific habitats or specific species) and be carried out at various geographical scales. Furthermore, restoration approaches need to take into account that future restored ecosystems should be climate  $r \in s \ i \ l \ i \in n \ t \ .$ 

To date, the efforts to restore ecosystems in the EU have been <u>insufficient</u>. In 2011, a key voluntary target of the <u>EU 2020 Biodiversity Strategy</u> was to restore at least 15% of degraded ecosystems by 2020. This voluntary target <u>has not been met</u>, and restoration plans were only developed by a couple of Member States. Some progress has been reported, in particular in areas where legal obligations exist in the <u>Birds</u> and <u>Habitats</u> Directives, the <u>Water Framework Directive</u>, the <u>Floods Directive</u> and the <u>Marine Strategy Framework Directive</u>, but there are still challenges that hinder restoration progress. For instance, there is no requirement for Member States to have biodiversity restoration plans. There are not always: clear or binding targets; specified timelines; clear definitions of what is meant by restoration or the sustainable use of ecosystems. There is also no requirement to comprehensively map, monitor or assess the condition of ecosystems, the benefits they provide to society and restoration efforts. The EU <u>Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystems and their Services</u> initiative has made methodological progress in this respect, but there are still significant

Moreover, existing legislation covers only some of the EU's ecosystems. For example, the Birds and Habitats Directives cover many natural and semi-natural parts of ecosystems but not cropland, intensively used grassland, forest plantations and urban ecosystems. Soil health and soil biodiversity are not explicitly covered by EU legislation. Thus, there is no EU legislation to explicitly address a number of ecosystems and habitats in need of restoration or species whose decline needs to be reversed. Furthermore, in most cases (with the exception of the <u>prioritised action frameworks</u>) there are no clear links between restoration needs and EU funding instruments.

### Why are we consulting?

This consultation is part of the impact assessment that will underpin the Commission's proposal for binding EU restoration targets. We would like to have your views on the main elements and the approach to devising the Commission's proposal for binding restoration targets. Further targeted consultations and public workshops will be carried out to obtain stakeholder views on the conditions in which these targets should be implemented, as well as on the potential social, economic and wider environmental impacts that need to be taken into account. For more information, see <a href="https://ec.europa.eu/environment/eu-nature-restoration-targets\_en">https://ec.europa.eu/environment/eu-nature-restoration-targets\_en</a>.

### Questions on the development of binding EU nature restoration targets

- 1. The EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 set the following target in 2011: "By 2020, ecosystems and their services are maintained and enhanced by establishing green infrastructure and restoring at least 15% of degraded ecosystems". While the evaluation of the strategy is ongoing, there is sufficient evidence that the 15% restoration target has not been achieved. In your view, which of the factors below have undermined the delivery of the target?
- **1.1. The target was too general:** there was no common understanding of its scope and application to different ecosystem types
  - Fully agree



	Tend to agree
	Neither agree nor disagree
	Tend to disagree
	Completely disagree
	Don't know / no opinion
1.2.	There was no strategic restoration approach across the EU
	Fully agree
•	Tend to agree
	Neither agree nor disagree
0	Tend to disagree
0	Completely disagree
0	Don't know / no opinion
1.3.	The responsibilities of key actors to implement the target were not clear
0	Fully agree
•	Tend to agree
0	Neither agree nor disagree
0	Tend to disagree
0	Completely disagree
0	Don't know / no opinion
1.4.	There was no implementation obligation: the target was voluntary
•	Fully agree
	Tend to agree
0	Neither agree nor disagree
	Tend to disagree
0	Completely disagree
0	Don't know / no opinion
1.5.	Funding was insufficient to carry out restoration actions
0	Fully agree
0	Tend to agree
0	Neither agree nor disagree
0	Tend to disagree
	Completely disagree

Don't know / no opinion
1.6. Knowledge and skills were insufficient to carry out restoration actions
Fully agree
Tend to agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Tend to disagree
Completely disagree
Don't know / no opinion
1.7. Conflicting land use interests were not tackled successfully
Fully agree
Tend to agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Tend to disagree
Completely disagree
Don't know / no opinion
2. In order to step up the restoration of degraded ecosystems, the EU should:
2.1. Set legally binding targets for the Member States to restore degraded
ecosystems
Fully agree
Tend to agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Tend to disagree
Totally disagree
I don't know / no opinion
2.2. Provide better guidance to help Member States develop restoration
plans and strategies
Fully agree
Tend to agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Tend to disagree
Totally disagree

I don't know / no opinion

2.3.	Promote better use of existing EU funding opportunities for restoration
	Fully agree
•	Tend to agree
0	Neither agree nor disagree
	Tend to disagree
	Totally disagree
0	I don't know / no opinion
2.4.	Promote the development of economic incentives and business
oppo	ortunities related to ecosystem restoration and sustainable management
0	Fully agree
•	Tend to agree
0	Neither agree nor disagree
	Tend to disagree
0	Totally disagree
0	I don't know / no opinion
2.5.	Support stakeholder training and awareness raising on restoration
0	Fully agree
0	Tend to agree
	Neither agree nor disagree
0	Tend to disagree
0	Totally disagree
0	I don't know / no opinion
2.6.	Strengthen and expand the monitoring of the condition of ecosystems
and	the services they provide across the EU
•	Fully agree
0	Tend to agree
0	Neither agree nor disagree
	Tend to disagree
	Totally disagree
	I don't know / no opinion

(	<ul><li>Fully agree</li><li>Tend to agree</li></ul>					
(	Neither agree nor disagree					
(	Tend to disagree					
(	Totally disagree					
(	I don't know / no opinion					
2.8	. Encourage cooperation with th	e EU's r	neighbour	ing cou	ntries to	restore
cro	ss-border ecosystems					
(	Fully agree					
(	Tend to agree					
(	Neither agree nor disagree					
(	Tend to disagree					
(	Totally disagree					
(	I don't know / no opinion					
3. for	To what extent should the follow restoration?	ring crite	eria guide	the sett	ing of p	riorities
	Ecological effectiveness: restoration will contribute to:	High priority	Moderate priority	Low priority	Not at all priority	No opinion/ I don't know
	Improving the health of ecosystems, habitats or species of high biodiversity value	•	0	0	0	0
	Improving the connectivity of natural areas (ecological corridors including migration routes)	0	•	0	0	0
	Improving the resilience of ecosystems to climate change	0	0	0	•	0
	Benefits to society: restoration will contribute to the provision of the following	0	0	0	0	•

2.7. Support research and innovation to strengthen the knowledge base on

restoration

ecosystem services:

- climate change mitigation, including carbon sequestration	0	0	0	0	•
- climate change adaptation	0	0	0	0	•
- disaster risk reduction (such as protection from floods and storms)	0	0	0	0	•
- water purification	0	0	•	0	0
- water quantity regulation	0	0	•	0	0
- air quality regulation	0	0	0	•	0
- nutrient cycling	0	0	0	0	•
- soil fertility	0	0	0	0	•
- gene pool maintenance	•	0	0	0	0
- pollination	•	0	0	0	0
- pest and disease control	0	0	0	0	•
- fish stock maintenance	0	0	0	0	0
- human health and well-being benefits from interaction with nature	0	•	0	0	0
- multi-functionality, i.e. the capacity of healthy ecosystems to deliver a wide range of ecosystem services	0	•	0	0	0
- Other services	0	0	0	0	•
Cost-effectiveness of the restoration measures	•	0	0	0	0
Other criteria	0	0	0	0	0

	Please	specify
--	--------	---------

25	O character(s) maximum

4. Restoration is the process of assisting the recovery of an ecosystem that has been degraded, damaged, or destroyed. Restoration targets may be set in a number of different ways. They can relate to incremental improvements of ecosystem condition or to reaching good condition; to a percentage of EU area or a specified extent of ecosystems on which restoration activities should take place. The restoration commitments of the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030 include such different approaches. In your view, should EU restoration targets be set as (multiple answers possible):

	A general EU level restoration target across all ecosystems
<b>V</b>	Specific EU level targets per ecosystem or habitat
1	Specific EU level targets per species or groups of species
	Other

### 5. Should any of the following ecosystem types be prioritised for restoration in the EU?

	High priority	Moderate priority	Low priority	Not at all priority	No opinion/ I don't know
<b>Urban ecosystems</b> , such as urban green areas and brownfields	0	0	0	•	0
Agroecosystems, such as grasslands, dehesas and montados, and landscape features (including on croplands) such as for example fallow land, buffer strips, hedges, terrace walls and ponds	0	•	0	0	0
Forest ecosystems including natural, seminatural forests and plantations	0	0	•	0	0
Heathlands and shrublands	0	0	0	0	•
Sparsely vegetated lands, such as rocky areas in mountains, beaches and dunes	0	0	0	0	•
Inland wetlands, such as marshes, peatlands, wet grasslands, fluvial forests, riparian areas and floodplains	0	•	0	0	0
Soil ecosystems (across urban, agricultural, forest and other terrestrial ecosystems)	0	0	0	0	•
Freshwater ecosystems, such as rivers and lakes	•	0	0	0	0
Marine ecosystems, such as coastal wetlands, nursery habitats, shallow biogenic constructions and deep water corals	0	0	0	0	•
Other	0	0	0	0	0

6. How important do you consider the following factors and measures for ensuring that future EU restoration targets are delivered?

## 6.1. Specify how EU targets should be broken down into national contributions, taking into account national characteristics



	Very important
	Somewhat important
0	Not at all important
0	I don't know / no opinion
6.2.	Require Member States to establish national restoration plans
•	Very important
	Somewhat important
0	Not at all important
0	I don't know / no opinion
6.3.	Put in place a comprehensive system to monitor, map and asses the
cond	ition of ecosystems and the services they provide
0	Very important
•	Somewhat important
0	Not at all important
0	I don't know / no opinion
6.4.	Put in place a mechanism for regular reporting on progress in meeting
the t	argets
the t	argets Very important
the t	argets
the t	argets Very important
the t	Argets Very important Somewhat important
the t	Very important Somewhat important Not at all important
the t	Very important Somewhat important Not at all important I don't know / no opinion
the t	Very important Somewhat important Not at all important I don't know / no opinion  Raise public awareness about the benefits from restored nature
the t	Very important Somewhat important Not at all important I don't know / no opinion  Raise public awareness about the benefits from restored nature Very important
the t	Very important Somewhat important Not at all important I don't know / no opinion  Raise public awareness about the benefits from restored nature Very important Somewhat important
the t	Very important Somewhat important Not at all important I don't know / no opinion  Raise public awareness about the benefits from restored nature Very important Somewhat important Not at all important
6.5.	Very important Somewhat important Not at all important I don't know / no opinion  Raise public awareness about the benefits from restored nature Very important Somewhat important Not at all important I don't know / no opinion
6.5.	Very important Somewhat important Not at all important I don't know / no opinion  Raise public awareness about the benefits from restored nature Very important Somewhat important Not at all important I don't know / no opinion  Other - please specify

the long term?

7.1. Anticipate climate change effects in the planning of restoration actions, to ensure resilience to climate change
Very important
Somewhat important
Not at all important
I don't know / no opinion
7.2. Establish long-term monitoring and reporting on the condition of
restored ecosystems
Very important
Somewhat important
Not at all important
I don't know / no opinion
7.3. Designate certain restored ecosystems as protected areas
Very important
Somewhat important
Not at all important
I don't know / no opinion
7.4. Other - <i>please specify</i>
300 character(s) maximum
8. Is there anything else you would like to add?
1000 character(s) maximum
You may attach relevant supporting documents to this questionnaire.
The maximum file size is 10 MB
Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

THANK YOU FOR RESPONDING TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Rayka.HAUSER@ec.europa.eu



### Feedback: Protecting biodiversity: nature restoration targets under EU biodiversity strategy

The Bioenergy Association of Finland supports the aim of the EU to address biodiversity loss and the degradation of ecosystems. As pointed out by the Council Conclusions on Biodiversity Strategy, a thorough impact assessment is needed for any legislative proposals from the Commission. The impact assessment needs to address the economic and social effects of the EU's environmental actions.

The general objective of the proposed legislation is to restore degraded ecosystems, in particular those with the most potential to capture and store carbon and to prevent and reduce the impact of natural and man-made disasters. We would like to remind again in this context that the EU and its Member States have already several instruments in place for managing carbon and greenhouse gas emission balance, which will also be reviewed as part of the Fit-for-55 package. Therefore, any restoration targets should fully focus on addressing and improving biodiversity, and not set any additional climate change related requirements for Member States. The greenhouse gas emission balance of the land-use, land-use change, and forestry sector is already addressed through the LULUCF regulation, in which the Member States have discretion on and determine how to respond to the no-debit requirement.

Effective and coordinated contributions by all Member States are necessary to achieve significant levels of biodiversity restoration in the EU. As a general principle, any binding restoration targets need to consider the current differences in percentage and quality of protected lands in different Member States. A one-size-fits-all solution does not exist: adjustments for local and regional variations are essential and should be assessed and implemented by Member States. Restoration and protection both aim at the same objective and need to be looked at together. The Commission should consider a wider and more strategic approach that enables voluntary, national, and local decisions to promote the vitality of nature. If binding targets are set, the targets need to be clearly defined and comparable. It must be clear through which parameters an area is deemed "restored" and why (some of the losses in biodiversity are caused e.g., by climate change). It is also important to address the quality of the restoration and rehabilitation activities. Restoration needs to be as cost-effective as possible both at the EU and Member State level. As forest policy is Member States' competence, as highlighted in the views of the Council and Parliament on the EU Forest Strategy, any restoration measures regarding forests should be defined in Member States.

In order to offset the costs of biodiversity protection and restoration, economic incentives, such as compensation mechanisms, should be developed. The goal could be the overall improvement of the state of ecosystems and biodiversity - not only the no-net-loss of biodiversity.

The analysis and the toolbox available should make full use of and build on voluntary certification systems for restoration, rehabilitation, and conservation of different habitats already in use in and widely acknowledged by different interest groups. The established certification systems can greatly



benefit work e.g., by their continuous criteria updating processes and dialogue with important stakeholders of biodiversity. It is also evident that such voluntary systems may decrease the administrative burden, increase the degree of commitment and eventually prove out more cost effective and up-to-date.

The effort-sharing among Member States needs to be reasonable in protection and restoration measures. The restoration efforts needed to reach the objectives of the strategy must be shared in a just way between Member States, regions, different sectors, and different groups of people. Too strict protection and restoration targets in carbon-rich areas might have major negative impacts to the national and rural areas' economies which need to be considered.

Climate and biodiversity policies need to be consistent in acknowledging the benefits of wood-based products. The EU needs a determined shift from the fossil economy to a bio-based circular economy in order to meet its' climate targets. The sustainably managed forests and wood-based products play a key role in tackling climate change. These benefits need to be horizontally recognized in EU's policies.