Contribution ID: 39718231-5009-4c40-8666-863ad9c85410

Date: 05/04/2021 09:59:02

## 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

## 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
	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	
* Fir	rst name	
	Alexis	
*Su	ırname	
	Kuhl	
*En	nail (this won't be published)	
	alexis.kuhl@europanels.org	
* 0 0	ountry of origin	
	ountry of origin ease add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.	
	Afghanistan Djibouti Libya Saint Martin	

<sup>©</sup> Åland Islands	Dominica	Liechtenstein	Saint Pierre and Miquelon
Albania	<ul><li>Dominican</li><li>Republic</li></ul>	Lithuania	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Algeria	Ecuador	Luxembourg	Samoa
American Samoa	Egypt	Macau	San Marino
Andorra	El Salvador	Madagascar	São Tomé and Príncipe
Angola	Equatorial Guinea	Malawi	Saudi Arabia
Anguilla	Eritrea	Malaysia	Senegal
Antarctica	Estonia	Maldives	Serbia
Antigua and Barbuda	Eswatini	Mali	Seychelles
Argentina	Ethiopia	Malta	Sierra Leone
Armenia	Falkland Islands	Marshall Islands	Singapore
Aruba	Faroe Islands	Martinique	Sint Maarten
Australia	Fiji	Mauritania	Slovakia
Austria	Finland	Mauritius	Slovenia
Azerbaijan	France	Mayotte	<ul><li>Solomon</li><li>Islands</li></ul>
Bahamas	French Guiana	Mexico	Somalia
Bahrain	French Polynesia	Micronesia	South Africa
Bangladesh	French Southern and Antarctic Lands	Moldova	<ul> <li>South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands</li> </ul>
Barbados	Gabon	Monaco	South Korea
Belarus	Georgia	Mongolia	South Sudan
Belgium	Germany	Montenegro	Spain
Belize	Ghana	Montserrat	Sri Lanka

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

Chile	Isle of Man	Panama	Ukraine
China	Srael	Papua New Guinea	United Arab 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
Curação	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	

## \*Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

European Panel Federation

## \*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.

572064811767-22

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 agree with the personal data protection provisions

## 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 <u>Directives</u>	0	•	0	0
Target 2. Maintain and restore ecosystems and their services	0	•	0	0
Target 3. Increase the contribution of agriculture and forestry to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity	•	0	0	0
Target 4. Ensure the sustainable use of fisheries resources and marine ecosystems	0	©	•	0
Target 5. Combat invasive alien species	0	•	0	0
Target 6. Help avert global biodiversity loss	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 them as far as feasible?

Fι	اال	V

## 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 <u>Directives</u>	0	•	0	0	0
Target 2. Maintain and restore ecosystems and their services	0	•	0	0	©
Target 3. Increase the contribution of agriculture and forestry to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity	0	•	0	0	©
Target 4. Ensure the sustainable use of fisheries resources and marine ecosystems	0	•	0	0	©
Target 5. Combat invasive alien species	0	0	•	0	0
Target 6. Help avert global biodiversity loss	0	0	•	0	0

Partially

Poorly

Not at all

I don't know / no opinion

50 character(s) maximum					
Have you identified, since 2011, signi activity or living area that have resulted rategy?  Yes – positive No Yes – negative I don't know / no opinion  Has funding been sufficient to suppose	from t	he imple	mentati	on of	the
20 biodiversity targets?	Fully	Partially	Poorly	Not at all	I don't know / no opinior
20 biodiversity targets?  Target 1. Fully implement the EU Birds and Habitats  Directives	Fully	Partially	Poorly	at	know /
Target 1. Fully implement the EU Birds and Habitats				at all	know /
Target 1. Fully implement the EU Birds and Habitats  Directives  Target 2. Maintain and restore ecosystems and their	0	•		at all	know /
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	0	•		at all	know /
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		•		at all	know /

in the design and implementation of the following EU policies?

Please highlight significant achievements of the strategy and related

3a.

success factors:

250 character(s) maximum

	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	•
Business and industry	0	0	0	0	©
Chemicals	0	0	0	0	©
Circular economy	0	•	0	0	©
Climate action	0	0	0	0	0
Common agricultural policy	0	0	•	0	©
Common fisheries policy	0	0	0	0	•
Development cooperation and external action	0	0	0	0	•
Disaster risk reduction and management	0	0	•	0	©
Education and training	0	0	•	0	©
Energy	0	0	•	0	©
Forest Strategy	0	•	0	0	©
Integrated maritime policy	0	0	0		•
Investment	0	0	0	0	•
Marine	0	0	0	0	•
Regional policy	0	0	•	0	0
Research and innovation	0	•	0	0	0
Trade	0	0	•	0	0
Transport	0	0	0	0	•
Water	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	•
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	•
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	•

8.	To what extent has the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 responded to the
mai	in biodiversity needs and issues in the EU?

-			
	Fu	ıll	ly

- Partially
- Poorly
- Not at all
- I don't know / no opinion

Please indicate what further issues, in your view, should have been dealt with by the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020

2	Character(s) maximum	

## 9. To what extent has the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 helped to ensure:

Poorly	Partially	Fully
--------	-----------	-------

High-level political commitment to protect and restore biodiversity	0	•	0	0	0
A strategic approach to biodiversity protection and restoration across the EU	0	•	0	0	0
Cross-border cooperation on biodiversity protection and restoration	0	0	0	0	•
Integration of biodiversity in other EU policies and in related EU funding instruments	0	•	0	0	0
Cooperation and learning on biodiversity among the Member States	0	0	0	0	•
Cooperation and learning on biodiversity between the EU and third countries.	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?

- Yes
- <sup>◎</sup> 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	•
Coordinated efforts at all levels (sub-national, national, EU and global)	0	0	0	0	•
Effective use of EU funding opportunities for biodiversity in the Member States	0	•	0	0	0
Effective engagement of stakeholders in the design and implementation of EU biodiversity policy	0	•	0	0	0

Public access to information on the state of biodiversity and on the key drivers of biodiversity loss in the EU	0	©	•	0	0
Contribution of research and knowledge to the implementation and monitoring of biodiversity targets	0	0	•	0	0
Building the capacities of national and sub-national actors for biodiversity action	0	0	0	0	•

DI		:.	
Please	explain	ΙT	necessarv
. ioacc	OAPIGIT	•••	necessary

4	50 character(s) maximum

## 12. To which extent has the monitoring framework for the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 enabled the tracking of progress in reaching the 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	•
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

## Please indicate any major gaps of the monitoring framework:

450	character(s) maximum			

## 13. Other comments

Is there anything else you would like to add?

1000 character(s) maximum

Subsidies for early energy recovery of woody biomass create market distortions, contribute to GhG emissions and increase pressure on forests' natural capital that could be better used by preferring material use in line with the waste hierarchy. The lack of public awareness of the climate benefits of using carbon storing/substitution of long-lived harvested wood products when used for construction/renovation, furniture and packaging makes this worse. These twin threats should be safeguarded against by preferring material use in line with the EC's cascade use of wood guidelines and the waste hierarchy. With growing demands on biomass resources it is vital that productive planting undertaken in accordance with sustainable forest standards and practices is maintained. Biodiversity objectives are compatible with modern productive forest practices and it is important that forest policy should reflect a balanced approach such that planting levels of commercial tree species are not diminished.

## 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  $S\ t\ r\ a\ t\ e\ g\ y$   $t\ o$   $2\ 0\ 2\ 0$ .

A summary of our findings from the consultation will be published <u>here</u> in 2021.

Questions on the EU Regulation on Invasive Alien Species
<ul> <li>1. How familiar are you with the EU Regulation on Invasive Alien Species?</li> <li>Very familiar</li> <li>Moderately familiar</li> <li>Slightly familiar</li> <li>Not at all familiar</li> </ul>
2. To what extent is the design of the Regulation adequate to address the
threat posed by invasive alien species to biodiversity in the EU?
Fully
Partially
Poorly
Not at all
I don't know / no opinion
3. Does the current list of invasive alien species of Union concern cover the most relevant species to be controlled in the EU?
Fully
Partially
Poorly
Not at all
I don't know / no opinion
4. To what extent have the following provisions on invasive alien species of Union concern been implemented?
4.1. The restrictions on keeping the listed species
Fully
Partially
Poorly
Not at all

I don't know / no opinion
<ul> <li>4.2. The restrictions on importing and selling the listed species</li> <li>Fully</li> <li>Partially</li> <li>Poorly</li> <li>Not at all</li> <li>I don't know / no opinion</li> </ul>
4.3. The restrictions on breeding and growing the listed species
Fully
Partially
Poorly
Not at all
I don't know / no opinion
4.4. The management of pathways of unintentional introduction and spread
Fully
Partially
Poorly
Not at all
I don't know / no opinion
4.5. The surveillance system
Fully
Partially
Poorly
Not at all
I don't know / no opinion
4.6. The official customs controls
Fully
Partially
Poorly
Not at all
I don't know / no opinion

Po	rtially orly t at all					
I do	on't know / no opinion					
	ase assess the importare alien species:	nce of the	following f	actors in	combattir	ng
		Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important	I don't know / no opinion
	rledge and research on effective of methods	•	0	0	0	0
Availa	ability of funding for control	0	•	0	0	0
desig	cities of public authorities to n, implement and enforce of measures	0	•	©	0	0
Know	rledge and skills of private actors	0	•	0	0	0
						19

4.7. The rapid eradication at an early stage of invasion

4.8. The management of widely spread invasive alien species

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

I don't know / no opinion

Poorly

Fully

Partially

Not at all

Poorly

economy?

Fully

Engagement of key sectors in efforts to limit intentional introductions of invasive alien species into the environment (e.g. pet trade, horticulture and forestry)	©	•	©	©	©
Public awareness	0	•	0	0	0

## Other, please specify

25	50 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	I 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	0
Common fisheries policy	0	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	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	•

## 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?

45	0 character(s) maximum
9.	Is there anything else you would like to add?
10	000 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

## 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 impa

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 e s i l i e 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">https://ec.europa.eu/environment/eu-nature-restoration-targets</a> en.

## 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
Tend to disagree
Completely disagree
Don't know / no opinion
1.3. The responsibilities of key actors to implement the target were not clear
Fully agree
Tend to agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Tend to disagree
Completely disagree
Don't know / no opinion
1.4. There was no implementation obligation: the target was voluntary
Fully agree
Tend to agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Tend to disagree

Completely disagree

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
	Tend to disagree
0	Completely disagree
0	Don't know / no opinion
1.6.	Knowledge and skills were insufficient to carry out restoration actions
0	Fully agree
0	Tend to agree
0	Neither agree nor disagree
0	Tend to disagree
0	Completely disagree
0	Don't know / no opinion
1.7.	Conflicting land use interests were not tackled successfully
0	Fully agree
0	Tend to agree
0	Neither agree nor disagree
0	Tend to disagree
0	Completely disagree
0	Don't know / no opinion
2. Ir	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
ecos	systems
0	Fully agree
0	Tend to agree
0	Neither agree nor disagree
0	Tend to disagree
0	Totally disagree
0	I don't know / no opinion

	Provide better guidance to help Member States develop restoration
plan	s and strategies
0	Fully agree
0	Tend to agree
0	Neither agree nor disagree
0	Tend to disagree
	Totally disagree
	I don't know / no opinion
2.3.	Promote better use of existing EU funding opportunities for restoration
0	Fully agree
0	Tend to agree
0	Neither agree nor disagree
0	Tend to disagree
0	Totally disagree
0	I don't know / no opinion
2.4.	Promote the development of economic incentives and business
	•
	ortunities related to ecosystem restoration and sustainable management
0	ortunities related to ecosystem restoration and sustainable management Fully agree
0	ortunities related to ecosystem restoration and sustainable management Fully agree Tend to agree
0	Fully agree Tend to agree Neither agree nor disagree
0	ortunities related to ecosystem restoration and sustainable management Fully agree Tend to agree
0	Fully agree Tend to agree Neither agree nor disagree Tend to disagree Tend to disagree Totally disagree
0	Fully agree Tend to agree Neither agree nor disagree Tend to disagree
0	Fully agree Tend to agree Neither agree nor disagree Tend to disagree Tend to disagree Totally disagree
	Tend to agree Neither agree nor disagree Tend to disagree Totally disagree I don't know / no opinion
	Tend to agree Neither agree nor disagree Tend to disagree Totally disagree I don't know / no opinion  Support stakeholder training and awareness raising on restoration
	Tend to agree Neither agree nor disagree Tend to disagree Totally disagree I don't know / no opinion  Support stakeholder training and awareness raising on restoration Fully agree
	Tend to agree  Tend to disagree  Tend to disagree  Totally disagree  I don't know / no opinion  Support stakeholder training and awareness raising on restoration  Fully agree  Tend to agree
	Tend to agree Neither agree nor disagree Totally disagree I don't know / no opinion  Support stakeholder training and awareness raising on restoration Fully agree Tend to agree Neither agree nor disagree
	Tend to agree Tend to disagree Totally disagree I don't know / no opinion  Support stakeholder training and awareness raising on restoration Fully agree Tend to agree Tend to agree Tend to disagree Tend to disagree Tend to agree Tend to disagree Tend to disagree

2.6. Strengthen and expand the monitoring of the condition of ecosystems

and the services they provide across the EU

(	Deither agree nor disagree					
(	Tend to disagree					
(	Totally disagree					
(	I don't know / no opinion					
2.7	. Support research and innovation	on to str	engthen tl	he know	vledge b	ase on
res	toration					
(	Fully agree					
(	Tend to agree					
(	Deither agree nor disagree					
(	Tend to disagree					
(	Totally disagree					
(	I don't know / no opinion					
2.8	. Encourage cooperation with the	e EU's n	eighbouri	ng coui	ntries to	restore
cro	ss-border ecosystems					
(	Fully agree					
(	Tend to agree					
(	Deither agree nor disagree					
(	Tend to disagree					
(	Totally disagree					
(	I don't know / no opinion					
2.9	. Other- please specify					
<i>15</i>	0 character(s) maximum					
3. for	To what extent should the follow restoration?	ing crite	eria guide i	the sett	ing of p	riorities
					Not at	No
	Ecological effectiveness: restoration will contribute to:	High priority	Moderate priority	Low priority	all priority	opinion/ I don't know
	Improving the health of ecosystems, habitats	0	0	0	0	0

Fully agree

Tend to agree

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	0
Benefits to society: restoration will contribute to the provision of the following ecosystem services:	0	0	0	0	0
- climate change mitigation, including carbon sequestration	0	0	0	0	0
- climate change adaptation	0	0	0	0	0
- disaster risk reduction (such as protection from floods and storms)	0	0	0	0	0
- water purification	0	0	0	0	0
- water quantity regulation	0	0	0	0	0
- air quality regulation	0	0	0	0	0
- nutrient cycling	0	0	0	0	0
- soil fertility	0	0	0	0	0
- gene pool maintenance	0	0	0	0	0
- pollination	0	0	0	0	0
- pest and disease control	0	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	0
- multi-functionality, i.e. the capacity of healthy ecosystems to deliver a wide range of ecosystem services	0	0	0	0	0
- Other services	0	0	0	0	0
Cost-effectiveness of the restoration measures	0	0	0	0	0
Other criteria	0	0	0	0	0

**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
Specific EU level targets per ecosystem or habitat
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
Urban ecosystems, such as urban green areas and brownfields	0	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	0
Forest ecosystems including natural, seminatural forests and plantations	0	0	0	0	0
Heathlands and shrublands	0	0	0	0	0
Sparsely vegetated lands, such as rocky areas in mountains, beaches and dunes	0	0	0	0	0
Inland wetlands, such as marshes, peatlands, wet grasslands, fluvial forests, riparian areas and floodplains	0	0	0	0	0
Soil ecosystems (across urban, agricultural, forest and other terrestrial ecosystems)	0	0	0	0	0
Freshwater ecosystems, such as rivers and lakes	0	0	0	0	0
Marine ecosystems, such as coastal wetlands, nursery habitats, shallow biogenic constructions and deep water corals	0	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?

contributions, taking into account national characteristics
contributions, taking into account national onal actions is
Very important
Somewhat important
Not at all important
I don't know / no opinion
6.2. Require Member States to establish national restoration plans
Very important
Somewhat important
Not at all important
I don't know / no opinion
6.3. Put in place a comprehensive system to monitor, map and asses the
condition of ecosystems and the services they provide
Very important
Somewhat important
Not at all important
I don't know / no opinion
6.4. Put in place a mechanism for regular reporting on progress in meeting
the targets
Very important
Somewhat important
Not at all important
I don't know / no opinion
6.5. Raise public awareness about the benefits from restored nature
Very important
Somewhat important
Not at all important
I don't know / no opinion
6.6. Other - please specify
150 character(s) maximum

7. What measures are needed to ensure that restored ecosystems are kept in good condition in 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

## Contact

Rayka.HAUSER@ec.europa.eu