

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

* Language of my contribution

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

- Finnish
- French
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Irish
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

* I am 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

Please 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

* First name

The Green Tank

* Surname

The Green Tank

* Email (this won't be published)

info@thegreentank.gr

* Country of origin

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

- Afghanistan
- Djibouti
- Libya
- Saint Martin

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

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

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

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

The Green Tank

* 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 [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

396314833858-72

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. **For 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 [EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020](#) (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 [evaluation of the Strategy](#), 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	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 2. Maintain and restore ecosystems and their services	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 3. Increase the contribution of agriculture and forestry to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 4. Ensure the sustainable use of fisheries resources and marine ecosystems	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 5. Combat invasive alien species	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 6. Help avert global biodiversity loss	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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?

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

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	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 2. Maintain and restore ecosystems and their services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 3. Increase the contribution of agriculture and forestry to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 4. Ensure the sustainable use of fisheries resources and marine ecosystems	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 5. Combat invasive alien species	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 6. Help avert global biodiversity loss	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

250 character(s) maximum

Successful completion of B&H Directives Fitness Check
 Adoption of new Action Plan
 Significant increase of Natura 2000 sites and area coverage
 Improved conservation status, recovery of some species (e.g. carnivores)
 Progress relating to MAES

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

250 character(s) maximum

Weak implementation of B&H Directives
 Lack of restoration (e.g. Green Infrastructure Strategy not implemented)
 Biodiversity not mainstreamed (e.g. CAP not reformed) & sustainable practices not promoted
 Inadequate dedicated biodiversity financing

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

Please elaborate

300 character(s) maximum

The EU Strategy influenced the development of Greece's national biodiversity strategy (2014) & the National Forest Strategy (2018)
 Compliance with the BH Directive was greater when the EC initiates pilot or infringement cases, i.e. when implementation of the Directives is a priority (Target 1)

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 Directives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Target 2. Maintain and restore ecosystems and their services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 3. Increase the contribution of agriculture and forestry to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 4. Ensure the sustainable use of fisheries resources and marine ecosystems	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 5. Combat invasive alien species	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 6. Help avert global biodiversity loss	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Banking and finance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Business and industry	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Chemicals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Circular economy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Climate action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Common agricultural policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Common fisheries policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Development cooperation and external action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Disaster risk reduction and management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Education and training	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Energy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Forest Strategy	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Integrated maritime policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Investment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Marine	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regional policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research and innovation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Trade	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Transport	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Water	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Business and industry	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Circular economy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Climate action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Common agricultural policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Common fisheries policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Development cooperation and external action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Disaster risk reduction and management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Education and training	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Forest Strategy	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Integrated maritime policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Investment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Marine	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public health	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regional policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research and innovation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Trade	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Water	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

- Fully
- 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

200 character(s) maximum

Greater emphasis on nature restoration and mainstreaming of biodiversity across sectors, seeking binding commitments for the sustainable transformation of specific sectors

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

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

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
- No
- I don't know / no opinion

11. The EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 established a [common implementation framework](#) 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	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regular progress review and strengthening of efforts if needed	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Coordinated efforts at all levels (sub-national, national, EU and global)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Effective use of EU funding opportunities for biodiversity in the Member States	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Effective engagement of stakeholders in the design and implementation of EU biodiversity policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public access to information on the state of biodiversity and on the key drivers of biodiversity loss in the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Contribution of research and knowledge to the implementation and monitoring of biodiversity targets	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Building the capacities of national and sub-national actors for biodiversity action	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain if necessary

450 character(s) maximum

One of the main weaknesses is the lack of coordination among various levels (local, national, EU and global) without common monitoring and metrics, despite overall progress in available knowledge.

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 Directives	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 2. Maintain and restore ecosystems and their services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 3. Increase the contribution of agriculture and forestry to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 4. Ensure the sustainable use of fisheries resources and marine ecosystems	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 5. Combat invasive alien species	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Target 6. Help avert global biodiversity loss	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please indicate any major gaps of the monitoring framework:

450 character(s) maximum

One of the main weaknesses is the lack of coordination among various levels (local, national, EU and global) without common monitoring and metrics, despite overall progress in available knowledge.

13. Other comments

Is there anything else you would like to add?

1000 character(s) maximum

We think it would be advantageous to consider the assessment of the progress of implementation of the Greek national biodiversity strategy that the Green Tank completed in late 2020. The report (available here: <https://thegreentank.gr/en/2020/12/09/greece-biodiversity-strategy-assessment/>) highlights the links between the EU and the national biodiversity strategy and its implementation. There is no doubt that the national policy is influenced heavily by the EU policy across biomes, threats and responses. In this context it would be beneficial to consider greater effort across the EU Member States in order to coordinate the EU's policy and to consider joint contributions to the global biodiversity conservation effort.

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 [EU Regulation on Invasive Alien Species](#) 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 Strategy to 2020.

A summary of our findings from the consultation will be published [here](#) 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
- Moderately familiar
- Slightly familiar
- Not at all familiar

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

4.2. The restrictions on importing and selling the listed species

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

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

4.7. The rapid eradication at an early stage of invasion

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

4.8. The management of widely spread invasive alien species

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

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 economy?

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

6. Please assess the importance of the following factors in combatting invasive alien species:

	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important	I don't know / no opinion

Knowledge and research on effective control methods	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Availability of funding for control	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Capacities of public authorities to design, implement and enforce control measures	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Knowledge and skills of private actors	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Engagement of key sectors in efforts to limit intentional introductions of invasive alien species into the environment (e.g. pet trade, horticulture and forestry)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public awareness	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other, please specify

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	I don't know / no opinion
Animal health legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Business and industry	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Climate action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Common agricultural policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Common fisheries policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Education and training	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Energy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
External action and development cooperation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disaster risk reduction and management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Forest strategy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Integrated maritime policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Investment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Marine	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Plant health legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public health	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regional policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research and innovation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Trade	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transport	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Water	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

Ensure the elaboration of national IAS lists
 Introduce common rules and protocols on management and eradication
 Ensure greater emphasis on prevention
 Encourage networking among relevant authorities (the example of the INVALIDIS Interreg project stands out, as it provided for the first time networking and exchange of information opportunities through the Greek regional meetings)
 Great emphasis on training and awareness raising activities

9. 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

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 [EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030](#) 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, **binding 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 natural disasters.

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 resilient.

To date, the efforts to restore ecosystems in the EU have been [insufficient](#). In 2011, a key voluntary target of the [EU 2020 Biodiversity Strategy](#) was to restore at least 15% of degraded ecosystems by 2020. This voluntary target [has not been met](#), 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 [Birds](#) and [Habitats](#) Directives, the [Water Framework Directive](#), the [Floods Directive](#) and the [Marine Strategy Framework Directive](#), 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 [Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystems and their Services](#) initiative has made methodological progress in this respect, but there are still significant data gaps.

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 [prioritised action frameworks](#)) there are no clear links between restoration

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 https://ec.europa.eu/environment/eu-nature-restoration-targets_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

- Fully agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- 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
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Totally disagree
- I don't know / no opinion

2.4. Promote the development of economic incentives and business opportunities related to ecosystem restoration and sustainable management

- Fully agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Totally disagree
- I don't know / no opinion

2.5. Support stakeholder training and awareness raising on restoration

- Fully agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Totally disagree
- 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
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Totally disagree
- I don't know / no opinion

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

- Fully agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Totally disagree
- I don't know / no opinion

2.8. Encourage cooperation with the EU's neighbouring countries to restore cross-border ecosystems

- Fully agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Totally disagree
- I don't know / no opinion

2.9. Other- please specify

3. To what extent should the following criteria guide the setting of priorities for restoration?

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	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improving the connectivity of natural areas (ecological corridors including migration routes)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improving the resilience of ecosystems to climate change	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Benefits to society: restoration will contribute to the provision of the following ecosystem services:	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
- climate change mitigation, including carbon sequestration	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
- climate change adaptation	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
- disaster risk reduction (such as protection from floods and storms)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
- water purification	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
- water quantity regulation	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
- air quality regulation	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
- nutrient cycling	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
- soil fertility	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
- gene pool maintenance	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
- pollination	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
- pest and disease control	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
- fish stock maintenance	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
- human health and well-being benefits from interaction with nature	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- multi-functionality, i.e. the capacity of healthy ecosystems to deliver a wide range of ecosystem services	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
- Other services	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cost-effectiveness of the restoration measures	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other criteria	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please specify

250 character(s) maximum

Restoration priorities must be set based on a holistic approach that will result in ecological effectiveness and the provisions of benefits for society. Choosing among those benefits would lead to misguided priorities and ad hoc approaches.

Please specify

250 character(s) maximum

We have assessed as top priority all criteria, because if ecosystem restoration is secured, then multiple benefits will be also attained. If one service is given priority there is a risk for the quality of the ecosystem restoration.

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	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
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	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Forest ecosystems including natural, semi-natural forests and plantations	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Heathlands and shrublands	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sparsely vegetated lands , such as rocky areas in mountains, beaches and dunes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Inland wetlands , such as marshes, peatlands, wet grasslands, fluvial forests, riparian areas and floodplains	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Soil ecosystems (across urban, agricultural, forest and other terrestrial ecosystems)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Freshwater ecosystems , such as rivers and lakes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Marine ecosystems , such as coastal wetlands, nursery habitats, shallow biogenic constructions and deep water corals	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please specify

250 character(s) maximum

Creating pilot cases of varied restored ecosystems, including in urban and semi-urban, areas, monitoring their benefits and measuring the impact can create a needed momentum for ecosystem restoration.

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
- 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 assess 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

The restoration framework although legal binding must allow for dynamic evolution, iteration of restoration plans and progressive targets.

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 - *please specify*

300 character(s) maximum

Increasing connectivity among established protected areas can be helpful in ensuring long-term impact. Monitoring the multi-faceted impact - also in economic terms - of ecosystem restoration can support the maintenance of ecosystems in good conditions in the long term.

8. Is there anything else you would like to add?

1000 character(s) maximum

The Climate and Energy National Plans that, based on a common format establish a commitment towards a joint EU target, which is revised based on scientific evidence create a binding yet dynamic framework. NECPs guide policy and financing priorities and provide signals to investors. They are formally reviewed and stakeholders are being consulted during their preparation. NECPs and their revisions are necessarily taken into account in the planning of EU funded programmes and as such have multiple influence across policies. The NECP governance structure with the lessons learned from its implementation can offer useful guidance for the development of the EU's legally binding Restoration Framework, integrating the concept of iterative and progressive targets in its approach and governance. While emphasizing the need for urgent action in nature restoration, such an approach could allow for learning and mobilization towards greater ambition, once the restoration process has been initiated.

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