

Public consultation on the development of legally binding EU nature restoration targets (EU biodiversity policy initiatives)

A Eurelectric response paper

Eurelectric represents the interests of the electricity industry in Europe. Our work covers all major issues affecting our sector. Our members represent the electricity industry in over 30 European countries.

We cover the entire industry from electricity generation and markets to distribution networks and customer issues. We also have affiliates active on several other continents and business associates from a wide variety of sectors with a direct interest in the electricity industry.

We stand for

The vision of the European power sector is to enable and sustain:

- A vibrant competitive European economy, reliably powered by clean, carbon-neutral energy
- A smart, energy efficient and truly sustainable society for all citizens of Europe

We are committed to lead a cost-effective energy transition by:

investing in clean power generation and transition-enabling solutions, to reduce emissions and actively pursue efforts to become carbon-neutral well before mid-century, taking into account different starting points and commercial availability of key transition technologies;

transforming the energy system to make it more responsive, resilient and efficient. This includes increased use of renewable energy, digitalisation, demand side response and reinforcement of grids so they can function as platforms and enablers for customers, cities and communities;

accelerating the energy transition in other economic sectors by offering competitive electricity as a transformation tool for transport, heating and industry;

embedding sustainability in all parts of our value chain and take measures to support the transformation of existing assets towards a zero carbon society;

innovating to discover the cutting-edge business models and develop the breakthrough technologies that are indispensable to allow our industry to lead this transition.

Dépot légal : D/2021/12.105/16

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

Alexander

* Surname

Krenek

* Email (this won't be published)

akrenek@eurelectric.org

* Country of origin

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



Afghanistan



Djibouti



Libya



Saint Martin

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| ☐ Åland Islands | ☐ Dominica | ☐ Liechtenstein | ☐ Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| ☐ Albania | ☐ Dominican Republic | ☐ 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 | ☐ Solomon Islands |
| ☐ Bahamas | ☐ French Guiana | ☐ Mexico | ☐ Somalia |
| ☐ Bahrain | ☐ French Polynesia | ☐ Micronesia | ☐ South Africa |
| ☐ Bangladesh | ☐ French Southern and Antarctic Lands | ☐ Moldova | ☐ South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands |
| ☐ Barbados | ☐ Gabon | ☐ Monaco | ☐ South Korea |
| ☐ Belarus | ☐ Georgia | ☐ Mongolia | ☐ South Sudan |
| ☒ Belgium | ☐ Germany | ☐ Montenegro | ☐ Spain |
| ☐ Belize | ☐ Ghana | ☐ Montserrat | ☐ Sri Lanka |

- | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| ☐ Benin | ☐ Gibraltar | ☐ Morocco | ☐ Sudan |
| ☐ Bermuda | ☐ Greece | ☐ Mozambique | ☐ Suriname |
| ☐ Bhutan | ☐ Greenland | ☐ Myanmar | ☐ Svalbard and Jan Mayen |
| | | /Burma | |
| ☐ Bolivia | ☐ Grenada | ☐ Namibia | ☐ Sweden |
| ☐ Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba | ☐ Guadeloupe | ☐ Nauru | ☐ Switzerland |
| ☐ Bosnia and Herzegovina | ☐ Guam | ☐ Nepal | ☐ Syria |
| ☐ Botswana | ☐ Guatemala | ☐ Netherlands | ☐ Taiwan |
| ☐ Bouvet Island | ☐ Guernsey | ☐ New Caledonia | ☐ Tajikistan |
| ☐ Brazil | ☐ Guinea | ☐ New Zealand | ☐ Tanzania |
| ☐ British Indian Ocean Territory | ☐ Guinea-Bissau | ☐ Nicaragua | ☐ Thailand |
| ☐ British Virgin Islands | ☐ 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 | ☐ Northern Mariana Islands | ☐ Tonga |
| ☐ Cambodia | ☐ Hungary | ☐ North Korea | ☐ Trinidad and Tobago |
| ☐ Cameroon | ☐ Iceland | ☐ North Macedonia | ☐ 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 | ☐ Israel | ☐ Papua New Guinea | ☐ United Arab Emirates |
| ☐ Christmas Island | ☐ Italy | ☐ Paraguay | ☐ United Kingdom |
| ☐ Clipperton | ☐ Jamaica | ☐ Peru | ☐ United States |
| ☐ Cocos (Keeling) Islands | ☐ Japan | ☐ Philippines | ☐ United States Minor Outlying Islands |
| ☐ Colombia | ☐ Jersey | ☐ Pitcairn Islands | ☐ Uruguay |
| ☐ Comoros | ☐ Jordan | ☐ Poland | ☐ US Virgin Islands |
| ☐ Congo | ☐ Kazakhstan | ☐ Portugal | ☐ Uzbekistan |
| ☐ Cook Islands | ☐ Kenya | ☐ Puerto Rico | ☐ Vanuatu |
| ☐ Costa Rica | ☐ Kiribati | ☐ Qatar | ☐ Vatican City |
| ☐ Côte d'Ivoire | ☐ Kosovo | ☐ Réunion | ☐ Venezuela |
| ☐ Croatia | ☐ Kuwait | ☐ Romania | ☐ Vietnam |
| ☐ Cuba | ☐ Kyrgyzstan | ☐ Russia | ☐ Wallis and Futuna |
| ☐ Curaçao | ☐ Laos | ☐ Rwanda | ☐ Western Sahara |
| ☐ Cyprus | ☐ Latvia | ☐ Saint Barthélemy | ☐ Yemen |
| ☐ Czechia | ☐ Lebanon | ☐ Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha | ☐ Zambia |
| ☐ Democratic Republic of the Congo | ☐ Lesotho | ☐ Saint Kitts and Nevis | ☐ Zimbabwe |
| ☐ Denmark | ☐ Liberia | ☐ Saint Lucia | |

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Eurelectric

* 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.

4271427696-87

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	☐	☐	☐	☐
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	☐	☐	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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

250 character(s) maximum

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

250 character(s) maximum

4. Have you identified, since 2011, significant impacts on your sector, field of activity or living area that have resulted from the implementation of the strategy?

- ☐ Yes – positive
- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes – negative
- ☐ I don't know / no opinion

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

	Fully	Partially	Poorly	Not at all	I don't know / no opinion
Target 1. Fully implement the EU Birds and Habitats 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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Business and industry	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Circular economy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Climate action	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Common agricultural policy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Common fisheries policy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Development cooperation and external action	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Disaster risk reduction and management	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Education and training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Forest Strategy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Integrated maritime policy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Investment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Marine	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Public health	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Regional policy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Research and innovation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Trade	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Water	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
A strategic approach to biodiversity protection and restoration across the EU	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cross-border cooperation on biodiversity protection and restoration	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Integration of biodiversity in other EU policies and in related EU funding instruments	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cooperation and learning on biodiversity among the Member States	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cooperation and learning on biodiversity between the EU and third countries.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Regular progress review and strengthening of efforts if needed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Coordinated efforts at all levels (sub-national, national, EU and global)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Effective use of EU funding opportunities for biodiversity in the Member States	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Effective engagement of stakeholders in the design and implementation of EU biodiversity policy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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

Please explain if necessary

450 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 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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Availability of funding for control	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Capacities of public authorities to design, implement and enforce control measures	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Knowledge and skills of private actors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Business and industry	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Climate action	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Common agricultural policy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Common fisheries policy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Education and training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Energy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
External action and development cooperation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Disaster risk reduction and management	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Forest strategy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Integrated maritime policy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Investment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Marine	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Plant health legislation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Public health	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Regional policy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Research and innovation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Trade	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Transport	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Water	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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

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 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 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

150 character(s) maximum

develop a coherent framework/common methodologies to define/map degraded ecosystems: prerequ. to compare different types of measures for restoration.

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	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Improving the connectivity of natural areas (ecological corridors including migration routes)	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Improving the resilience of ecosystems to climate change	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Benefits to society: restoration will contribute to the provision of the following ecosystem services:	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
- climate change mitigation, including carbon sequestration	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

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

Please specify

250 character(s) maximum

The 'water quantity regulation criteria' is of low priority in the context of biodiversity policy as it is largely managed in the context of the Water Framework Directive (WFD).

Please specify

250 character(s) maximum

All decisions should be based on cost-benefit assessments, take into account potential conflicts with or quantified negative effects on other uses or activities and be in line with the WFD, including the concept of Heavily Modified Water Bodies.

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

Please specify

300 character(s) maximum

For a start, it may be seen as preferable to use one EU Level restoration target across all ecosystems. However, specific targets for certain ecosystems or groups of species could also be worked on and maybe found more appropriate in the future.

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	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
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	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Forest ecosystems including natural, semi-natural forests and plantations	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Heathlands and shrublands	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Sparsely vegetated lands , such as rocky areas in mountains, beaches and dunes	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Inland wetlands , such as marshes, peatlands, wet grasslands, fluvial forests, riparian areas and floodplains	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Soil ecosystems (across urban, agricultural, forest and other terrestrial ecosystems)	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Freshwater ecosystems , such as rivers and lakes	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Marine ecosystems , such as coastal wetlands, nursery habitats, shallow biogenic constructions and deep water corals	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Other	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please specify

250 character(s) maximum

No new initiative shall conflict with the Water Framework Directive, especially the concept of Heavily Modified Water Bodies and periodically revised River Basin Management Plans

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

Increase interdisciplinary research including 'human health'. Develop common methodologies for profound cost-benefit assessments.

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

Ad 7.3.: define “certain” and if/what shall be prohibited in protected areas – both information needed to answer

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

1000 character(s) maximum

Our sector's aim is carbon-neutrality by 2045 and the EU needs more sustainably sourced energy to fight against climate change and biodiversity loss. We are in favor of setting a binding overall restoration target at EU level. However, there should be no binding national targets. National restoration plans should outline how MS can contribute to the overall EU target, taking into consideration national specificities, such as the prevalence of N2000 sites. A reconsideration of allowed activities in N2000 sites is necessary and should be based on empirical analysis of the impacts of RES technologies instead of the currently applied “prohibition basis”. The new regulation should be aligned with existing EU legislation like the Birds and Habitats Directive, Floods Directive, Marine Strategy Directive and Water Framework Directive. In line with the Climate Law proposal and the Adaptation Strategy, mitigation & adaption should be considered ‘high priority’ when setting restoration targets.

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

Eurelectric pursues in all its activities the application of the following sustainable development values:

Economic Development

- Growth, added-value, efficiency

Environmental Leadership

- Commitment, innovation, pro-activeness

Social Responsibility

- Transparency, ethics, accountability



Union of the Electricity Industry - Eurelectric aisbl
Boulevard de l'Impératrice, 66 – bte 2 - 1000 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: + 32 2 515 10 00 - VAT: BE 0462 679 112 • www.eurelectric.org
EU Transparency Register number: [4271427696-87](https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/?s=details&id=4271427696-87)