Guidelines and template for the review of the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

## Background

1. The second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group[[1]](#footnote-1) on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework invited the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at its twenty-fourth meeting to, among other things, carry out a scientific and technical review of the updated goals and targets, and related indicators and baselines, of the draft global biodiversity framework. Under agenda item 3 the Subsidiary Body will consider this issue.
2. Tables 1 and 2, presents a draft monitoring framework for the 2050 Goals and the 2030 targets respectively. These tables are being made available for the purposes of peer review. In both tables’ interim formulations of the proposed 2050 goals and milestones and the 2030 targets are provided for context. Review comments are not being sought on these parts of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework at this time. Column A of the tables provides draft components of the goals and targets. Columns B and C of the tables provide draft monitoring elements and indicators to be used at the global level to monitor progress in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Further column D provides information on the period baseline data is available for the indicator and on the frequency that the indicator is updated where known. Review comments are being sought on columns A, B, C and D only.

## II. Submitting Comments

1. To ensure that your comments are given due consideration, please send them by e-mail to [secretariat@cbd.int](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int), at your earliest convenience but no later than 25 July 2020
2. When submitting comments, please adhere to the following guidelines as much as possible:
   1. Please provide all comments in writing and in an MS Word or similar document format using the table provided below.
   2. Please provide full contact information for the individual/Government/organization submitting the comments.
   3. Please avoid commenting on issues related to grammar, spelling, or punctuation, unless it affects the overall meaning of the text, as the document will be edited as the final draft is prepared.
   4. To facilitate the revision process please be as specific as possible in your comments. In areas where you feel additional or alternative text or information is required, please suggest, if possible, what this text may look like or what should be included.
   5. If you refer to additional sources of information, please include these with your comments when possible or provide a complete reference or hyperlink.
   6. Please focus your comments on columns A (components the draft goals and targets), B (monitoring elements), C (indicators) and D (indicator baseline year and frequency of updates) of tables 1 and 2.
   7. If you are suggestion the inclusion of additional indicators please provide information on if the indicator is currently operational, the organization supporting its development, its baseline (i.e. the year data is first available) and how frequently the indicator is updated (i.e. monthly, yearly, every two years etc.).
   8. All review comments will be posted on the webpage for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in the interests of transparency
3. Should you have any questions regarding the review process, please contact [secretariat@cbd.int](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int).

III. Template for Comments

1. Please use the review template below when providing comments.
2. The complete draft of the monitoring framework has been released in a portable document format (PDF). For tables 1, 2 and 3 column letters and row numbers have been provided as well as page numbers. Please use these as a reference as illustrated in the table below. General comments can be included in the table by referring to Page 0 and Line 0.

TEMPLATE FOR COMMENTS

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Review comments on the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework | | | | |
| Contact information | | | | |
| Surname: | | | | Benítez Díaz |
| Given Name: | | | | Hesiquio |
| Government (if applicable): | | | | MEXICO |
| Organization: | | | | CONABIO |
| Address: | | | | Liga Periférico-Insurgentes sur 4903, piso 2  14010. Ciudad de México |
| City: | | | | Mexico City |
| Country: | | | | MEXICO |
| E-mail: | | | | [dgcii@conabio.gob.mx](mailto:dgcii@conabio.gob.mx) |
| General Comments | | | | |
| This technical and scientific analysis aims to contribute potential elements and indicators to monitor the current draft of goals and targets of the Post-2020 Framework, which is still under negotiation and will not be adopted until the Conference of the Parties. This implies future work before a final definition on the monitoring framework can be adopted. | | | | |
| While we understand the logic behind only including indicators which are currently operational at the global level, we suggest to also consider the need to develop new indicators to fill some critical gaps. In those cases, we suggest analyzing the feasibility of following a similar scheme to the IAEG-SDG indicators, classifying the indicators in 3 tiers.  <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/iaeg-sdgs/>. However, it is important to bear in mind that if this approach is to be considered, a plan to address tier 3 indicators in a timely manner should be developed to avoid an absence of monitoring and evaluation and a void in data for certain targets throughout the implementation period. | | | | |
| Bear in mind: disaggregation of data in indicators, as appropriate, to make the framework inclusive with relevant stakeholders such as women, youth, IPLC and sub national governments. | | | | |
| For Table 1, elements and indicators for goals should have a higher level in comparison to Table 2 for targets. | | | | |
| Homogenize the use of terms such as change vs trends: use trends in column B and number-proportion-change in column C. | | | | |
| There are over 150 indicators, the great majority inform only one element of a target or goal (not as a whole). This will make very hard to agree and adopt a relatively small set of indicators for all countries to inform on them. It would be desirable to have a pre-selection of indicators, that could be adopted as HEADLINE INDICATORS. | | | | |
| For Tables 1 and 2 add a column with information on whether the data is available at national level, and the current country coverage of the data. It is also suggested to add a column with the source of the data (UNEP-WCMC has done this already) so that the information provided on the proposed indicators can be easily checked and made more user-friendly for the Parties. | | | | |
| For all the indicators that are also SDG indicators, it would be very useful to add information on whether these are currently classified as Tier I, Tier II or Tier III. The latest information on SDG Tier classification is available here (17 April, 2020): https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/Tier%20Classification%20of%20SDG%20Indicators\_17%20April% 202020\_web.pdf  Please note that an SDG indicator that is classified as Tier I effectively implies that it meets the headline indicator criteria – Tier I means data are regularly produced by countries for at least 50 per cent of the countries and of the population in every region where the indicator is relevant. This means that data is available in a consistent and comparable way across many countries. The data can therefore be added up, to determine whether countries are on track to meet the post-2020 global biodiversity (goals) and targets. | | | | |
| For Table 3, it is proposed to add a column to indicate which of the indicators are state indicators, pressure indicators, or response indicators. This will help to determine the relative balance of indicators proposed across the goals and targets of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It is important to have a good balance of different types of P-S-R indicators (this is related to the theory of change). | | | | |
| Some indicators, such as SDG 15.3.1 and 15.1.1, are used for more than one component. It is understandable this is a pragmatic approach to make the most of limited information. But how valuable and valid is it to use the same information with different interpretations? For example, indicator 15.3.1 is used for restoration, connectivity, trends in sustainable agriculture, fragmentation, and change of dry and sub-humid lands. Particularly, this indicator does not seem feasible for measuring sustainable agriculture. | | | | |
|  | | | | |
| Specific Comments | | | | |
| Table | Page | Column letter | Row number | Comment |
| 1 | 2 | B | 16 | Add a monitoring element related to the “trends in selected ecosystem services quality” such as water and soil quality. |
| 1 | 2 | B | 16 | This indicator may not me adequate for this target since the relation between ecosystem integrity and trends in farmland biodiversity and sustainability of agricultural land is not clear. Needs clarification. |
| 1 | 2 | B | 1-14 | All B for A1 needs balance between the number of terrestrial and marine monitoring elements as in A2, currently is biased to marine ones.  Table 1 does not include specific indicators for ocean ecosystems. And the coastal indicators are only related to the coastline and not to the continental shelf area.  Table 2. There is an overconfidence in the red list and the MSC, despite the fact that there are other ways to assess the progress of conservation and certification of fisheries. |
| 1 | 2 | C | 2 | Indicator for tree cover loss should be TREE COVER CHANGE since could be Positive (increase) or Negative (loss)  Note that “Change in the extent of water related ecosystems over time (SDG indicator 6.6.1)” goes beyond mangroves. |
| 1 | 2 | C | 7 | Trends in mangrove extent should be CHANGE in Mangrove extent. |
| 1 | 2 | C | 8 | Live coral cover Should be LIVE CORAL COVER CHANGE. could be increase (positive) or loss (negative) |
| 1 | 2 | B-C | 8 | There are no monitoring elements nor indicators for ecological integrity (terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems). Global information and indicators can be used from the UNLAB (<https://unbiodiversitylab.org/>), linked to ecological integrity like degradation within ecoregion, rate of loss within ecoregions 1993 – 2009, rate of forest loss 2000-2017, etc. There are other references about global indexes for ecological integrity based on remote sensing data available on Ecological Integrity in Science and Law (Springer, 2020), human footprint trends (for terrestrial ecosystems) and the UICN guidelines for conserving connectivity |
| 1 | 2 | C | 10 | Global seagrass extent should be treated with two elements as in Corals. |
| 1 | 2 | B | 11-13 | A monitoring element related with oceanic waters should be included, for example: Trends in oceanic ecosystems. With an indicator: Cumulative human impacts on oceanic ecosystems (consider fishing, marine transit, mining, etc.). |
| 1 | 2 | A | 15 | Is there consensus within the CBD on what “integrity” means and how this will be translated into specific indicators? |
| 1 | 2 | A2 | 15 | Seems that Ecosystem integrity and connectivity have been measured based on fragmentation and ecosystem quality for different vegetation types or ecosystems with the exception of agricultural lands (maybe as a key driver of habitat change). If this is the case, similar monitoring elements should be included for other habitat loss drivers such as: mining, energy, infrastructure and urban areas. |
| 1 | 2 | B | 16 | This indicator may not be adequate for this target since the relation between ecosystem integrity and trends in farmland biodiversity and sustainability of agricultural land is not clear. Needs clarification. |
| 1 | 3 | A3 | 29 | Include an indicator on the number and % of endangered species under recovery programs and effectiveness. |
| 1 | 3 | B-C | 29 | In the UNLAB there are geo data bases regarding species richness, threatened species richness, and, critically threatened species richness, that can be used like monitoring elements for A3 component. |
| 1 | 3 | C | 29 | The indicator focuses only on birds and mammals, while it should be broader and cover all species extinction. |
| 1 | 4 | B | 36 | Examples of genetic indicators that could be used: expected heterozygosity, allelic richness, number of alleles, inbreeding coefficient, proportion admixture, fixation index, effective population size, effective number of breeders, migration rate.  Be more specific “diversity of sub species”. |
| 1 | 4 | C | 37 | Indicator needs to be clarified. |
| 1 | 4 | B | 37-39 | Consider Indicators of Genetic Diversity, Genetic Erosion and Genetic Vulnerability for Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (published by FAO). |
| 1 | 4 | C | Add after the row 38 | Add a new monitoring element for *in situ* conservation of plant and animal genetic resources for food and agriculture. For the indicators: GIAHS considered by FAO (<http://www.fao.org/giahs/es/>).  “Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems” (GIAHS) <http://www.fao.org/giahs/en> <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i6157e.pdf> |
| 1 | 4 | A | 42 | The term “critical ecosystems” should be clearly defined. The monitoring elements and indicators proposed do not mention the word “critical”. |
| 1 | 4 | B | 48 | Clarify which are the “areas of particular importance”. |
| 1 | 4 | C | 48 | Include Coverage of other effective area-based conservation measures and security that they have respected IPLC rights to the governance of their territories through adequate governance models (share governance or IP governance models) |
| 1 | 5-6 | A | 51-71 | For ecosystem services we suggest to use the classification used under CBD which includes: provisioning, regulating, cultural and supporting. |
| 1 | 5 | C | 54 | Red List Index (pollinating species) is not an adequate indicator. Assessing pollination service requires data and analysis of pollinators presence together with elements and conditions like dispersal of seeds and plant reproduction among others, analyzed on a case by case basis. |
| 1 | 5 | B | 55 | Consider monitoring elements such as acid rain, solid particles (ppm), soot index, and ozone. |
| 1 | 5 | C | 56 | Regulation of climate should not be limited to certified forest. There are more examples of terrestrial, coastal and marine ecosystems (including mangroves) contributing to climate change regulation, including blue carbon, that should be considered as indicators. |
| 1 | 5 | C | 56, 58 y 59 | Certified forest are very limited in relation to monitoring elements in B. Ecological Integrity Index can be broader and useful. |
| 1 | 5 | C | 58 | Indicator may not be appropriate. We suggest to use BOD and WQI indicators, as well as measures of sewage and wastewater from industrial and agricultural activities in rural and urban areas |
| 1 | 5 | C | 60 | We suggest to use indicators like points of harmful algal blooms and coastal eutrophication. |
| 1 | 5 | B | 62 | Amend B as follows: “Trends in regulation of hazards and extreme events attributed to healthy ecosystems”.  This indicator, as currently drafted, does not respond to the trend that is meant to be assessed. There is no direct correlation between the conservation and sustainable use of nature, and the number of deaths, missing and affected persons from disasters (in fact, depending on the type of disaster, it might not have any relation to hydrometeorological risks). |
| 1 | 6 | B | 63 | Needs clarification. |
| 1 | 6 | B | 64 | We suggest to amend B2 as follows: “Trends in provision of nature’s materials contributions to people resulting from conservation and sustainable use biodiversity". |
| 1 | 6 | B | 64-67 | The correlation between conservation and/or sustainable use efforts and the provision of material contributions that the indicators are attempting to measure is too weak, e.g. “Trends in the provision of energy supply from biological resources” respond to a myriad of factors that may not be clearly related with the goals of the Post-2020 GBF.  This could explain how good biological resources provide ecosystem services but no if there is any negative impact for biodiversity in providing this service.  Would an upward or downward trend be desirable here? Without any consideration of sustainability, an upward trend could be devastating for biodiversity. The same could be said for other monitoring elements and indicators under Goal B. OECD recommends a greater focus on “sustainable” use, not simply use and benefits from this use. |
| 1 | 6 | C | 65 | Agrobiodiversity index. |
| 1 | 6 | C | 65, 66, 67 | FAO has data and information about those topics and its indicators. |
| 1 | 6 | B | 66 | “materials and assistance from biodiversity” needs clarification. |
| 1 | 6 | B | 68-71 | Trends of linguistic diversity and numbers of speakers of indigenous languages (decision VII/30 and VIII/15) and traditional knowledge use should be explicitly added to monitoring element. |
| 1 | 6 | C | 68-71 | Index for linguistic (decision XIII/2) |
| 1 | 6 | C | 73 | Another indicator can be the number of biocultural protocols published as well as number of countries with laws that support the Nagoya Protocol. |
| 1 | 6 | C | 74 | Número de Certificados de Cumplimiento Internacionalmente Reconocidos (CCIR) / Convenios o contratos con distribución de beneficios.  Percent of products derived from genetic resources under ABS schemes.  Number of access made following the rules established in a community biocultural protocol. |
| 1 | 6 | C | 75 | Productos y derivados con Certificados de Cumplimiento Internacionalmente Reconocido (CCIR) / Registros en el ABS – CH  Number of experiences where the use of genetic resources promotes positive impacts on species conservation and sustainable use. |
| 1 | 6 | A | 76 | MAT within the Nagoya Protocol could provide information for an indicator on ABS. |
| 1 | 6 | C | 76 | Productos y derivados con Certificados de Cumplimiento Internacionalmente Reconocido (CCIR) / Evidencias de distribución monetaria y no monetaria de beneficios. |
| 1 | 6-7 | B | 78 | consider other means to reflect this through SEEA accounting, WAVES and through the inclusion of more countries into the BIOFIN initiative. |
| 1 | 6 | C | 78 | We suggest to include indicators at national level from BIOFIN methodology. |
| 1 | 7 | B | 79 | A qualitative indicator focusing on the adoption of regulatory mechanisms for biodiversity mainstreaming could be a better proxy to this matter. For example, the adoption of financial protocols, taxonomies, and regulations regarding mandatory disclosures for companies, banks and other financial institutions. |
| 1 | 7 | C | 79 | As suggested in the report Conservation Finance From Niche to Mainstream: The Building of an Institutional Asset Class (Credit Suisse, 2015, consultable at [www.credit-suisse.com](http://www.credit-suisse.com)), this could be measured through the number of investment vehicles used for conservation finance. |
| 1 | 7 | C | 81, 82 | While outdated, the UNDP publication Capacity Development: a UNDP Primer (2009, retrievable at <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/capacity-development-a-undp-primer.html>) provides a simple framework for measuring capacity development that can be used to evaluate the stability, performance and adaptability of capacity development activities. |
| 1 | 7 | B | 81-84 | Although it would be important, most of the times this is promoted through ODA and thus will be included in the indicator for row 77. Important to avoid duplication. |
| 1 | 7 | C | 84 | There are already some initiatives focused on scientific cooperation such as the Bio-Bridge initiative, that could be a source of information to measure progress on this issue. |
| 1 | 7 | B | 85 | What sort of technologies are we planning to monitor? Is there any previous information regarding this indicator? How it will be marked and differentiated from ODA?, needs clarification. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table | Page | Column letter | Row number | Comment |
| 2 | 10 | C | 29 | How was the 10% agreed? what is the rationale behind? Any cropland with 10% of natural vegetation would be considered as restored land? Meanwhile use % of restored land in croplands. This is a subset of the one in line 24 referring to terrestrial areas restored. |
| 2 | 10 | C | 30-34 | None of these indicators assess restoration or connectivity. Include Biological Corridors related indicators (vegetation & wildlife distribution, fragmentation, etc.). |
| 2 | 11 | C | 46 | How will effective management of protected areas will be reported? Other than IUCN Green List, there is not a homogeneous criterion and it is not feasible to run this methodology on all protected areas.  We should include a specific indicator on public finance for protected areas as a proxy to effective management. Countries should report on how they are funding PA conservation through time. |
| 2 | 12 | C | 54 | It doesn’t specify what tool would be used to measure this. It may be through trends in species categories listed in IUCN’s Red List of Threatened Species. Another indicator could be CITES species transferred from Appendix I to II. |
| 2 | 12 | A, B | 55 | What should be measured is the reduction of human-wildlife conflicts as a result of planned management actions, rather than isolated reduction of conflict (which alone may be a result of reduction of wildlife populations). Link the reduction to programs focused on awareness raising, capacity building of IPLC relating to their relation with these species, and/or sustainable use programs in place.  Change A to: “Reduced human-wildlife conflicts as result of awareness raising campaigns, capacity building and/or implementation of sustainable use programs”.  Change B to: “Trends in human-wildlife conflicts as result of awareness raising campaigns, capacity building and/or implementation of sustainable use programs”. |
| 2 | 12 | B | 55 | Needs a Monitoring Element: Trends in bycatch by oceanic fisheries. With the indicator: Percentage of threatened species in the catch. |
| 2 | 12 | C | 55 | There are good records of conflicts among humans and some species, such as crocodiles. The CrocBITE platform gathers records of conflicts around the world (http://www.crocodile-attack.info/).  As said, this trend by itself doesn't tell us much; It would be worth linking the trends observed in different places with the already mentioned above for A and B. |
| 2 | 12-13 | A | 56 | It should refer to wild species (as the Target refers to wild species particularly) as follows: “Wild species harvest is legal sustainable and safe for human health and biodiversity”. |
| 2 | 12-13 | C | 56 | The indicator for T4.1, "Proportion of traded wildlife that was poached or illicitly trafficked (SDG indicators 15.7.1 and 15.c.1)" does not refer to harvest, but to legal trade. We consider this indicator could better fit the component of T4.2. |
| 2 | 12-13 | B | 56 and 58 to 65 | All trends for Target 4 should refer to wild species (as does the Target), not to biological resources (which goes beyond wild species). For example; “Trends in proportion of wild species harvested legally”.  Modify B as follows "Trends in proportion of biological resources harvested within ~~established~~ sustainable harvest limits". |
| 2 | 13 | B | 59 | The indicator is redundant with the one in line 58, we suggest to merge them. |
| 2 | 13 | A | 61-63 | It should refer to wild species (as the Target refers to wild species particularly) as follows: “WILD SPECIES Trade is legal….” |
| 2 | 13 | C | 61 | CITES species, trends can be measured through WCMC’s trade database, using both registers of legal and illegal trade and their proportions by species (<https://trade.cites.org/>). |
| 2 | 13 | B | 62 | Better not to use "established limits / quotas". Many species have no established limits or quotas, and harvesting/trade permits are based on a case by case basis and the information available in that particular case.  It could be edited as follows: “Trends in proportion of wild species traded within sustainable levels”. |
| 2 | 13 | C | 62 | For T4.2 we also suggest using additional indicators. For CITES listed species, the trade data available in the UNEP-WCMC database (legal trade, illegal trade), and transference of species between CITES Appendix I and II, along with Trends in the IUCN red list of those species in trade, could be used as indicators. (NDFs in CITES context -if well formulated- are indicators of sustainability, but there are no international records referring to them and the way each country does them). |
| 2 | 13 | A | 64 | It should refer to wild species (as the Target refers to wild species particularly) as follows: “Use of WILD SPECIES is legal ….” |
| 2 | 14 | B | 66 | “measures in ensuring safe use of biodiversity” needs clarification. |
| 2 | 14 | B | 67 | Are there baselines on identification of pathways, to use the trends as a monitoring element? It is not clear how this can be measured, most countries have plant and animal health protection agencies, and thus their information can be used as input. However, many IAS are not necessarily monitored by these agencies, thus it might be a problem for many countries. Early warning systems and sanitary measures to avoid pests can be used too. |
| 2 | 14 | C | 69 | instead of trends use Number of invasive alien species introduction events to avoid duplication with column B. |
| 2 | 14 | C | 73 | This needs to be paired up against a list of vertebrate IAS present in certain areas, to then see the trend in reduction of vertebrate IAS. We suggest to include other eradications such as plants or invertebrates.  We also suggest to add a new indicator for non-vertebrate IAS.  We suggest a more precise phrasing: “Number (instead of trends) of eradications conducted” |
| 2 | 16 | C | 74 | Check data repository of IMO in relation to invasive aquatic species and ballast waters |
| 2 | 15 | C | 77 | The IUCN red List is a good tool, we could use also areas with IAS presence, Protected areas with IAS management plans per country, etc.. |
| 2 | 15-16 | A, B | 81-96 | Action on pollution is already governed by a range of existing conventions which should be referred to, in particular for developing or including indicators in relation to impacts to biodiversity and human health.  Heavy metals should be included and considered as they impact soils, water, impact human health and the environment. Include persistent organic pollutants (POPs) as a major polluter of biodiversity since their impacts are global and their transboundary movements affect terrestrial and marine species through direct harm and bioaccumulation in the food chain (Basel Stockholm, Rotterdam and Mercury Conventions) |
| 2 | 15 | B, C | 86 | There is a need to include impacts on biodiversity for defining these indicators and not to limit to “excess” of pesticides. How is “excess” determined? Needs clarification. |
| 2 | 16 | B | 88 | “Other biocides” should be defined and clarified. |
| 2 | 17 | C | 97 | There are data available from UNLab: carbon stores in the environment, carbon sequestration potential, and carbon stores in PA networks |
| 2 | 16-17 | C | 99 | There is no direct correlation between this indicator and the conservation and/or sustainable use of biodiversity. The number of countries that adopt and implement national disaster risk reduction strategies in no way reflects progress in the implementation of such measures, and could depend on a number of other unrelated factors.  Indicators should focus on how biodiversity conservation and sustainable use can contribute to climate change adaptation and mitigation within the scope of CBD. |
| 2 | 17-18 | A, B, C | 103-116 | As currently drafted, it is not clear how sustainable management of wild species of fauna and flora will **ensure** the nutrition, food security, livelihoods health and wellbeing of people.  We don’t believe it should be the intent of the target. Needs clarification. |
| 2 | 18 | C | 108 | About the indicator "MSC Certified Catch”, we have to consider that the MSC is not the only certification organization for sustainable fisheries, so this indicator might change to: the proportion of Certified Sustainable Catch. |
| 2 | 19 | C | Include instead or after the row 114 | “Trends in the diversity of plant and animal species/genetic resources, including wild relatives and non-commercial varieties, conserved in situ by diverse farming methods, including traditional agricultural practices” |
| 2 | 19 | C | 110 | The indicator "Red List Index (albatrosses and large petrels)" only considers some marine birds. We suggest to additionally use the following indicator: Proportion of species with conservation concerns found as bycatch (Red list index) and as a possible target to reduce bycatch.  Trends in bycatch databases could also be considered, along with number of Parties implementing the FAO’s International Guidelines on Bycatch Management and Reduction of Discards (consider other possible synergies with FAO in this target). |
| 2 | 19 | B | 114 | Trends in terrestrial wild species of fauna and flora used for food and medicine  consider other possible sustainable uses of wild terrestrial species of fauna and flora such as clothing (fur, leather), wood, fibers... indirect uses like ecotourism. Other uses also contribute to livelihoods, as these provide resources for IPLC which can then be used for improving people’s wellbeing. |
| 2 | 19 | C | Include instead or after row 114 | Add “Changes in diversity of plant and animal species/genetic resources [of wild relatives and non-commercial varieties] conserved in situ by diverse farming methods, including traditional agricultural practices“. |
| 2 | 20 | C | 118 | Proportion of agricultural area under productive intensive and sustainable agriculture. |
| 2 | 20 | C | 118 | Add Area of traditional farming methods where plant and animal genetic resources for food and agriculture are conserved in situ, including FAO’s Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems |
| 2 | 20 | C | 120 | "Trends in soil organic carbon stocks" it is an opportunity to improve synergies between GBF & UNCCD. One way to link them could be through indicator SDG, 15.3.1: "Information on the proportion of land that is degraded over the total land area that is going to be regularly collected and analyzed by the UNCCD through its national reporting and review process beginning in 2018, and every four years thereafter". |
| 2 | 20 | B, C | 122 | Delete the monitoring element and indicator Number of plant and animal genetic resources for food and agriculture secured in either medium- or longterm conservation facilities (SDG indicator 2.5.1). Indicators do not have a strong enough relation with Target 9 and the monitoring element associated, as well as the Trends in genetic diversity of cultivated plants and wild relatives.  Move them to a new section of targets related to genetic conservation measures. |
| 2 | 20 | B | 124 | Number of aquatic animal species produced in captivity.  (Percentage of total endangered species produced by aquaculture. *the more endangered species we can grow in captivity, more genetic resources we will have to help wild populations*.  Percentage of commercially exploited aquatic animal produced in aquaculture. *Production in captivity can reduce pressure over wild populations, it allows an alternative source for that product.* |
| 2 | 20 | C | 124 | Number of registered aquaculture companies with Best Aquaculture Practices certification standards and how many new ones got certified in the past years and how many are under the certification process. The leading sustainable aquaculture certifications are: BAP, ASC, GGap. See attached annex  Number of certificated for sustainable fisheries |
| 2 | 20 | C | 124 | Aquaculture can reduce overexploitation of certain endangered species’ populations if done under a sustainability approach and releasing breed specimens to recover wild populations. two possible indicators can be: 1) number of endangered species successfully breed in captivity for recovery and 2) number of species bred in captivity for consumption that reduce pressure on wild populations. |
| 2 | 20 | B | 125 | For T9.3. “Sustainable management of all types of forests, in particular native forests”. |
| 2 | 21 | B | 127 | “Trends in ecosystems contributing to air quality” needs further explanation. |
| 2 | 21 | B, C | 128 and 130 | B. Trends in hazardous and extreme events **attributed to biodiversity loss**  These **indicators** do not respond to the trends that are meant to be assessed. There is no direct correlation between the conservation and sustainable use of nature, and the number of deaths etc. from disasters (see above) or policies in place for the participation of local communities in water and sanitation. |
| 2 | 21 | A | 129 | “timing” needs clarification. |
| 2 | 21 | C | 132 | (We suggest two approaches:   1. Spatial analysis with GIS. Spatial-temporal comparison of habitat fragmentation, composition and configuration of green spaces.   References:   * CBD, ONU (2014). User’s Manual on the Singapore Index on Cities’ Biodiversity (also known as the City Biodiversity Index). Published in: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/city/subws-2014-01/other/subws-2014-01-singapore-index-manual-en.pdf>  1. A perception survey about the presence or absence of biodiversity, classifying species that indicate good or bad health of green areas (invasive, endemic, pollinators, …)   References:   * Markevych, I. 2017. Exploring pathways linking greenspace to health: Theoretical and methodological guidance. Elsevier. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2017.06.028>   And include landscape and greespace proxy indicators.  References:   * Badach, J. et al. (2019) Developing a Framework for the Implementation of Landscape and Greenspace Indicators in Sustainable Urban Planning. Waterfront Landscape Management: Case Studies in Gdansk, Pozna ́n and Bristol * Firmansyah et al (2018). A set of sustainable urban landscape indicators and parameters to evaluate urban green open space in Bandung City. IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci. 179 012016 * Gavrilidis, A. et al (2016). Urban Landscape Quality Index – planning tool for evaluating urban landscapes and improving the quality of life. International Conference – Environment at a Crossroads: SMART approaches for a sustainable future   Hoyle H. et al. (2019) What determines how we see nature? Perceptions of naturalness in designed urban green spaces. People and Nature. Research Ecological Society. Bristol, Inglaterra. 1: 167 -180 |
| 2 | 22 | B, C | Add after row 132 | Add trends/changes in the integration of biodiversity and ecosystems functions and services in the planning and development of cities, including approaches to conserving, enhancing, restoring and sustainably using biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services in spatial planning across cities, landscapes and seascapes.  Decision 14/3 m, COP 14 |
| 2 | 22 | B | 133-139 | Trends in zoonotic events and trends in epizootic events consult information from World Organization for Animal Health [www.oie.int](http://www.oie.int) |
| 2 | 22 | B | 133-139 | Include the next new monitoring element: “Trends in contributions to human health and well-being of urban dwellers from biodiversity and green/blue spaces in cities”. To prepare it, we suggest performing a correlation analysis with satellite images to verify the damping effect on heat islands and the decrease in temperature thanks to green areas.  References:  Carrus, G. 2014 Go greener, feel better? The positive effects of biodiversity on the well-being of individuals visiting urban and peri-urban green áreas. Elsevier. Landscape and Urban Planning. |
| 2 | 22 | B, C | 133 -139 | Analysis of the column elements B is required to define the indicators. Because the monitoring element “Trends in contributions to human health and well-being from” is repeated, only changes the ecosystem. |
| 2 | 22 | C | 135 | This indicator needs revision as it does not provide information about the benefits from biodiversity to human health. |
| 2 | 22 | B | Add after row 139 | Add Trends in the impact of ecosystem degradation on human health and wellbeing, especially regarding impacts on vulnerable sectors (IPLCs, women, girls, youth…) |
| 2 | 22 | A | 140 | Consider to include Digital Sequence Information (DSI) as a potential component for this Target, in accordance to CBD progress on this issue. |
| 2 | 22 | A | 140 | It is not clear how the T12.1 element will help to measure the increase of benefits shared for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Needs clarification. |
| 2 | 23 | C | 145 | Add Number of community biocultural protocols in the ABS Clearing-House that establish rules before granting access to genetic resources |
| 2 | 24 | A & B | 146 | T12.2. Benefit shared from the ~~use~~ **utilization** of genetic resources  Trends in the **equitably shared** benefits from the access to genetic resources. Both changes are agreed language in CBD |
| 2 | 24 | C | 150 | Number of biopiracy cases related to TK associated to genetic resources  Number of parties that established national mechanisms to protect traditional knowledge associated to genetic resources (such as the Ecuador voluntary deposit for traditional knowledge or INDECOPI from Perú).  Number of community biocultural protocols in the Clearing House that include rules for protecting traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources. |
| 2 | 25 | C | 151 | Percentage of documented events of access to genetic resources with TK associated that shared benefits.  Number of Parties that have established or adopted guidelines to estimate rates for sharing benefits from access to genetic resource with TK associated. |
| 2 | 25 | B | Add after row 152 | Add Trends in reviewing and updating legal frameworks, policies and practices to promote the mainstreaming of biological diversity in productive sectors, socio-economic and business policies and planning, through incentives for best practices in supply chains, sustainable production and consumption, including monitoring and oversight measures, as indicated in CBD COP 14 Decision 14/3.  <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-03-en.pdf> |
| 2 | 25-26 | B & C | Add after row 153 | Add Trends in sustainable public procurement strategies implemented.  Usar los indicadores que plantearon los programas Eap Green y SPPEL del PNUMA/ONU Medioambiente:  UN Environment two major projects in sustainable public procurement: Eap Green, which ran from 2013-2016 and involved Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Belarus; and the SPP and Eco-labelling Project (SPPEL) ran from 2013-2017 with activities in Vietnam, Brazil, Mongolia, Morocco, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Colombia, Peru, Argentina and Chile. |
| 2 | 26 | B | 154-156 | The monitoring elements in 154 to 156 could be subsumed in the monitoring element 159 in page 27. Is there really a need to disaggregate between different kinds of policies (e.g. poverty reduction strategies) and produce a specific indicator for each? |
| 2 | 26 | B | 158 | “other accounts” needs clarification. |
| 2 | 27 | C | 162 | Has the CBD agreed to a concept and methodology to measure “Ecological Footprint”? There are well documented problems in economic and ecological terms with this indicator. |
| 2 | 26 | C | 173 | This indicator should be further developed to measure effectiveness of the sustainability actions in relation to biodiversity carried out by companies |
| 2 | 29 | A | 177 | This element and its components should be in-line with WTO and other international regulations for commerce. |
| 2 | 32 | C | Add after row 177 | Proportion of Trade agreements with environmental provisions for biodiversity protection, conservation and sustainable use and their compliance. |
| 2 | 29 | C | 177 | Area of agricultural land under certification on biodiversity items (such as bird friendly for coffee; bat friendly for tequila, among others). |
| 2 | 29 | C | 178 | Number of financial institutions that include biodiversity performance standards as a requirement for a loan.  Number of projects with loans that have incorporated measures to protect biodiversity. |
| 2 | 31 | A | 190 | “New vision of good quality of life” needs clarification within the scope of CBD. |
| 2 | 31 | A | 193 | “Peoples’ responsibility for their choices” needs clarification within the scope of CBD. |
| 2 | 31 | B | 193 | Add: Trends in tools and resources developed for policy makers, businesses and civil society to uptake sustainable lifestyles that address global challenges such as biodiversity conservation, resource efficiency, climate change mitigation, poverty reduction and social well-being.  <https://www.oneplanetnetwork.org/sustainable-lifestyles-and-education> and  <https://www.unenvironment.org/explore-topics/resource-efficiency/what-we-do/sustainable-lifestyles/why-sustainable-lifestyles> |
| 2 | 32 | B, C | 194 | “necessary” needs clarification. |
| 2 | 32 | B | 194-197 | Eliminate or provide clarification about the scope of the term “other measures”  If clarification is given, provide some guidance as to which such measures will be considered for monitoring progress on this target **or eliminate the term in order to avoid confusion**. |
| 2 | 32 | D | 194-197 | Column D states baseline from 2019, however it is suggested to revise this. Baseline information is available for CP parties reports from as early as 2005 and can be downloaded from the Cartagena’s Protocol Biosafety Clearing House  (hereby the link <https://beta.bch.cbd.int/reports>). Also, the CP Executive Secretariat summarizes progress on those indicators in the form of preparatory documents that are placed for consideration of the Compliance Committee and the Liaison Group of the Cartagena Protocol, as well as COP-MOP meetings, together with the analyses of the compulsory national reports.  The Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol has been a very useful tool for guiding Parties in their implementation of the Protocol, where similar and more detailed indicators were used. Its assessment and review is available at the following webpage: <https://bch.cbd.int/protocol/issues/cpb_art35.shtml>; the outcomes were presented at COP-MOP 8 and the final assessment reported in COP-MOP 9 in 2018. |
| 2 | 32 | C | 198 | Add the text “and document or report” as suggested:  “Percentage of Parties that carry out and document/report scientifically sound risk assessments to support biosafety decision making.”  As some parties manifest implementing risk assessment but no documented evidence is provided on which events were evaluated nor the biosafety considerations regarding the characteristics of the introduction site. This is useful for parties with similar biodiversity for the decision-making process. |
| 2 | 33 | A | 198 | Consider using targets 16.2 and 16.3 under the current text: “16.2 Measures to manage adverse impacts of biotechnology on biodiversity and human health”, maintaining separate the putative monitoring trends (“Trends in scientifically sound risk assessments and management of the identified risks; Trends in number of countries that share and have access to biosafety related information for the safe use of the products of biotechnology), since indicators C 198-201 contribute to risk management actions.  Indicator C 201 does not relate to Target 16.3, information sharing among parties is useful as guidelines or reference material but not a control measure. |
| 2 | 33 | C | 203 | Indicator C 203 could be further developed. Parties somehow might have frameworks for restoration and compensation on a legal basis, yet not always articulated to environmental activities, much less for biotechnology. |
| 2 | 34 | A, C | 208- 210 | Delete “the most” in A.  Include mining among harmful subsidies to biodiversity. |
| 2 | 34 | A, B, C | 212 | There is a clear duplication with what is expressed in Table 1. Goal D lines 78-85. We suggest consolidating everything related to financing in a single target. |
| 2 | 35 | C | 217 | As suggested in the report Conservation Finance From Niche to Mainstream: The Building of an Institutional Asset Class (Credit Suisse, 2015, consultable at [www.credit-suisse.com](http://www.credit-suisse.com)), this could be measured through the number of investment vehicles used for conservation finance. The indicators might be differentiated by the specific area of investment (sustainable forestry, sustainable agriculture, sustainable tourism) in volume and by instrument. |
| 2 | 36 | C | 219 | need to clarify nationally determined target for increasing the level of domestic resources. Maybe resources allocated (budget) to implement CBD. |
| 2 | 36 | C | 220 | Amount of investments on biodiversity conservation and sustainable use from private sector. |
| 2 | 36 | C | 221 | Amount of resources donated from the private sector for nonprofit activities in benefit of capacity building for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. |
| 2 | 38 | C | 238 | This indicator alone is not adequate to effectively measure the fulfillment of the goal, as well as the elements that compose it.  Add: Number of publications, videos, or other materials made based on TK, promoting biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.  Add: Number of projects related to traditional knowledge associated to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. |
| 2 | 38 | A | 239 | Target 20 has two components that could be monitored separately. 1) the equitable participation of different actors (including IPLC, as well as women, girls and young people) in decision-making; and, 2) the exercise of rights over the relevant resources.  The wording “relevant resources” in Target 20.1 may lead to different interpretations which, among other things, may limit the role of local actors, including IPLCs, as custodians of biodiversity and relevant actors in ecosystem conservation, integrity and connectivity, as well as in situ biodiversity conservation, including natural and genetic resources important for food and agriculture. Needs clarification or deletion. |
| 2 | 38 | C | 239 | Add “recognized” after respected.  Consider as possible elements to develop indicators:  - The development of national guidelines or action plans that recognize and safeguard the rights of traditional knowledge of indigenous and local communities.  - The participation of indigenous and local communities in the creation, control, governance and management of protected areas.  As well as what is established in Decision XII / 12 E, paragraph 6: to recognize, support and encourage the development of local sui generis systems by indigenous and local communities, including through the development of community protocols, as part of national action plans for the protection, preservation and promotion of TK, innovations and practices within national strategies and action plans on biodiversity. |
| 2 | 38 | C | Additional | SDG 16.7.1: Proportions of positions (by age group, sex, persons with disabilities and population groups) in public institutions (national and local), including (a) the legislatures; (b) the public service; and (c) the judiciary, compared to national distributions. |
| 2 | 38 | C | Additional | Suggested indicator: "Trends in participation of indigenous women and indigenous youth in environment-related ministries or agencies and other environmental governance bodies such communal land, forest, fisheries, water management and energy governance bodies, at national and local levels". |
| 2 | 38 | C | Additional | Suggested indicator: “Proportion of parties with appointed representative UN Youth Delegates to CBD party delegations, following the criteria designated by the United Nations Guide to the Youth Delegate Programme”. Indicator data should be disaggregated by sex, ethnicity and age to measure gender and intergenerational equity. |
| 2 | 39 | C | 241-242 | Indicator data should be disaggregated by sex and age to measure gender and intergenerational equity. |
| 2 | 39 | C | Additional | Suggested indicator: Number of ha. of ICCAs and IPs territories and resources formally recognized |
| 2 | 39 | C | Additional | Suggested indicator: "Change in gender-responsive national policies and legislations related to rights over resources". |
| 2 | 39 | C | 244-245 | While these are good indicators for gender balance, they need to be focused on biodiversity related issues  Indicator data must be disaggregated by productive sectors related with biodiversity as well as relevant resources to measure women and girls' engagement in forestry, fisheries, aquaculture, agriculture as well as governance in water and energy as relevant resources, either in national or local levels. |
| 2 | 39 | C | Additional | Suggested indicator: "proportion of women and girls participating in environment-related ministries or agencies and other environmental governance bodies such as communal land, forest, fisheries, water management, and energy governance bodies, at international, national and local levels". |
| 2 | 39 | C | Additional | Suggested indicator: "Women in governmental environmental decision-making institutions: Proportion of seats held by women and the time they remain on of those seats, such as heads of environment-related ministries". Data disaggregated by age and ethnicity. |
| 2 | 40 | C | 246 | SDG 5.a.1 (a) Proportion of total agricultural population with ownership or secure rights over agricultural land, by sex; and (b) share of women among owners or rights-bearers of agricultural land, by type of tenure |
| 2 | 40 | C | 247 | SDG 16.7.1: Proportions of positions (by age group, sex, persons with disabilities and population groups) in public institutions (national and local), including (a) the legislatures; (b) the public service; and (c) the judiciary, compared to national distributions.  (AArreguín) Suggested indicator: “Proportion of parties with appointed representative UN Youth Delegates to CBD party delegations, following the criteria designated by the United Nations Guide to the Youth Delegate Programme”. Indicator data should be disaggregated by sex, ethnicity and age to measure gender and intergenerational equity. |
| 2 | 40 | C | 247 | Suggested indicator: "Trends in participation of youth in environment-related ministries or agencies and other environmental governance bodies such as communal land, forest, fisheries, water management and energy governance bodies, at international, national and local levels". Data disaggregated by sex and ethnicity.  Suggested indicator: "Youth in governmental environmental decision-making institutions: Heads of environment-related ministries". Data disaggregated by sex and ethnicity.  Suggested indicator: Number of youths participating to biodiversity-related national, regional, and international consultations and decision-making processes. |

1. [CBD/WG2020/REC/2/1](https://www.cbd.int/doc/recommendations/wg2020-02/wg2020-02-rec-01-en.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)