

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

I. Background

1. The second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group¹ 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. Columns A, B 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 C provides information on the baseline year for the indicator and on the frequency that the indicator is updated where known. Review comments are being sought on columns A, B and C only.

II. Submitting Comments

1. To ensure that your comments are given due consideration, please send them by e-mail to 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:
 - a. Please provide all comments in writing and in an MS Word or similar document format using the table provided below.
 - b. Please provide full contact information for the individual/Government/organization submitting the comments.
 - c. 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.
 - d. 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.
 - e. If you refer to additional sources of information, please include these with your comments when possible or provide a complete reference or hyperlink.
 - f. 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.

¹ [CBD/WG2020/REC/2/1](#)

- g. 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.).
 - h. All review comments will be posted on the webpage² 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.

III. Template for Comments

- 4. Please use the review template below when providing comments.
- 5. 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 | | | | |
|--|--|---------------|------------|--|
| <i>Contact information</i> | | | | |
| Surname: | VAZQUEZ | | | |
| Given Name: | SILVIA | | | |
| Government (if applicable): | ARGENTINA | | | |
| Organization: | Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship | | | |
| Address: | Esmeralda 1212 | | | |
| City: | Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires | | | |
| Country: | Argentina | | | |
| E-mail: | vqs@mrecic.gov.ar ; digma@mrecic.gov.ar ; jqb@mrecic.gov.ar | | | |
| <i>Comments</i> | | | | |
| Table | Page | Column letter | Row number | Comment |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | The comments provided in this document do not constitute an agreement expressed by the Government of Argentina in any proposed goal, target, component of goal, component of target, monitoring element, indicator or baseline for the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. In particular, these comments do not include suggestions for the goals and targets under the understanding that these have been provided |

² <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/post2020>

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | for context and that they will be subject of negotiations to take place in future stages. |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | The document under review represents a useful tool to identify indicators that could monitor the progress on a framework that has not been decided yet. In this sense, the Government of Argentina provides these comments in good faith in order to contribute to the selection of a small set of “candidates” to “headline” indicators. Only once the framework is agreed at COP XV, Parties could choose among these “candidates” to quickly set up a monitoring framework. |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | In general terms, a clear and direct link between component, monitoring element and indicator should exist. This is not true in many cases. Difficulties arise when several indicators partially cover a specific component and it is not clear how the information they provide would be aggregated to give a sense of progress on the component. It is also concerning that different components seem measurable by the same indicator. Progress in different components should be informed by different indicators. |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | We believe that global indicators to track progress in targets agreed under intergovernmental processes should be informed by data provided by national governments in all cases. We suggest deleting indicators that are based on information from sources not authorised by National Focal Points of CBD. |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | The different stages of development in which countries found themselves creates a need to monitor two different outcomes of the GBF. On the one hand, there is a need to track the set up of mechanisms needed to address biodiversity loss. On the other, we need to monitor results on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity once these mechanisms are already in place. Therefore, we suggest that each monitoring element includes both indicators to track the status of biodiversity and the measures undertaken by governments to address biodiversity challenges. |
| | | | | <p>We consider that the document makes a fair effort to identify the current availability of data and baselines for the proposed indicators. In some cases the available information goes back hundreds of years but, in most cases, only very recent records have been identified.</p> <p>This does not preclude, in our view, the possibility to build datasets that track trends with a longer timeframe. Technology and science currently allow us to modelize future scenarios to understand if we will be able to meet our</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | <p>biodiversity targets. These techniques can also be of use to develop historic timelines to track long running processes from the past.</p> <p>In this sense, we want to underline the need to acknowledge that the current trends in biodiversity loss should be tracked, at least, from the beginning of the industrialization process and, in some cases, since colonization (as is the case of the IPBES Assessment for the Americas). This is central for a strong and ambitious multilateral solution to biodiversity loss.</p> |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <p>Many of the indicators contained in the document under review are considered desirable. However, in order for Parties to report on them, there is need for sufficient finance, technology transfer and capacity building. In many developing countries this is required to allow for the development of baselines and monitoring capacities, the maintenance of regular monitoring and the publication of periodic information.</p> |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <p>All references made to "indigenous peoples and local communities" in the "draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework for review" and in the comments provided by this review are understood by Argentina in accordance with the framework established by Article 46 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.</p> |
| 1 | 2 | A | 1 | <p>Clarification on the meaning of "natural ecosystem" is needed.</p> |
| 1 | 2 | C | 1 | <p>It is suggested to replace "forest area" by "native forest area"</p> |
| 1 | 2 | D | 1 | <p>Argentina has the Forest Evaluation System Management Unit (UMSEF) In this sense, the monitoring of native forests is carried out, for the detection, quantification and monitoring over time of the processes of natural and / or anthropic origin that modify the structure and / or extension of natural forest ecosystems using mainly remote sensing techniques and a Geographic Information System (GIS). The National System for the Monitoring of Native Forests has an integrated portal to the Environmental Information Center, which allows the visualization of the available information generated. The available update periods for the indicator are updated annually.</p> |
| 1 | 2 | C | 2 | <p>It is suggested to add the term "native" to "tree cover loss".</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------|--|
| 1 | 2 | A | 15 | It is considered necessary to incorporate indicators that can differentiate the fragmentation of habitat from the loss of area (Fahrig 1997, Fahrig 2019). There are proposals for indicators to include this variable and to measure its compliance. It is considered essential to incorporate specific indicators to measure the connectivity of areas. Travis Belote et al. (2020) propose to incorporate multiscale evaluations such as the existence of public policies and the resources available to conserve and restore areas to the connectivity indicators, added to the area connectivity metrics. |
| 1 | 2 | C | 4 | We consider this proposed indicator positive contributions and proper funding should be provided for developing countries to implement it and report on it every five years. |
| 1 | 3 | C | 31-32 | We recognize that this indicator may be useful even though we do not report it. |
| 1 | 3 | A | 34-35 | We consider these proposed indicators positive contributions and proper funding should be provided for developing countries to implement it and report on it periodically. |
| 1 | 4 | A | 36-41 | We suggest to add a monitoring element of “trends in genetic diversity in ex-situ collections” |
| 1 | 4 | A | 42 | Clarification on the meaning of “critical ecosystem” is needed. We suggest a national determination of what are the ecosystems considered “critical” |
| 1 | 4 | B | 46 | The areas considered of particular importance for biodiversity should be nationally determined. |
| 1 | 4 | C | 46 | The areas considered key biodiversity areas should be nationally determined. |
| 1 | 5 | A | 51 | The scope of the term “nature contributions” has not been agreed under CBD. Argentina suggests to substitute it with “ecosystem services” which was previously used in the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. |
| 1 | 5 | C | 56 | There is no experience in homogeneous reporting on this item under the UNFCCC MRV process. Using national indicators could lead to methodological inconsistencies. We request deleting the indicator or using indicators based on specific information reported by Parties to the UNFCCC, and the Paris Agreement under the relevant decisions (9/CP.16, 2/CP.17 and 18/CMA.1). |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------|--|
| 1 | 5 | D | 59 | Argentina is in the process of calculating the baseline for the SDG indicator 6.3.2. Given that Argentina is a Federal country, target values will be established at the sub-national level and each province will define the target values associated with the calculation of the indicator in its jurisdiction. To that end, the national government is working with the provinces within the Federal Water Council (COHIFE) to define the target values associated with the calculation of the indicator in each jurisdiction. |
| 1 | 5 | B | 61 | Argentina is not aware of the existence of any indicator already implemented and available regarding contamination of the soil. If there were a specific proposition, an analysis should be done in correspondence with its potential to contemplate the differences in the natural endowment, regional characteristics, environmental and economic profiles and human geographies on a country-by-country basis. Another aspect of the selection process should concern the feasibility of its diffusion as an indicator among the developing countries without unduly increasing their monitoring and reporting obligations. |
| 1 | 6 | A | 64 | The scope of the term “nature contributions” has not been agreed under CBD. Argentina suggests to substitute it with “ecosystem services” which was previously used in the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. |
| 1 | 6 | B | 64-67 | The proposed monitoring elements are not always related to the state of biodiversity and ecosystem services. In particular, poor trends in energy supply, food and feed, materials and medicine can be also related to economic and social issues and it is difficult to address them only in their environmental dimension. |
| 1 | 6 | B | 68-71 | The proposed monitoring elements are not always related to the state of biodiversity and ecosystem services. In particular, learning and inspiration, physical and psychological experiences, identities and cultural values are intrinsically related to economic and social issues and it is difficult to address them only in their environmental dimension. |
| 1 | 6 | A | 68 | The scope of the term “nature contributions” has not been agreed under CBD. Argentina suggests to substitute it with “ecosystem services” which was previously used in the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------|--|
| 1 | 6 | C | 72-73 | <p>We suggest to include two indicators for the monitoring element “trends in access to genetic resources”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of countries that have adopted legal, administrative and normative frameworks to regulate access to genetic resources and participation in benefits. - Number of internationally recognized certificates of compliance published |
| 1 | 6 | B | 72-73 | <p>We suggest to include an additional monitoring element: “trends in access to genetic resources in possession of indigenous peoples and local communities”. We suggest two associated indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of countries that have adopted legal, administrative and normative frameworks to regulate access to genetic resources and participation in benefits with special mechanisms for cases in which the genetic resources are in possession of indigenous peoples and local communities. - Number of internationally recognized certificates of compliance regarding genetic resources in possession of indigenous peoples and local communities published. |
| 1 | 6 | B | 72-73 | <p>We suggest to include an additional monitoring element: “trends in access to traditional knowledge associated to genetic resources”. We suggest three associated indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of countries that have adopted legal, administrative and normative frameworks to regulate access to traditional knowledge associated to genetic resources and participation in benefits - Number of internationally recognized certificates of compliance regarding traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources published. - Number of community or biocultural protocols available on the ABS Clearing House. |
| 1 | 6 | B | 74 | <p>We suggest modifying the monitoring element for “trends in the participation of benefits from the access to genetic resources and ASSOCIATED TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE”.</p> |
| 1 | 6 | C | 72 | <p>We do not agree with the indicator “number of users that have provided information relevant to the utilization of genetic resources to designated checkpoints”. This is an indicator that will mainly reflect the activity of developed countries, countries that are users of genetic resources.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-----|----|--|
| 1 | 6 | C | 74 | <p>We suggest two indicators for the monitoring element “trends in the benefits from the access to genetic resources shared”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of internationally recognized certificates of compliance for commercial projects - Number of internationally recognized certificates of compliance for research projects without commercial purpose. |
| 1 | 6 | C | 75 | <p>We suggest moving the indicator “number of checkpoint communiques published in the ABS Clearing-House” to this section regarding the utilization of genetic resources, rather than the access. The communiques are the instruments that allow us to acknowledge the use of genetic resources in line with granted authorizations.</p> |
| 1 | 6 | B-C | 76 | <p>We suggest modifying the monitoring element for “trends in the monetary and non-monetary benefits from access to genetic resources AND TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE ASSOCIATED shared”. We also suggest the following indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Numbers of internationally recognized certificates of compliance for commercial projects - Number of internationally recognized certificates of compliance for research projects without commercial purpose. - Number of internationally recognized certificates of compliance that foresee a participation in monetary benefits. - Number of internationally recognized certificates of compliance that foresee a participation on non monetary benefits - Number of internationally recognized certificates of compliance that foresee a participation in monetary benefits, including the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities - Number of internationally recognized certificates of compliance that foresee a participation in non monetary benefits, including the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities |
| 1 | 6 | A | 77 | <p>Argentina suggests to split the component “availability of sufficient financial resources” in two:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Availability of sufficient financial resources to meet the goals and targets of the framework |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------|---|
| | | | | - Provision of new and additional financial resources from developed countries to developing countries to cover the incremental cost of the implementation of the framework. |
| 1 | 6 | C | 77-80 | Argentina suggests to include the following indicators: - Provision of new and additional financial resources for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity from developed countries to developing countries - Global Environment Facility (GEF) funds for biodiversity. |
| 1 | 7 | B | 81-84 | Argentina suggests to include the following monitoring elements: - Trends in capacities acquired by developing countries - Trends in south-south scientific and technical cooperation - Trends in north-south scientific and technical cooperation - Trends in triangular scientific and technical cooperation |
| 2 | 8 | B | 4 | Add an element that focuses on freshwater ecosystems: Trends in wetlands inland area under sustainable use. |
| 2 | 8 | C | 4 | From the previous row. Add an indicator: Proportion of wetland areas with applied instruments intended for sustainable use (Eg. agreements, laws, decrees and other.) |
| 2 | 8 | D | 1 | For this indicator Argentina uses a baseline in 2020 |
| 2 | 9 | C | 24 | Close to 120 countries have engaged in the voluntary Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) Target Setting Programme of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), which is directly linked to the target 15.3 of the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals. Methodologically, the Parties under the voluntary LDN TSP have agreed on three proxy indicators of LDN, further adjusted to each country and region when necessary: those are 1) land cover (land cover change), 2) land productivity (net primary productivity) and 3) carbon stocks (soil organic carbon). In order to avoid monitoring and reporting duplications, as well as fast-tracking negotiations and maximizing the deployment of resources towards the implementation itself, the Post 2020 CBD Biodiversity Framework could benefit |

| | | | | |
|---|----|-----|-------|--|
| | | | | from choosing among those indicators in both categories, degraded land and soil quality. |
| 2 | 10 | A | 30 | Clarification on the meaning of “natural ecosystem” is needed. |
| 2 | 11 | A-B | 39 | Areas considered of “particular importance for biodiversity” should be nationally determined |
| 2 | 11 | C | 39 | Areas considered “key biodiversity areas” should be nationally determined |
| 2 | 11 | C | 40-42 | Areas considered “Important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity” should be nationally determined |
| 2 | 12 | C | 53 | We recognize that this indicator may be useful even though we do not report it. |
| 2 | 12 | A-B | 55 | Further clarification on the meaning of “reduced human-wildlife conflicts” is needed. We understand that the reduction of that kind of conflicts could be attributed to many different reasons. |
| 2 | 14 | C | 70 | We suggest to add the following indicator: - “Number training activities for capacity building in the detection of Invasive Aliens Species” |
| 2 | 14 | C | 71 | We suggest to add the following indicator: - “Trends in the capacities of national science systems to taxonomically determined alien species with invasive potential” |
| 2 | 14 | C | 72 | We suggest to add the following indicators: - “Trends in number of countries that have monitoring systems of invasive alien species in place” - “Trends in the development of regional networks for monitoring invasive alien species” - “Trends in the development of strategic associations with relevant stakeholders to join permanent monitoring activities” |
| 2 | 15 | A | 73 | Given that eradication is not always possible, we suggest the following modification: “Establishment of measures to eradicate, control or management of invasive alien species, as appropriate” |
| 2 | 15 | C | 76 | We suggest the following indicator: |

| | | | | |
|---|----|-------|---------|--|
| | | | | - “Number of countries that have a national strategy for management of invasive alien species that include, inter alia, education, outreach, strengthening of scientific capacities, gender considerations and cultural values of indigenous peoples” |
| 2 | 15 | A-B-C | 81-96 | It is rather difficult to understand how the content under review in this section will focus on biodiversity and avoid undermining discussions regarding the regulation of pollutants in general. As a matter of fact, none of identified components of the target, monitoring elements or indicators are directly related to the impacts of pollution on biodiversity. |
| 2 | 16 | B | 97 | Information on carbon stocks, and its trends should be methodologically robust, and consistent. Any indicators chosen for this element should be based on National GHG Inventories submitted by Parties to the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement. |
| 2 | 16 | B | 98 | Indicators of contribution to climate change adaptation should be based on Parties reports and communications on this topic under the UNFCCC process (eg.: National Adaptation Plans, Adaptation Communications, National Communications, Biennial Transparency Reports), and could also include information arising from the Global Stocktake under the Paris Agreement. |
| 2 | 17 | C | 101 | The indicator chosen is not necessarily related to the monitoring element. We suggest deleting the indicator or complementing it with more appropriate indicators (eg.: information reported by Parties to the Paris Agreement under article 13.7b). |
| 2 | 18 | A | 103-116 | We believe that the components identified for the proposed target are appropriate within the context of CBD. However, we note that the proposed components do not cover other parts of the proposed target (ensure benefits such as nutrition, food security, livelihoods, health and wellbeing). We do not propose to include components and monitoring elements for those parts of the proposed target given that it is difficult for us to find a direct cause-effect connection between them and biodiversity. |
| 2 | 18 | C | 108 | The present indicator is a certification provided by a private institution. The payment required to producers for using this form of certification may limit its availability as a general indicator. For this reason we believe that the inclusion of indicators of a private nature might not be the correct |

| | | | | |
|---|----|-----|---------|---|
| | | | | approach for tracking progress in the implementation of an intergovernmental instrument. In the specific case of certifications, we consider that only those in line with multilateral trade rules could be of use for indicators in this framework. We suggest the deletion of this indicator. |
| 2 | 19 | C | 115 | The indicator chosen is not necessarily related to the monitoring element and the component of the target. |
| 2 | 19 | C | 116 | The indicator chosen is not necessarily related to the monitoring element and the component of the target. |
| 2 | 19 | B-C | 117 | <p>Close to 120 countries have engaged in the voluntary Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) Target Setting Programme of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), which is directly linked to the target 15.3 of the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals.</p> <p>Methodologically, the Parties under the voluntary LDN TSP have agreed on three proxy indicators of LDN, further adjusted to each country and region when necessary: those are 1) land cover (land cover change), 2) land productivity (net primary productivity) and 3) carbon stocks (soil organic carbon).</p> <p>In order to avoid monitoring and reporting duplications, as well as fast-tracking negotiations and maximizing the deployment of resources towards the implementation itself, the Post 2020 CBD Biodiversity Framework could benefit from choosing among those indicators in both categories, degraded land and soil quality.</p> |
| 2 | 20 | C | 118 | There is need for clarification with regards to meaning of the term “productive agriculture” |
| 2 | 20 | B-C | 117-119 | Not having a clear notion of which indicator (and therefore definition of the concept) will be selected, Argentina considers that the full spectrum of agricultural practises and modalities that can be branded as sustainable is actually quite large. In that sense, the definition should not be excessively stringent and should be based in the best available scientific knowledge. |
| 2 | 20 | B-C | 120 | Close to 120 countries have engaged in the voluntary Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) Target Setting Programme of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification |

| | | | | |
|---|-------|-----|---------|--|
| | | | | <p>(UNCCD), which is directly linked to the target 15.3 of the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals.</p> <p>Methodologically, the Parties under the voluntary LDN TSP have agreed on three proxy indicators of LDN, further adjusted to each country and region when necessary: those are 1) land cover (land cover change), 2) land productivity (net primary productivity) and 3) carbon stocks (soil organic carbon).</p> <p>In order to avoid monitoring and reporting duplications, as well as fast-tracking negotiations and maximizing the deployment of resources towards the implementation itself, the Post 2020 CBD Biodiversity Framework could benefit from choosing among those indicators in both categories, degraded land and soil quality.</p> |
| 2 | 20 | C | 121 | We recognize that this indicator may be useful even though we do not report it. |
| 2 | 21 | D | 129 | Argentina is in the process of calculating the baseline for the SDG indicator 6.3.2. |
| 2 | 22-23 | C | 140-145 | <p>For the monitoring element “trends in access to genetic resources” we suggest adding the following indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of countries that have adopted legal, administrative and policy frameworks regulating access to genetic information and participation in benefits - Number of community or biocultural protocols available on the ABS Clearing House. |
| 2 | 24 | B-C | 146-149 | <p>We suggest modifying the monitoring element as follows: “trends in the benefits from the access to genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge shared”. To support this monitoring element, we suggest the following indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of internationally recognized certificates of compliance that foresee a participation in monetary benefits - Number of internationally recognized certificates of compliance that foresee a participation in non monetary benefits - Number of internationally recognized certificates of compliance that foresee a participation in benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic information. |
| 2 | 24 | C | 147-148 | For the monitoring element “trends in the number of countries that have adopted legislative, administrative or |

| | | | | |
|---|----|---|---------|---|
| | | | | <p>policy frameworks to ensure fair and equitable sharing of benefits” we suggest adding the following indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of countries that have adopted legislative, administrative and policy frameworks regulating access to genetic information and participation in benefits. |
| 2 | 27 | C | 162 | <p>There is a lack of agreement at the multilateral level regarding the definition of “ecological footprint”. It should be avoided to adopt an indicator that is not precise. The various different schemes, in this regard, generate uncertainty and difficulties for producers that need to comply with several and different requirements. In this sense, we underline the need that any indicator related to “ecological footprint” is based on methodologies designed and implemented in line with multilateral trade rules.</p> |
| 2 | 27 | D | 165 | <p>Argentina is in the process of calculating the baseline for the SDG indicator 6.4.1</p> |
| 2 | 27 | D | 166 | <p>Argentina is in the process of calculating the baseline for the SDG indicator 6.4.2. Due to the lack of data on water withdrawal by major sectors, they must be estimated. At the moment the appropriate methodology is being evaluated to make the estimates. Withdrawals of the agriculture and services sectors have already been estimated but methodologies for the industrial sector are still under discussion.</p> |
| 2 | 28 | A | 167-172 | <p>We believe that the “circular economy” can be a useful tool that contributes to sustainable development, even though it is not the only one. Therefore, we consider the component of the target could benefit from a broader scope, such as: “Sustainable production practices, including, among others, circular economy and waste management...”</p> |
| 2 | 29 | B | 175 | <p>We believe that the “circular economy” can be a useful tool that contributes to sustainable development, even though it is not the only one. Therefore, we consider the monitoring element could benefit from a broader scope, such as: “Trends in the application of principles and practices of sustainable consumption and production, such as circular economy, among others”</p> |
| 2 | 28 | D | 171 | <p>Argentina is in the process of calculating the baseline for the SDG indicator 6.4.1</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|----|---|---------|---|
| 2 | 30 | B | 179 | Further clarification on the meaning and scope of the term “legal supply chains” is needed. |
| 2 | 30 | C | 179 | The present indicator is a certification provided by a private institution. The payment required to producers for using this form of certification may limit its availability as a general indicator. For this reason, we believe that the inclusion of indicators of a private nature might not be the correct approach for tracking progress in the implementation of an intergovernmental instrument. In the specific case of certifications, we consider that only those in line with multilateral trade rules could be of use for indicators in this framework. We suggest the deletion of this indicator. |
| 2 | 30 | C | 180 | There is a lack of multilateral agreement on the scope of the definition of “material footprint”. We believe it is important to be careful in the promotion of indicators that could generate different certification schemes. In this sense, we consider that the design and implementation of an indicator of this tenure should reflect alignment with multilateral trade rules. |
| 2 | 31 | D | 186 | Argentina is in the process of calculating the baseline for the SDG indicator 6.4.2. |
| 2 | 31 | C | 188 | There is a lack of agreement at the multilateral level regarding the definition of “ecological footprint”. We believe it is important to be careful in the promotion of indicators that could generate different certification schemes. In this sense, we consider that the design and implementation of an indicator of this tenure should reflect alignment with multilateral trade rules. |
| 2 | 31 | A | 190-192 | In order to agree that this is a component of the target, a definition of “good quality of life” and of “new social norms for sustainability” should be agreed by Parties in the context of the CBD process. |
| 2 | 31 | B | 193 | Given that the proposed target calls to eliminate unsustainable consumption patterns, the proposed monitoring element should look over “trends in demand for more sustainable products”, covering the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainability. |

| | | | | |
|---|-------|---|---------|--|
| 2 | 32-33 | A | 194-202 | <p>We suggest modifying target components 16.1, 16.2 and 16.3 in line with the wording of the related CBD Article 8(g):</p> <p>T16.1. Measures to [prevent potential adverse impacts] REGULATE RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE USE AND RELEASE OF LIVING MODIFIED ORGANISMS RESULTING FROM biotechnology on biodiversity and human health</p> <p>T16.2. Measures to manage [potential adverse impacts of] RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE USE AND RELEASE OF LIVING MODIFIED ORGANISMS RESULTING FROM biotechnology on biodiversity and human health</p> <p>T16.3. Measures to control [adverse impacts of] RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE USE AND RELEASE OF LIVING MODIFIED ORGANISMS RESULTING FROM biotechnology on biodiversity and human health</p> |
| 2 | 33 | A | 203-204 | <p>The component “restoration and compensation for damage to biodiversity caused by LMOs” seems too prescriptive. It assumes that there is existing damage caused by LMOs and expresses only one of the multiple possible ways a Party may decide to address it. Therefore, we suggest to merge this component with the other proposed components, such as T16.2 and T16.3 and collocate the suggested monitoring elements under that section.</p> |
| 2 | 33 | A | 207 | <p>We recall the need for incentives to be in line with multilateral trade rules, in particular those under Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture. In this sense, the component of the target should be “increase in positive public and private economic and regulatory incentives in line with multilateral rules”</p> |
| 2 | 34 | A | 212 | <p>We acknowledge that it is of utmost importance to improve the implementation of CBD and for this to happen we consider that more has to be done to mobilize resources from developed to developing countries. In this sense, we could benefit from a specific target component such as “annual increase of US\$ [X] the amount of financial resources provided by developed countries to developing countries for covering the incremental cost of implementation of the framework”. The progress in this component could be monitored by some of the already suggested indicators, such as “Official Development Assistance for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity” or “Amount of funding provided through the Global Environment Facility and allocated to biodiversity focal areas”.</p> |

Comments should be sent by e-mail to secretariat@cbd.int no later than 25 July 2020.