**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 (monitoring elements), B (indicators) and C (Indicator baseline year and frequency of updates) of the 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[[2]](#footnote-2) 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:** | | | | Rai | |
| **Given Name:** | | | | Mrinalini | |
| **Government** (if applicable)**:** | | | |  | |
| **Organization:** | | | | CBD Women Caucus | |
| **Address:** | | | | Chiang Mai | |
| **City:** | | | | Chiang Mai | |
| **Country:** | | | | Thailand | |
| **E-mail:** | | | | [mrinalini.rai@women4biodiversity.org](mailto:mrinalini.rai@women4biodiversity.org) / [mrinalini.rai@gmail.com](mailto:mrinalini.rai@gmail.com) | |
| Page | Column | ***General Comments*** | | | |
|  | 0 | Secure, legal tenure rights—particularly for women, youth, indigenous peoples, and other marginalized populations—as well as inclusive land governance, are foundational to achieving the goals of the monitoring framework of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF).  While the current draft of the monitoring framework includes references to inclusive tenure rights as well as inclusive decision-making and holistic governance approaches (T2.4, T2.7, T20.1, T20.2, T20.3), it would benefit from stronger linkages to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) indicators related specifically to inclusive tenure rights and governance, in particular: SDG indicators 1.4.2, 5.a.1, and 5.a.2. While 5.a.2 is included in the Executive Secretary’s note on **“Linkages Between the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development,”** it is not included in the draft monitoring framework. We recommend acknowledging the role of land tenure in biodiversity conservation by including additional indicators and SDG linkages that hold countries accountable to ensuring land rights to advance biodiversity protection.  The monitoring framework would also benefit from better articulation of the links between inclusive tenure and governance and SDG indicators that already feature strongly in the framework, including 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.4.1, 5.5.1, 5.c.1, 11.3.1, 11.5.1, 13.1.2, 13.1.3, 13.b.1, 14.7.1, 15.1.1, 15.1.2, 15.2.1, 15.3.1, 15.4.1, 15.4.2., 15.a.1, 16.1, 16.7.2, and 17.14. Additionally, indicator 16.7.1, which calls for equitable representation in national and local institutions, including legislatures, public service, and the judiciary, should be considered. A focus on better inclusion in these institutions, and land line ministries in particular would contribute significantly to better land governance and stronger tenure security (including clarity and enforcement of rights) in support of biodiversity. Adding the proposed monitoring elements and indicators below will strengthen biodiversity conservation by addressing some of the root causes of land degradation: weak land tenure and nonrepresentative governance.  In general, links between named SDG indicators and land governance and tenure could be strengthened by mapping trends and indicators included in the monitoring framework to tenure risks and incentives that may underly or drive those trends (e.g., deforestation, land cover change, fragmentation and quality of wetlands); examples of this mapping are provided in the “ Comments” section.  There are approximately 2.5 billion people globally who are rural land users, including indigenous peoples and local communities (agricultural, coastal, and forest-dwelling). These communities manage approximately 65 percent of the world’s land and coastal ecosystems.[[3]](#footnote-3) We cannot address the biodiversity crisis or the climate crisis, or achieve sustainable and equitable development, without realizing the tenure and governance rights of these rural land users. This legal recognition is the basis for, and must be followed by, significant investment to include rural land users (with particular attention to intersecting vulnerabilities faced by women, youth, and other marginalized groups) in planning and implementation for biodiversity conservation and restoration. This approach is both rights-based and pragmatic: land users’ human rights are intertwined with biodiversity;[[4]](#footnote-4) and achieving biodiversity goals will require a massive mobilization of effort. Rural land users should be equipped and incentivized economically to co-design and lead these efforts,[[5]](#footnote-5) and secure tenure is an essential component of this engagement. States Parties should be urged to make a significant investment in rural infrastructure and resources for rural land users, to address multiple interlinked national and transnational policy priorities; biodiversity included, but also climate change, food security, and sustainable urbanization.  Given that a minority of rural and indigenous land is legally recognized, these communities are left vulnerable to more powerful actors at national levels who engage in land governance decision-making, often in isolation from national-level actors responsible for implementation of biodiversity and climate action frameworks. These communities are also vulnerable to powerful private sector forces seeking land for extractives, infrastructure and development, and even biofuel.[[6]](#footnote-6) Without rights to property, these communities lack the security to invest in the ecosystems on which they depend, which can hinder uptake of sustainable management practices even when support for them is offered. Securing tenure rights and ensuring land governance that is inclusive and representative of communities is crucial to undoing these power imbalances and addressing lack of access to government services or lack of incentive for sustainable use of biodiversity.  Women suffer disproportionate impacts from biodiversity loss and climate change impacts, because their livelihoods depend on the management and consumption of diverse natural resources. Women are also powerful agents for engaging in protection of biodiversity, because of their unique roles and possession of knowledge on natural resources within rural and indigenous communities.[[7]](#footnote-7) Emerging evidence also suggests that when women hold secure rights to land, efforts to protect biodiversity[[8]](#footnote-8) and address climate change are more successful.[[9]](#footnote-9) But women are radically under-represented in decision-making spaces related to conservation, climate action, land governance, and land administration at all levels in least-developed countries. Research shows that increasing women’s control over land increases their local-level decision-making ability.[[10]](#footnote-10) Rights to land are also likely to contribute to women’s influence more broadly—greater levels of assets correlate with greater levels of political involvement[[11]](#footnote-11); when women have greater economic power, including via control over land, they will also have greater political power.  Land rights and management are increasingly recognized as paramount for climate action and sustainable development, and the links to biodiversity are similarly substantial. A recent study published in BioScience[[12]](#footnote-12) (endorsed by 11,000 scientists from around the globe), and the 2019 report on land[[13]](#footnote-13) from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), in addition to the most recent report from the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)[[14]](#footnote-14) are part of a growing consensus that the rights of local communities and indigenous groups are central to sustainable development, halting and reversing biodiversity loss, and climate change mitigation and adaptation. The publications highlight that preserving forests and restoring degraded agricultural land is crucial to these outcomes, and both identify rural land users as the group that can achieve this. And very recent research highlights the link between tenure rights and preventing forest loss.[[15]](#footnote-15)  Intrinsic to all this is to recognize that women’s rights are the fundamental human rights that were enshrined by the United Nations for every human being on the planet nearly 70 years ago. These rights include the right to live free from violence, slavery, and discrimination; to be educated; to own property; to vote; and to earn a fair and equal wage. For the global biodiversity framework to truly achieve the thirteen guiding principles[[16]](#footnote-16) as set for the Post2020 global biodiversity framework at CBD COP 14, it must recognize and build synergies with elements and components addressed in the Convention the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)[[17]](#footnote-17) and the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action[[18]](#footnote-18) which marks its twenty-fifth anniversary (Beijing+25) this year, 2020.  Importantly, the CBD should work with States Parties and other UN bodies to drive policy coherence efforts between land governance (land use planning and land line ministries, including forest departments, as well as ministries in charge of finance, urbanization, and investment), and ministries responsible for climate change and the SDGs, in order to ensure that legal and policy frameworks are harmonized and mutually reinforcing, in accordance with SDG indicator 17.14. This will require institutional capacity building, but this investment is both necessary and efficient—global frameworks including the CBD impose overlapping requirements on national-level actors in resource scarce settings. Clarification of where efforts can be combined and coordinated will contribute to reaching the goals of the CBD, the SDGs, and other global agendas, including the UNFCCC, the UNCCD, and human rights framework. | | | |
|  |  | ***Comments*** | | | |
| **Table** | **Page** | **Column letter** | **Row number** | | **Comment** |
| **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | | We need to show more positives actions that will provide inspiration for people, change attitudes and behaviors as we move towards the transformational change. |
| 1 | 2 | B | 1-28 | | Monitoring elements should also include trends of conservation of mountain ecosystems, including their biodiversity, in order to enhance their capacity to provide benefits and services that are essential for supporting healthy ecosystems.  Trends in area, fragmentation and quality of social-ecological systems, cultural landscapes, and the like should be included. |
| 1 | 2 | C | 1-14 | | Proposed indicator:   * Coverage by protected areas of important sites for mountain biodiversity ( SDG15.4.1) * Mountain Green Cover Index (SDG indicator 15.4.2) |
| 1 | 2 | C | 15 | | Need to show indicators that show linkages and connectivity across different types of ecosystems across many landscapes e.g. Actions and case studies promoted by the International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative (IPSI). This is particularly important in the continental –marine relationships. |
| 1 | 4 | B | 37-39 | | Should include also small-scale marine/freshwater species in fisheries and aquaculture since such provide sustainable livelihoods in some countries. E.g. Caribbean Fisher folk organizations (CFNO) and Red de áreas marinas de pesca respons ( Costa Rica) |
| 1 | 4 | C | 37 | | The term “socio-ecologically” should be included for as we move forward, we will need a framework for multiple level engagements as we move towards the all of society approach. IPLC and women would be key stakeholders to identify “culturally valuable species” and their contributions to traditions diets for food and nutrition for medicines, material item and part of the community history. |
| 1 | 4 | C | 48 | | Mountain Green Cover Index (SDG indicator 15.4.2) |
| 1 | 4 | C | 48 | | 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 ( shared governance or IP governance models) |
| 1 | 5 | A, B & C | 51 - 63 | | For all monitoring elements described in Goal C, natural disaster risk reduction strategies are foundational to ecological resilience.  Proposed indicators:   * Number of countries that adopt and implement national disaster risk reduction strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030 (SDG indicator 13.1.2) * Proportion of local governments that adopt and implement local disaster risk reduction strategies in line with national disaster risk reduction strategies (SDG indicator 13.1.3 |
| 1 | 5 | B and C | 51-85 | | ICCAs and other Indigenous lands and territories under shared governance or/and IP governance schemes could be an additional monitoring element. As indicator, trends in biodiversity and ecosystem functions in ICCAs and self-determined territories, including for marine, costal and other water and food sources. However, any mapping, recognition or designation of ICCA’s – Territories of Life, whether as protected areas, conserved areas or otherwise, must be subject to the self-identification, self-governance, and free prior and informed consent of the relevant custodians. |
| 1 | 5 | C | 62  additional | | Number of deaths, missing persons and directly affected persons attributed to disasters per 100,000 population (SDGs 1.5.1 along with 11.5.1) |
| 1 | 6 | B | 64-71 | | Monitoring elements described should include language around equitable and just distribution of natural benefits, including to women and indigenous peoples as populations garnering additional attention; call for diverse perspectives of rural land users, including women, youth, and indigenous groups, in assessing these trends; and distinguish between small-scale provision from biodiversity and large-scale or commercial provision. |
| 1 | 6 | C | 64-71 | | To support the monitoring elements there would be a need identify inclusive indicators that also would reflect gender-responsiveness to ensure equitable and just distributions of natural benefits. |
| 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 of Linguistic Diversity | (CBD/COP/DEC/XIII/28) | |
| 1 | 6 | B | 68 | | Measures how women and girls learn from and get inspired by biodiversity by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 1 | 6 | B | 69 | | Measure women and girls' physical and psychological experiences regarding biodiversity by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 1 | 6 | B | 70 | | Measure should be defined on how biodiversity support women and girls’ identities by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 1 | 6 | A | 72-76 | | The Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) provides for the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). State Parties are obliged to take legislative, administrative and technical measures to recognize, respect and support/ensure the free, prior and informed consent of Indigenous peoples and their effective involvement. |
| 1 | 6 | B | 72 - 76 | | The post-2020 monitoring framework should follow the principle of data disaggregation and where relevant indicator data to be disaggregated by sex. Collecting sex-disaggregated data is necessary for the implementation of a gender-responsive post-2020 global biodiversity framework as it can provide the evidence-base for the three priority areas (equal access to biological resources, fair and equitable benefit sharing, equal engagement and leadership at all levels of decision-making). Therefore, indicators proposed for monitoring elements related to genetic resources and benefit sharing (C1 and C2) should require indicator data to be disaggregated by sex. |
| 1 | 6 | C | 72-76 | | To be able to have access and to ensure equitable benefit sharing, the monitoring element must include   * Trends in ensuring that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable have….. ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance (SDGs 1.4) |
| 1 | 6 | C | 72-76 | | Proposed indicator:   * Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure (SDGs 1.4.2), including marine territories. |
| 1 | 6 | C | 72 - 76 | | Proposed indicator:   * Proportion of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) guarantees women’s equal rights to land ownership and/or control (SDG 5.a.2) |
| 1 | 6 | B | 71 | | Measure women and girls’ contributions to maintenance of cultural values by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 1 | 6 | A | 72-73 | | Define gender responsive components such as women and girls’ access, control, use, ownership over those resources in different contexts |
| 1 | 6 | B | 72 - 76 | | The post-2020 monitoring framework should follow the principle of data disaggregation and where relevant indicator data to be disaggregated by sex. Collecting sex-disaggregated data is necessary for the implementation of a gender-responsive post-2020 global biodiversity framework as it can provide the evidence-base for the three priority areas (equal access to biological resources, fair and equitable benefit sharing, equal engagement and leadership at all levels of decision-making). Therefore, indicators proposed for monitoring elements related to genetic resources and benefit sharing (C1 and C2) should require indicator data to be disaggregated by sex. |
| 1 | 6 | C | 74 | | Suggest including an indicator capturing women in governmental environmental decision-making, including the following:  a. Delegates to international environmental COPs, such as for UNFCCC, UNCCD, CBD and BRS Conventions, by sex  b. Heads of delegations to international environmental COPs, such as for UNFCCC, UNCCD, CBD and BRS Conventions, by sex  c. Participants in national level environmental fora, by sex  d. % of women and men who benefit from access to genetic resources, ensuring data is disaggregated by gender. |
| 1 | 6 | C | 74 | | Suggest including an indicator capturing the percentage of women and men who benefit from the access to genetic resources, ensuring data disaggregated by gender. |
| 1 | 6 | B | 77 - 85 | | Targets on protected and conserved areas must be closely linked with targets on halting the drivers of biodiversity loss. Monitoring elements on trends in reallocation of resources from drivers of biodiversity loss (infrastructure, monoculture plantations, bioenergy, use of chemical inputs for food crops, etc) to positive incentives should be included, including refinining the monitoring element to be gender-responsive including women right's safeguards and promoting this mobilization to be women-targeted. |
| 1 | 7 | B | 81-84 | | Suggest including indicators in capacity building, technology transfer and cooperation as such that would relate to dynamic and transformational impacts that bring about results and changes. Indicators should consider quality as well as quantity of capacity building, transfer and cooperation |
| 1 | 7 | C | 81-84 | | Suggest including indicators capturing the access and implementation by qualifying women and girls, youth and IPLC's engagement in capacity development strategies, rather than designers, facilitators or recipients by putting in place equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 1 | 7 | C | 85 | | Quantify women and girls, youth and IPLC's access to relevant technologies by putting in place equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 8 | A | 1-34 | | Any spatial target should not be considered in a vacuum and additional component should consider good governance diversity, quality and vitality that work to prevent land-use change. Spatial planning does not per se ensure such target. A specific component around ICCAs and IPs territories could be considered. Especially in light of the fact that 80% of remaining high value biodiversity is in IPs territories. The latter work for preventing degradation, maintaining wilderness and restoring areas.  We strongly encourage that these indicators be culturally-relevant and community-based to enable meaningful action on the ground, and recognize the role and contributions of women. |
| 2 | 8-10 | B and C | 1-34 | | For all monitoring elements described in Target 1,  “Trends in natural disaster risk reduction strategies” are foundational to ecological resilience.  Proposed indicators:   * Number of countries that adopt and implement national disaster risk reduction strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030 (SDG indicator 13.1.2) * Proportion of local governments that adopt and implement local disaster risk reduction strategies in line with national disaster risk reduction strategies (SDG indicator 13.1.3) |
| 2 | 8 | C | 8 | | Suggest including an indicator capturing the trends in land cover change, disaggregated by sex of land user/owner |
| 2 | 10 | C | 29 | | FAO reports have presented mounting evidence that the biodiversity that underpins our food systems, at all levels, is declining around the world. Their recommendations for biodiversity-friendly management practices e.g. community seed bank and farmers rights should be reflected and included for once biodiversity is lost, plant, animal and microorganism species that are critical to our food systems, cannot be recovered, placing the future of our food under severe threats. The ITPGPRFA/FAO agreement supports this view |
| 2 | 10-11 | A | 39 | | Components T2.1 and T2.2 sound in part redundant? Instead, a component on ICCAs would be much relevant here |
| 2 | 11 | B | 43-45 | | How are the nature-culture links to Biodiversity represented and are important values for women, IPLC’s as it touches our values, beliefs and norms to practices, livelihoods, knowledge and languages. As a result, there exists a mutual feedback between cultural systems and the environment, as shift in one often leading to a change in the other. E.g. UNESCO guidelines |
| 2 | 10-11 | C | 46-52 | | Proposed indicator:   * Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population, by sex, age and cause (SDGs. 16.1.2) * Proportion of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms (SDGs16.3.1 |
| 2 | 11-12 | A and B | 46, 51,52 | | T2.4 and T2.6 overlap and partially redundant. T2.4 could focus on governance and equity only, the other on management effectiveness. Governance practices only as monitoring elements under ‘integration into…’ but they are a critical element of management effectiveness and equity |
| 2 | 12 | B | 46 | | Quantify women and girls, youth and IPLC's contributions, roles, control and access in effective management in Protected Areas and other effective conservation measures (OECMs) by putting in place equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 12 | B | 48 | | Here, as in other places in the draft framework, sustainable management of forests, including mangroves, and other sustainable management issues including soil restoration, are likely to be related to the strength of tenure and governance arrangements that prioritize the rights of local land users (see example of recent research on forest certification from Benin, *supra FN 16*), as well as Landesa’s work on mangrove and upland forest rights in Myanmar.[[19]](#footnote-19)  This item could be additionally included as a separate monitoring element:   * Trends in land rights governance at the national and local scales |
| 2 | 12 | C | 48 | | Proposed indicators:   * Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, (a) with legally recognized documentation, and (b) who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and type of tenure (SDG indicator 1.4.2) * Progress towards sustainable forest management (SDG indicator 15.2.1) |
| 2 | 12 | A, B | 52 - 55 | | Gender issues are often overlooked or little addressed in wildlife conservation and management efforts, even within those that are focused on community-driven efforts. Yet key factors influencing sustainable wildlife management (SWM) such as human-wildlife conflicts, unsustainable and illegal trade, tenure rights, poverty, and food and livelihood security all have significant gender dimensions. If these are not addressed, they may considerably limit the effectiveness of the management measures adopted and exacerbate pre-existing gender inequalities.[[20]](#footnote-20) (CPW, Factsheet 5)  These should be addressed in the components, monitoring elements and should be reflective in the indicators.  It would be useful to include a monitoring element that relates to women's involvement in conservation and management actions, and a relevant indicator for example: proportion of men and women involved in conservation and management actions |
| 2 | 12 | C | 52 | | Suggest including an indicator including sex disaggregation of individuals in decision-making positions when possible, from the Social Assessment of Governance and Equity (SAGE) |
| 2 | 12-14 | A, B & C | 56-66 | | The term “legal” might need to look into the debates around legal and its implications and indicators should be reflective of the aspect of sustainable use. If legal is the term, it might be interpreted that the only needed action is to legalize it and it also might have an unintended consequences of criminalizing some traditional sustainable practices of indigenous peoples’.  ‘Legal’ harvesting of wild species is not as high a priority  as ‘sustainable’, which is the key target. Legal should also incorporate relevant standards, including CITES, while respecting customary sustainable use, harvesting and exchange of natural products.  It is still unclear on the implication of the terms – harvest, trade and use and defining the use and limit of “safe” for human healthy and biodiversity.  Reflections and recommendations from the thematic consultation on Sustainable Use that took place and the survey outcomes should further provide more clarity and context to this whole Target 4, including the work of IPBES Assessment of Sustainable use[[21]](#footnote-21), IUCN-SULI[[22]](#footnote-22), Collaborative Partnership on Wildlife Management and IPLCs perspective on the work done under WG8(j) on Customary Sustainable Use. |
| 2 | 13 | C | 57 | | Local diets to be an indicator |
| 2 | 13 | B & C | 58 | | Quantify women and girls, youth and IPLC's contributions, roles, control and access in proportion of biological resources harvested though sustainable harvest practices by putting in place equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 13 | B & C | 59 - 60 | | The monitoring element and indictors should ensure that harvesting, trade and use of wild species, is sustainable and compliant with relevant laws, policies and standards (ref. CITES) while respecting and recognizing the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities to customary sustainable use, harvesting and exchange of natural products. |
| 2 | 13 | B & C | 64 | | Measure women and girls, youth and IPLC's contributions and roles in the legal use of biological resources by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 14 | B & C | 66 | | Measure women and girls, youth and IPLC's contributions and roles in the safe use of biological resources by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 15-16 | A & B | 81-96 | | Action on pollution is already governed by a range of existing conventions, which should be referred to. Impacts of pollution are disproportionately heavy on poorer and vulnerable sections of societies, which needs to be acknowledged. Consideration also to the Rio Principle of ‘polluter pays’.  All heavy metals should be included and considered as they impact soils, water and 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 the terrestrial and marine species through direct harm and bioaccumulation in the food chain. (Basel Stockholm, Rotterdam and mercury Conventions  The component, the monitoring elements and the indicators fail to address the impact of pollution, chemical and waste on human health. It should take reference and reflect on SDGs target 3.9, including quantify pollution impacts on women managing biodiversity by putting in place equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity  Elements should include by 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination (SDGs 3.9)  Action on pollution is already governed by a range of existing conventions, which should be referred to. Impacts of pollution are disproportionately heavy on poorer and vulnerable sections of societies, which needs to be acknowledged. Consideration also to the Rio Principle of ‘polluter pays’. |
| 2 | 16 | C | 81-96 | | Proposed indicators :   |  | | --- | | * Mortality rate attributed to household and ambient air pollution (SDG 3.9.1) | | * Mortality rate attributed to unsafe water, unsafe sanitation and lack of hygiene (exposure to unsafe Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for All (WASH) services) (SDG 3.9.2) * Mortality rate attributed to unintentional poisoning (SDG 3.9.3) * Number of parties to international multilateral environmental agreements on hazardous waste, and other chemicals that meet their commitments and obligations in transmitting information as required by each relevant agreement (SDG 12.4.1) *in addition to all elements of T6.4* | |
| 2 | 16-17 | A | 97- 102 | | The frameworks must also put in place system and /or tools to monitor and access the impact of climate change on biodiversity and biodiversity-based livelihoods, in particular to livelihoods of indigenous peoples’ and local communities, a well as to assess the effectiveness of ecosystem-based approaches for adaptation, and mitigation and disaster risk reduction.[[23]](#footnote-23)  Strategies and plans for management should also recognize the use of traditional knowledge[[24]](#footnote-24)  Nature based Solutions elements and indicators should acknowledge, involve and respond to the concerns of a variety of stakeholders, especially rights holders and should be based on mutual response and equality, regardless of gender, age or social status and uphold the right of Indigenous Peoples to Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). It should be based on inclusive, transparent and empowering governance processes.[[25]](#footnote-25) |
| 2 | 16 | B | 98 | | Monitoring elements and indicators should also reflect issues of governance models and solutions, including Customary practices and use and Trends could include inclusion of traditional knowledge and rights-holders in the design and implementation of these nature-based solutions. |
| 2 | 17 | A | 101-102 | | Create gender-responsive components to measure women involvement in those mitigation, adaptation and disaster risk reduction measures |
| 2 | 17 | B | 101 | | Create gender-responsive components to measure women involvement in risk management, and how gender-based violence is expressed during these extreme events |
| 2 | 17 | C | 102 | | Proposed indicators:   * Number of deaths, missing persons and directly affected persons attributed to disasters per 100,000 population (SDG 13.1.1) * Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population, by sex, age and cause (SDG 16.1.2)[[26]](#footnote-26) |
| 2 | 17-19 | B | 103 – l16 | | Customary use and practices, and tenure rights could be added as additional monitoring elements (as there is an indicator on income for small-scale producers, and this is a result of certain practices and governance models)  There is a lack of reference to customary use. The right to food is defined as follows by the UN Special Rapporteur: “the right to have regular, permanent and unrestricted access, either directly or by means of financial purchases, to quantitatively and qualitatively adequate and sufficient food corresponding to the cultural traditions of the people to which the consumer belongs, and which ensures a physical and mental, individual and collective, fulfilling and dignified life free of fear”[[27]](#footnote-27).  Indicators could include diversity of flora and fauna used for food security, livelihoods, health |
| 2 | 18 | A | 103-116 | | Human well-being needs to include cultural aspects as we live and exist in environments where our culture impacts our daily lives as evidenced by COVID 19. The post 2020 GBF offers new and ambitious opportunities to put people and nature at the core with linkage to culture and a nexus to many other areas. |
| 2 | 18 | B | 105 | | Quantify women and girls, youth and IPLC's contributions, roles, control and access in sustainable fisheries management by putting in place equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 19 | A & B | 114-117 | | The CBD has a Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use. Being an important part of work under the CBD, customary sustainable use needs to be a separate monitoring element under this section. |
| 2 | 19 | C | 115 | | Proposed indicator:   * Average income of small-scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status (SDG indicator 2.3.2), in addition – *and producer type (e.g. family farmers, pastoralists, and fishers)* |
| 2 | 19 | C | 116 | | Caution should be used when linking this indicator to sustainability. While volume of production per labor unit may indicate for some crops or in some ecosystems that commercial approaches provide advantages, this should be carefully weighed against rights-based and gender-based considerations for local land users.  Proposed indicators:   * Number of countries with action taken to enhance decent rural employment opportunities, entrepreneurship and skills development, especially for youth (UN Decade on Family Farming) * Number of countries with an improved set of institutions and strategies–including policies, guidelines, regulations and tools and programmes–aiming to generate decent rural employment, particularly for youth (UN Decade on Family Farming) * Number of countries with action taken to accelerate gender equality and rural women’s economic empowerment (UN Decade on Family Farming) |
| 2 | 20-21 | B | 117-126 | | Production and productivity gaps should not be the main concerns under the CBD, the emphasis should be on  sustainability of such production and resilience.  The reference to socio-ecological land and seascapes (SEPLs) allows for a more integrated approach to landscapes that are a mosaic of managed and other  ecosystem, and to broaden the scope beyond agriculture.  Equitable governance is essential to enable stewardship of local actors leading to mutual wellbeingQuantify women and girls, youth and IPLC's contributions, roles, control and access in area of agriculture under sustainable practices by putting in place equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 20 | C | 117 - 119 | | Proposed indicator:   * 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 (SDGs 5.a.1 (a) ) * Proportion of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) guarantees women’s equal rights to land ownership and/or control (SDGs indicators 5.a.2)   Other possible indicators should be identified recognizing indigenous and traditional agricultural systems that are sustainable known by different terminologies.(e.g. Jhum cultivation, rotational farming, swedden cultivation, shifting cultivation) |
| 2 | 20 | C | 120 | | Proposed indicator:   * Suggest including an indicator disaggregating sustainable land use by sex |
| 2 | 20 | B | 122 | | Quantify women and girls, youth and IPLC's contributions, roles, control and access to genetic diversity of cultivated plants and of wild relatives by putting in place equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 20 | B | 123 | | Quantify women and girls, youth and IPLC's contributions, roles, control and access to genetic diversity of domesticated animals and of wild relative by putting in place equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 20 | C | 123 | | Another possible indicator to consider could be the Proportion of traditional knowledge over seeds preservation and utilization, also considering that much of the seed knowledge is with women. |
| 2 | 20 | B | 124 | | Quantify women and girls, youth and IPLC's contributions, roles, control and access in production of aquaculture under sustainable practices by putting in place equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 20 | A | 125 | | Create gender-responsive components: Women contributions to its sustainable management |
| 2 | 20 | A & B | 126 | | An additional component could read: ‘Trends in the recognition of customary sustainable use in agriculture, aquaculture, and forests’.  Under the suggested new component, there should be a monitoring element based on the number of people engaged in sustainable agriculture, aquaculture and forest management.  This element could read: “Proportion of population engaged in sustainable agricultural production” |
| 2 | 20 | C | 125 | | Proposed indicators:   * Average income of small-scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status (SDG indicator 2.3.2) * Trends in the practice of traditional occupations (decision X/43) * Number of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) incentivizes generational turnover in agriculture (UN Decade on Family Farming) * Percent of indigenous community members that participate and are employed in traditional and subsistence activities (FAO) |
| 2 | 21 | C | 126 | | * Proposed indicators: * 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 (SDGs 5.a.1 (a) trends in land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of IPLCs (decision X/43) * Cultural Well-­being and Cultural Vitality – cultural vitality index for indigenous and local knowledge [from the Arctic Social Development Index] |
| 2 | 21 | A | 128 | | Create gender-responsive components to measure women involvement in risk management, and how gender-based violence is expressed during these extreme events |
| 2 | 21 | A | 129-131 | | Quantify women and girls, youth and IPLC's contributions and access to good ambient water by putting in place equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 21 | B | 127 - 131 | | Traditional and customary systems/models and knowledge should be considered separately as additional ‘culture’ solutions integral part of nature-based solutions, and contributions to human health and wellbeing |
| 2 | 21 | A | 125 - 126 | | Proposed additional Component T9.4:   * Secure and equal access to land (SDG target 2.3) |
| 2 | 21 | B | 125 - 126 | | Monitoring elements could include:   * Trends in law/policy reform * Trends in institutional capacity development * Trends in titling/documentation * Trends in perceptions of tenure security * - Trends in institutional inclusivity and perceptions of inclusivity |
| 2 | 21 | C | 125 - 126 | | Proposed indicators:   * Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, (a) with legally recognized documentation, and (b) who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and type of tenure (SDG indicator 1.4.2) * (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 (SDG indicator 5.a.1) * Proportion of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) guarantees women’s equal rights to land ownership and/or control (SDG indicator 5.a.2) * Secure documented land tenure for indigenous peoples (consider urging States Parties to collect data on indigeneity when monitoring SDG indicator 1.4.2) * Volume of production per labour unit by classes of farming/pastoral/forestry enterprise size (SDG indicator 2.3.1) * Average income of small-scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status (SDG indicator 2.3.2) * Proportions of positions in national and local institutions, including (*a*) the legislatures; (*b*) the public service; and (*c*) the judiciary, compared to national distributions, by sex, age, persons with disabilities and population groups (SDG indicator 16.7.1) * Proportion of population who believe decision- making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group (SDG indicator 16.7.2)   Again, sustainable management of forests will be related to strong forest tenure rights for local users. |
| 2 | 21 | B | 132 | | It is suggested to explore ecosystems with urban-rural interlinkages, urban biodiversity, green spaces, and  ecological services which underpin local well-being,  resilience and sustainable economies by 2030.  The focus on green/blue spaces for wellbeing is too narrow.  The proposed target on urban ecosystems is inspired by the “Naturebased development pathway” in the ICLEI approach[[28]](#footnote-28) |
| 2 | 22 | B | 133-139 | | Consideration should be given to human health and well-being from social-ecological systems and cultural landscapes. This is important for women and IPLC’s |
| 2 | 22 | B | 134 | | Measure how those contributions impact differentiated on women and girl’s life by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | 22 | C | 134 | Proposed indicators:   * Suggest including an indicator on mortality and morbidity rates attributed to unsafe water, unsafe sanitation and lack of hygiene, by sex. * Suggest including an indicator on mortality and morbidity rates attributed to environmental causes (unintentional poisoning, air & water quality), by age and sex |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | 22 | B | 135 | Measure how those contributions impact differentiated on women and girl’s life by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 22 | B | 136 | Measure how those contributions impact differentiated on women and girl’s life by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 22 | B | 137 | Measure how those contributions impact differentiated on women and girl’s life by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 22 | B | 138 | Measure how those contributions impact differentiated on women and girl’s life by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 22 | B | 139 | Measure how those contributions impact differentiated on women and girl’s life by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 22 | B | 140 | Quantify women and girls, youth and IPLC's access to genetic resources by putting in place equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 22-25 | B | 140-151 | Element should undertake reforms to give women equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, financial services, inheritance and natural resources, in accordance with national laws (SDGs target 5.a.)  To have access and ensure equitable benefits, one needs to also have control and ownership over land and resources, and so it is imperative to have an indicator that addresses this foundation for the other two aspects to be beneficial. This should also be complimented with IPLCs Free, Prior and Informed Consent. |
| 2 | 22-25 | C | 140 | Proposed indicator:   * Proportion of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) guarantees women’s equal rights to land ownership and/or control (SDGs indicators 5.a.2) |
| 2 | 24 | B | 147-148 | To define indicators which consider disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 24 | C | 147 | Also, to measure if those frameworks are gender-responsive or not |
| 2 | 24 | C | 148 | Also, to measure if those frameworks are gender-responsive or not |
| 2 | 24 | C | 148 | Should also TK holders are part of the indicators as beneficiaries |
| 2 | 24 | C | 149 | Measure how women and girls participate in the distribution of those benefits. To define equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 24 | B | 150-151 | Monitoring elements should also recognize and include the work done on biocultural community protocols[[29]](#footnote-29), which is growing recognition and is used for protection of traditional knowledge and ensuring access and equitable benefit sharing for all relevant stakeholders. This element should also put in place previous prior informed consent mechanism. |
| 2 | 25 | B | 152-153 | To measure how those policy instruments, include women, IPLC and youth priorities and concerns. Define equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity to monitor it. |
| 2 | 25 | C | 151 | Measure how women and girls participate in the distribution of those benefits. To define equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity  An indicator on the number of countries that have established national targets in their NBSAPs that is also reflective of gender should be considered |
| 2 | 25 | C | 152-161 | To change policy and population behavior as described in Target 13, women’s role in government and decision-making must be equitable.  Proposed indicator:   * Proportion of seats held by women in (a) national parliaments and (b) local governments (SDG indicator 5.5.1)   Ensuring integration of biodiversity considerations into planning, policies and regulations, development processes, and poverty reduction strategies should specifically include land line ministries. Tenure and land governance will be intimately linked to poverty reduction especially for rural land users, with disparate and unique impacts on women and girls, youth, and indigenous land users. |
| 2 | 26 | C | 154 | To measure how those policy instruments, include women, IPLC and youth priorities and concerns. Define equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity to monitor it. |
| 2 | 26 | C | 155 | To measure how those policy instruments, include women, IPLC and youth priorities and concerns. Define equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity to monitor it. |
| 2 | 26 | C | 156 | To measure how those policy instruments, include women, IPLC and youth priorities and concerns. Define equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity to monitor it. |
| 2 | 27 | A | 159-161 | To define equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 27 | B | 159 | Those policies need to be intersectional and gender-responsive to ensure that women's rights in the biodiversity real are respected. |
| 2 | 27 | B | 160 | Those policies need to be intersectional and gender-responsive to ensure that women's rights in the biodiversity real are respected. |
| 2 | 27 | B | 161 | Those policies need to be intersectional and gender-responsive to ensure that women's rights in the biodiversity real are respected. |
| 2 | 27 | A | 162-166 | Measure the reduction of the collateral impacts on women and girls in direct contact with biodiversity by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 28 | A | 167-176 | Measure women and girls' contributions, roles and responsibilities in sustainable production practices by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 28 | B | 167 | Additional monitoring element should be about informal economy and local economies |
| 2 | 29 | C | 177 | An indicator on Participatory Guarantee System (PGS[[30]](#footnote-30)) could be considered. |
| 2 | 30-31 | A, B | 180-189 | Measure women and girls' contributions, roles and responsibilities in sustainable consumption patterns by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity as it relates to a key gender-biodiversity priority area (equal engagement) |
| 2 | 31 | A | 190-192 | What does "Good quality of life" mean? This must include the respect of biodiversity intrinsic values  Addition to text: "...New social norms for BIODIVERSITY value and integration" instead of "sustainability" |
| 2 | 31 | B | 193 | Redefine this element to be more culturally appropriate.  If in the global south it is already difficult to buy nutritious food, how people could afford to buy "organic-labeled" products? |
| 2 | 32 | A, B & C | 194-204 | Particular impacts on women and girls due to their physiology, specifically pregnant women.  Cartegena Protocol, however, does not address gender issues specifically. It is important that the Protocol recognizes that the impact of introducing GMOs could be gender-differentiated because men and women have different knowledges, needs and vulnerabilities. Women worldwide, and specially women from indigenous groups and local communities, need to have access to information, skills, equipment, regulatory frameworks, and procedures. This will allow them to understand the issues, make informed decisions, manage, or avoid any potential risks associated to GMOs, have the capacity to implement the Protocol, and have an arena where their needs and concerns are heard and valued[[31]](#footnote-31) and the need to systematically consider and address their needs and identify and deliver gender-responsive technology driven by gender specific technology demands.  The monitoring elements should consider the mainstreaming of gender in the Cartagena Protocol and the National Biosafety Action Plans. This could serve as an indicator itself to ensure that safety of half of the world’s populations health and well-being. |
| 2 | 33 | B | 201-202 | This should include not only countries but key potential partners or affected groups such as women, IPLCs and youth |
| 2 | 33 | B | 203-204 | Those systems need to be culturally appropriate and their promotion should guarantee that women get to know about them |
| 2 | 33 | A | 205-210 | The tools to monitor and implement such a target must recognize the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities. The recognition of tools already applied and used by civil society organizations.  There needs to be international criteria on what is negative and what is positive for biodiversity. Definition of criteria need consultation of affected peoples. All indicators should include IPLCs and other rights holders.  Refine the monitoring element to be gender-responsive including women right's safeguards and promoting this mobilization to be women-targeted, including the work in biodiversity production activities is fundamental as majority of them are carried out by women |
| 2 | 34-35 | A | 211-221 | Equitable participation of women and youth in the identification of funding needs for implementation-not just governmental needs but implementation. Monitoring elements that reflect funding needs and funding allocation for the implementation of a gender-responsive post-2020 global biodiversity framework are mission in T18.1, T18.2, T18.3 |
| 2 | 34-36 | B | 211 - 221 | Target 18 increases financial resources available to advance biodiversity goals. Investing in gender equality and women’s empowerment, particularly through strengthening women’s land tenure rights and participation in governance, would further this the biodiversity goals of this target.  Proposed monitoring element:   * Trends in gender equitable governance of natural resources. |
| 2 | 34-36 | C | 211-221 | Proposed indicators:   * Proportion of countries with systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment (SDG indicator 5.c.1) * Proportion of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) guarantees women’s equal rights to land ownership and/or control (SDG indicator 5.a.2) |
| 2 | 35 | C | 217 | Private sector actors (especially large food and beverage companies) increasingly have an interest in ensuring the sustainability and inclusivity of their supply chains, including via work to support stronger tenure rights for women. Leveraging this interest to promote biodiversity (through private sector promotion of agroforestry, intercropping, and other sustainable practices) could have widespread impacts in support of biodiversity.  Proposed Indicators (supported by private sector actors):   * Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, (a) with legally recognized documentation, and (b) who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and type of tenure (SDG indicator 1.4.2) * Progress towards sustainable forest management (SDG indicator 15.2.1) |
| 2 | 36 | A | 222-223 | Need to define components which report on women and youth engagement regarding these strategies. |
| 2 | 36 | B | 222 | Ensure that the support is allocated from a gender perspective, and that do not increase women and girls’ burdens. Specify women and girls' roles and participation in such programs by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 36 | B | 223 | Specify women and girls' roles and participation in such activities and ensure that are developed from a gender perspective, and that do not increase women and girls’ burdens, by defining equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 36 | A | 224-225 | Need to define components which report on women and youth engagement regarding these strategies. |
| 2 | 36 | B | 224 | To define equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 36 | B | 225 | To define equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 36-37 | A | 226-231 | Besides effective, the components, elements and indicators should also be reflective of *equitable* management.  Need to define components related to transparency, public access to environmental information, and culturally appropriate formats which includes effective translations to original languages.  It would be useful to include a monitoring element that relates to the trends in the availability of gender-biodiversity data, as this type of data is currently lacking to monitor progress towards the gender-biodiversity domain. |
| 2 | 36-37 | C | 226-231 | Refer to the implementation of the Voluntary guidelines for the sustainability of small-scale fisheries[[32]](#footnote-32) in the context of food security and poverty eradication in its gender chapter |
| 2 | 37 | A | 232-233 | While mainstreaming biodiversity attention must be place equally in all values of biodiversity. This means intrinsic biodiversity values should be taken into account while integrate it in national policy and budgets. |
| 2 | 37 | A | 234-235 | To promote all types of biodiversity- related education (formal, not formal and informal) at all levels. |
| 2 | 37 | B | 234-235 | Monitor women participation in biodiversity-related careers, including their position in academic bodies: students, professors, faculty directors, among others |
| 2 | 38 | A | 236-238 | Recognize women and girl’s contribution ad participation. Define indicators to compile data disaggregated by sex and age |
| 2 | 38 | B | 236-238 | Additional aspect of this indicator, disaggregated data by gender |
| 2 | 38 | C | 238 and 239 | This indicator seems more relevant for 1/6/B (68-71). Instead, indicator at line 239 is relevant for 238 |
| 2 | 38 | C | 239 - 248 | Participation is crucial but not sufficient, and needs to be embedded in equitable governance arrangements |
| 2 | 38 | B | 239-243 | To define equitable, intersectional and cultural appropriate indicators including disaggregated data by sex, age and ethnicity |
| 2 | 38 | C | 239 | Proposed Indicators:   * Proportions of positions in national and local institutions, including (a) the legislatures; (b) the public service; and (c) the judiciary, compared to national distributions, by sex, age, persons with disabilities and population groups (SDG indicator SDG 16.7.1); in addition % of IPLC in management bodies/boards/governance institutions of natural resources etc; plus   #ha of ICCAs and IPs territories and resources formally recognized;  Recognition of other governance models beside State and Private. This is number of recognized shared governance and IP governance of protected areas national wise. |
| 2 | 39 | C | 241-242 | Proposed indicators:   * Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, (a) with legally recognized documentation, and (b) who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and type of tenure (SDG indicator 1.4.2) * (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 (SDG indicator 5.a.1) * Proportion of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) guarantees women’s equal rights to land ownership and/or control (SDG indicator 5.a.2) * Secure documented land tenure for indigenous peoples (consider urging States Parties to collect data on indigeneity when monitoring SDG 1.4.2) * Progress towards sustainable forest management (SDG indicator 15.2.1) |
| 2 | 39 | C | 243 | Include trends in legislation related to rights over resources and work toward a rights-based approach must be considered.  Include trends in application of global policies gender sensitive in relation to the use of BD |
| 2 | 39 | A - C | 244-248 | Reference <https://www.cbd.int/sbstta/sbstta-24/post-2020-sdg-linkages-en.pdf>, Section II. This should be reflected in the monitoring framework including in the components, elements and indicators specifically to address gender-responsiveness.  Target 20, which emphasises equitable participation in decision making and rights over relevant resources for IPLCs, women and girls and youth, supports the achievement of SDGs 1.4, 5.5, 5.a, 10.2 and 16.7, which variously call for equal rights for women and men to land and natural resources, as well as social, economic and political inclusion of all, and decision-making at all levels that is inclusive, participatory and representative.  SDG target 5.c further highlights the need to adopt and strengthen sound policies and legislation to advance gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls at all levels. The GBF Target 20 could be further strengthened to better articulate the type of rights referred to in ‘ensure rights over relevant resources.’ There is also scope to use the language of gender equality and women’s empowerment and inclusion in this target and elsewhere in the GBF, to better respond to align with the strong commitments in this regard put forward in the 2030 Agenda.”[[33]](#footnote-33) |
| 2 | 39-40 | C | 244 - 246 | Proposed indicators:   * Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, (*a*) with legally recognized documentation, and (*b*) who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and type of tenure (SDG indicator 1.4.2) * (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 (SDG indicator 5.a.1) * Proportion of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) guarantees women’s equal rights to land ownership and/or control (SDG indicator 5.a.2) * Proportions of positions in national and local institutions, including (*a*) the legislatures; (*b*) the public service; and (*c*) the judiciary, compared to national distributions, by sex, age, persons with disabilities and population groups (SDG indicator 16.7.1) * Trends in the implementation of the Voluntary Guidance on the Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGT)[[34]](#footnote-34) (FAO; Land Portal[[35]](#footnote-35)) * Number of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) improves women’s rights to land ownership and/or control; access to other natural resources and productive assets, information, infrastructure, services and markets (UN Decade on Family Farming)   There is compelling evidence that women’s secure tenure rights change their decision-making power within the household, and change their status within their communities.[[36]](#footnote-36) |
|  |  |  |  | Additional rows can be added to this table by selecting “Table” followed by “insert” and “rows below” |

*Comments should be sent by e-mail to* [*secretariat@cbd.int*](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int)***no later than 15 August 2020****.*

1. [CBD/WG2020/REC/2/1](https://www.cbd.int/doc/recommendations/wg2020-02/wg2020-02-rec-01-en.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/post2020>

   [www.women4biodiversity.org](http://www.women4biodiversity.org) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. https://rightsandresources.org/wp-content/uploads/GlobalBaseline\_web.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. https://undocs.org/A/HRC/34/49 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/indigenous-knowledge-can-help-solve-the-biodiversity-crisis/ [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/mar/23/keep-off-our-land-indigenous-women-tell-ecuadors-president>; *see also* <https://www.cgdev.org/publication/where-do-internally-displaced-people-live-and-what-does-mean-their-economic-integration>;https://www.independent.co.uk/environment/green-living/biofuel-production-is-harming-the-poor-1773190.html [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Vandana Shiva (2016). *Women’s Indigenous Knowledge and Biodiversity Conservation,* available at: https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Women%27s-Indigenous-Knowledge-and-Biodiversity-Shiva/08a471357c1b4f5fdc290c9af3e335e185f9abca [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S027753951730420X [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Landesa Rural Development Institute (2010). *The Interface of Land and Natural Resource Tenure and Climate Change Mitigation Strategies: Challenges and Options.* Available at: http://foris.fao.org/static/data/nrc/Knox\_etal\_Tenure\_and\_CCM.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Meinzen-Dick et al, (2017) *Women’s Land Rights as a Pathway to Poverty Reduction*, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), at *v,* hereinafter “IFPRI,” available at: http://www.ifpri.org/publication/womens-land-rights-pathway-poverty-reduction-framework-and-review-available-evidence [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Pilar Domingo et al (2015). *Women’s voice and leadership in decision-making: assessing the evidence.* ODI, at 15, 95, hereinafter “ODI,” available at: https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/9627.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-50302392?fbclid=IwAR2CZc-UX5Y\_y544\_DWyRwPD90k0XlaQuhC1-TqOXtd7D9ZsWHfUkXdKlic [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2019/08/4.-SPM\_Approved\_Microsite\_FINAL.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. <https://ipbes.net/global-assessment> *See e.g.,***Chapter 2, para18. Leading economic policies (e.g., roads, credit, private rights) can be adjusted to lower degradation of nature and potentially at a low cost to affected economies *(well established)*.** One way governments stimulate economies is by investing in infrastructures for transport {2.1.9}. An obvious option to reduce its degradation is planning the routes for economic corridors {9}. With good local information, and processes, this can lower the costs of satisfying all stakeholder safeguards. Another core policy is establishing and enforcing clear tenure {2.1.8, 2.1.9}. Clarifying smallholder rights, including around customary tenure, can lower natural degradation {2.1.8, 2.1.9}. Further, it can spur greater investment in productivity, including within sustainable approaches. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. https://advances.sciencemag.org/content/6/26/eabb6914 [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Overarching principles guiding the preparatory process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (CBD/COP/14/34). <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-34-en.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. CEDAW General recommendation No. 34 (2016) on the rights of rural women. <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CEDAW.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. <https://beijing20.unwomen.org/~/media/Field%20Office%20Beijing%20Plus/Attachments/BeijingDeclarationAndPlatformForAction-en.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. https://www.landesa.org/what-we-do/asia/myanmar/trees-of-life/ [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Collaborative Partnership on Wildlife Management (CPW), Factsheet 5. Sustainable Wildlife Management and Gender <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i6574e.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. <https://ipbes.net/sustainable-use-wild-species-key-achieve-sustainable-development>. The IPBES assessment of the sustainable use of wild species aims to address challenges faced by policymakers and will be completed in 2022 [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. **Community Voices: Local Perspectives on International Responses to Illegal Wildlife Trade.** <https://pubs.iied.org/17633IIED/>

    ### 

    [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. CBD COP Decision 14/4 4 (f) To put in place systems and / or tools to monitor and assess the impacts of climate change on biodiversity and biodiversity-based livelihoods, in particular livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities as well as to assess the effectiveness of ecosystem-based approaches for adaptation, and mitigation and disaster risk reduction. (CBD/SBSTTA/23/INF/1) [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. CBD COP Decision IX/16, Para 4 (h) Applying the principles and guidance of the ecosystem approach such as adaptive management, the use of traditional knowledge, and the use of science and monitoring. (CBD/SBSTTA/23/INF/1) [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. [2020 IUCN Global Standard for Nature-based Solutions](https://portals.iucn.org/library/node/49070) <https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/2020-020-En.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. ## SDG indicators under OHCHR’s custodianship <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/SDGindicators.aspx>

    [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Jean Ziegler, A/HRC/7/5,

    para 17. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/616943?ln=en>

    [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. <https://iclei.org/en/our_approach.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Community Protocols are referenced in the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization under Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The parties committed to support the development of community protocols by ILCs, and to take into account community protocols and other community rules and procedures where traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources is concerned. This is the first internationally binding acknowledgment of community protocols. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. "Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS) are locally focused quality assurance systems. They certify producers based on active participation of stakeholders and are built on a foundation of trust, social networks and knowledge exchange.". <https://www.ifoam.bio/our-work/how/standards-certification/participatory-guarantee-systems>

    [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. <https://portals.iucn.org/union/sites/union/files/doc/gender_and_biosafety.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. <http://www.fao.org/voluntary-guidelines-small-scale-fisheries/en/> [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. <https://www.cbd.int/sbstta/sbstta-24/post-2020-sdg-linkages-en.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. The VGGT specifies equal rights to land tenure and resources for men and women. Land Portal (landportal.org) have country profiles on the implementation of the VGGT. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i2801e.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Land Portal [www.landportal.org](http://www.landportal.org) [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. IFPRI, *supra* note 11. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)