**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:** | | | | Harrison | |
| **Given Name:** | | | | Ian | |
| **Government** (if applicable)**:** | | | |  | |
| **Organization:** | | | | IUCN SSC Freshwater Conservation Committee | |
| **Address:** | | | | c/o 6180 E. Camden Road | |
| **City:** | | | | Flagstaff, AZ 86004 | |
| **Country:** | | | | USA | |
| **E-mail:** | | | | harrisonffsg@gmail.com | |
|  |  | ***Comments*** | | | |
| **Table** | **Page** | **Column letter** | **Row number** | | **Comment** |
| 1 | 2 | A | 1 | | Refer to ‘inland water’ rather than ‘freshwater,’ to be inclusive of soda lakes, inland seas etc. |
| 1 | 2 | B | 14 | | Trends in ‘inland waters’ – not wetlands (which may be interpreted as a different set of ecosystems) |
| 1 | 2 | C | 14 | | Stuart Crane (UNEP) has previously mentioned that a new set of indicators will be used for SDG 6.6.1 and it will be important for the Post 2020 Framework to adopt their structure, or at least #(i) here:  (i) Assessment of extent of water bodies will disaggregate lakes from reservoirs, so that changes in natural compared to non-natural ecosystems can be compared  (ii) An indicator on global water quality including trophic state (monthly and annual data) and turbidity. I recall this would be developed around a 5 year baseline from 2006-2010 data then use of 3 years of recent satellite data to compare change.  (iii) UNEP DHI developed indicator on inland wetland status, from European satellite data – no change statistic; just a baseline. |
| 1 | 2 | A | 15 | | Refer to ‘inland water’ rather than ‘freshwater,’ to be inclusive of soda lakes, inland seas etc. |
| 1 | 3 | B | 27 | | ‘Trends in fragmentation and quality of inland waters’ rather than ‘inland wetlands’ (to align with CBD terminology, and assuming that inland wetland systems does refer to all inland waters; which it should. |
| 1 | 3 | C | 27 | | Assuming ‘inland wetland systems’ refers to all inland waters, then an indicator for fragmentation of rivers is the River Connectivity Status Index (CSI) (Grill, G., Lehner, B., Thieme, M. et al. 2019. Mapping the world’s free-flowing rivers. Nature 569, 215–221). It is highly recommended that this indicator is included in the Framework. A baseline Connectivity Status Index map published in 2019. Work is now underway on a river connectivity metric using the CSI. This will be scalable for global, continental, national and river basin level analysis. A baseline, using this metric should be published in 2021 and might also be accompanied by reconstruction of historical baselines. |
| 1 | 3 | C | 27 | | It is strongly recommended to include e-flows in the monitoring framework as an indicator of ecosystem impacts of water use. A recommended indicator would be the proportion of river basins, in a country, where environmental flows are provided in accordance with the e-flow methodology of SDG indicator 6.4.2 (Dickens, C., Smakhtin, V., Biancalani, R., Villholth, K.G., Eriyagama, N. and Marinelli, M. (2019). How to Include Environmental Flows into “Water Stress” Indicator 6.4.2 Guidelines for a Minimum Standard Method for Global Reporting. Report to the Food and Agricultural Organisation of the UN. Rome. 32 pp. License: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO). |
| 1 | 3 | C | 27 | | Indicators of quality of inland waters should be included, especially the new sets of indicators that will be used for SDG 6.6.1:  (i) An indicator on global water quality including trophic state (monthly and annual data) and turbidity. I recall this would be developed around a 5 year baseline from 2006-2010 data then use of 3 years of recent satellite data to compare change.  (ii) UNEP DHI developed indicator on inland wetland status, from European satellite data – no change statistic; just a baseline. |
| 1 | 3 | C | 27 | | New Indicator (in addition to existing indicator): A new ‘Sustainable Watershed & Inland Fisheries index’ is being proposed for development. This will provide a measure of watershed health and, once developed, could be applied to measuring trends in fragmentation and quality of inland wetlands.  Supporting organization: There is a non-binding agreement to cooperate on developing this index between FAO, USGS and several other partner organizations (e.g. Conservation International), to have a first version ready by 2022.  Baseline: 2022  Frequency of updates: Every 2 years |
| 1 | 3 | C | 28 | | If a Red List Index for wetland species is used, then it will be important to have a consistent definition of 'wetland species'. It would be better to define this as 'inland water dependent species' in order to (i) avoid any inconsistency on the application of the parameters of 'wetlands' and (ii) to ensure that this includes species that live in inland waters, as well as those that are dependent on inland waters for some aspect of their life history (reproduction, feeding etc), as set out in the Freshwater Animal Diversity Assessment (Balian et al., 2008). The Red List currently has a 'freshwater' system category, but this is not applied consistently. Hence, the Red List should revise this to be more explicit, in order to support the application of this indicator. However, ultimately some other indicator should also be applied (such as those suggested in comments aove), since the Red List is an assessment of the threat of species at national or global scale but is not directly relevant to trends in inland water ecosystems in one particular place. |
| 1 | 3 | C | 29 | | The measurement should not be restricted to the number of species extinctions of birds and mammals; this can be measured for all taxonomic groups that have been comprehensively assessed (i.e. all species assessed by IUCN Red List criteria) at the geographic scale at which trends are being reported (national, regional, or global). |
| 1 | 3 | C | 30 | | This indicator has been updated for 2020, but is available for birds and mammals only (see preprint at <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.02.11.943902v1>) |
| 1 | 3 | C | 30 | | New indicator: Number of extinctions prevented by conservation action (IUCN Green Status of Species).  Supporting organisation: IUCN  Baseline: 2021  Frequency of updates: Annually |
| 1 | 3 | C | 32 | | New indicator: IUCN Green Status of Species Index (species recovery status).  Supporting organisation: IUCN  Baseline: 2025  Frequency of updates: Annually |
| 1 | 3 | C | 34-35 | | Column A indicates this relates to health - should there not be an indicator of health or, for example, disease? |
| 1 | 4 | C | 42 | | New Indicator for measuring ‘Trends in area of terrestrial and inland water areas conserved’ use the IUCN Green List of Protected Areas.  Supporting organisation: IUCN  Baseline: ?  Frequency of updates: ? |
| 1 | 4 | C | 42 | | Indicators for trends in protected areas covered should include the protected area downgrading, downsizing, and degazettement (PADDD) indicator to assess quality and change in protected areas. By tracking upgrades, downgrades, expansions, downsizes, establishments, and degazettements of protection it is possible to have a more accurate description of PA and OECM progress. |
| 1 | 4 | C | 43 | | Coverage of other effective area-based conservation Measures for terrestrial and inland water areas should includeareas that are conserved by IPLCs where appropriate. |
| 1 | 4 | C | 42-43 | | As well as measuring protected area coverage for terrestrial and inland water areas,and OECMS, add an indicator for trends in management effectiveness, as in Target 2; using appropriate Management Effectiveness tracking Tools as stated in target 2 |
| 1 | 4 | C | 44 | | New Indicator for measuring ‘Trends in area of terrestrial and inland water areas conserved’ use the IUCN Green List of Protected Areas.  Supporting organisation: IUCN  Baseline: ?  Frequency of updates: ? |
| 1 | 4 | C | 44 | | New Indicator for measuring ‘Trends in area of terrestrial and inland water areas conserved’ use the IUCN Green List of Protected Areas.  Supporting organisation: IUCN  Baseline: ?  Frequency of updates: ? |
| 1 | 4 | C | 44-45 | | As well as measuring protected area coverage for coastal and marine areas and OECMs, add an indicator for trends in management effectiveness, as in Target 2; using appropriate Management Effectiveness tracking Tools as stated in target 2 |
| 1 | 4 | C | 46 | | As well as measuring protected area coverage for KBAs, add an indicator for trends in management effectiveness, as in Target 2; using appropriate Management Effectiveness tracking Tools as stated in target 2 |
| 1 | 5 | B | 58 | | Refer to ‘inland water’ rather than ‘freshwater,’ to be inclusive of soda lakes, inland seas etc. |
| 1 | 5 | C | 58 | | Not clear why an assessment of quality, location and timing of freshwater should be tied specifically to forest areas. Seems like indicators associated with row 59 would be sufficient. |
| 1 | 5 | C | 59 | | Indicators of quality of inland waters can be provided by the new sets of indicators that will be used for SDG 6.6.1:  (i) An indicator on global water quality including trophic state (monthly and annual data) and turbidity. I recall this would be developed around a 5 year baseline from 2006-2010 data then use of 3 years of recent satellite data to compare change.  (ii) UNEP DHI developed indicator on inland wetland status, from European satellite data – no change statistic; just a baseline.  An indicator for timing would be the proportion of river basins, in a country, where environmental flows are provided in accordance with the e-flow methodology of SDG indicator 6.4.2, as recommended for A1 (Dickens, C., Smakhtin, V., Biancalani, R., Villholth, K.G., Eriyagama, N. and Marinelli, M. (2019). How to Include Environmental Flows into “Water Stress” Indicator 6.4.2 Guidelines for a Minimum Standard Method for Global Reporting. Report to the Food and Agricultural Organisation of the UN. Rome. 32 pp. License: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO). |
| 1 | 6 | A | 64-67 | | Add a Monitoring element on “Trends in status of ecosystems providing globally important services for water security and health”. Indicator could be the Freshwater Provisioning Index for Humans. Based on (Green, P.A., Vörösmarty, C.J., Harrison, I., Farrell, T. Saenz, L. & Fekete, B.M. (2015). Freshwater ecosystem services supporting humans: pivoting from water crisis to water solutions. Global Environmental Change 34, 108–118).  Supporting Organization: City University of New York  Baseline: 2021?  Frequency of updates: A baseline and could be updated on a scale relevant to rates of population change (every 2-5 years). |
| 1 | 6 | A | 64-67 | | Add a Monitoring element on “Trends in status of ecosystems providing globally important services for water security and health”. Indicator could be the new ‘Sustainable Watershed & Inland Fisheries Index’ being proposed for development. This will provide a measure of watershed health.  Supporting organization: There is a non-binding agreement to cooperate on developing this index between FAO, USGS and several other partner organizations (e.g. Conservation International), to have a first version ready by 2022.  Baseline: 2022 |
| 1 | 6 | A | 77-80 | | At present there is an imbalance in resource distribution for conservation; for example, freshwater is frequently receiving less than marine and terrestrial. Suggest Goal D also reflects that there should be equitable division of resources – e.g. Availability and equitable division of financial resources. |
| 2 | 8 | A | 1 | | When the Target gets changed (if it does), it should say: "By 2030, [50%] of land, inland water, and sea areas globally are under spatial planning addressing land. inland water, and sea use change, retaining most of the existing intact and wilderness areas, and allow to restore [X%] of degraded inland waters, marine and terrestrial natural ecosystems and connectivity among them." |
| 2 | 8 | A | 1 | | Refer to ‘inland water’ rather than ‘freshwater,’ to be inclusive of soda lakes, inland seas etc. |
| 2 | 8 | C | 5 | | SDG indicator 6.5.1 is useful because it includes an assessment of how water-related ecosystems are managed. It includes a 5-step scale from “No management instrument being applied” to a level where “Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with excellent coverage across different ecosystem types and the country and are highly effective. Environmental water requirements are analyzed for whole country.” (In the future this could be expanded upon to more specifically include aspects of freshwater biodiversity). |
| 2 | 9 | B | 19 | | ‘Trends in extent and rate of change of inland waters’ rather than ‘wetlands’ (to align with CBD terminology, and assuming that inland wetland systems does refer to all inland waters; which it should. |
| 2 | 9 | C | 20 | | The following new sets of indicators will be used for SDG 6.6.1, and it would be useful if the Post 2020 Framework adopted these, or at least #(i) here:  (i) Assessment of extent of water bodies will disaggregate lakes from reservoirs, so that changes in natural compared to non-natural ecosystems can be compared  (ii) An indicator on global water quality including trophic state (monthly and annual data) and turbidity. I recall this would be developed around a 5 year baseline from 2006-2010 data then use of 3 years of recent satellite data to compare change.  (iii) UNEP DHI developed indicator on inland wetland status, from European satellite data – no change statistic; just a baseline. |
| 2 | 10 | B | 28 | | Need to find an indicator for ‘Trend in the area of degraded wetlands restored’ |
| 2 | 10 | C | 30-34 | | Indicators of trends in habitat connectivity should include an indicator of freshwater connectivity, from the River Connectivity Status Index (CSI) (Grill, G., Lehner, B., Thieme, M. et al. 2019. Mapping the world’s free-flowing rivers. Nature 569, 215–221). A baseline Connectivity Status Index was published in 2019. Plans are being considered for periodic updates, subject to availability of resources.as an indicator. The index is global - the methodology is down-scalable and can be applied at river basin and other levels. |
| 2 | 10 | A | 35-38 | | ‘Area of terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecosystem under protection and conservation’ should refer to Area of terrestrial, *inland water* and marine ecosystem under protection and conservation |
| 2 | 10 | A | 35-38 | | Target 2 seems to consider extent/representation (rows 35-44) and then effectiveness (46-52). The Monitoring Framework should clearly show a distinction between what the coverage is and how much of that coverage is well managed (i.e. an association between rows 35-44 and rows 46-52). |
| 2 | 11 | C | 39 | | Indicator states: “Proportion of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity that are covered by protected areas, by ecosystem type´- this should refer to ‘sites for terrestrial and inland water biodiversity that are covered by protected areas or other protections (e.g. OECMs)’ |
| 2 | 11 | C | 42 | | Indicator states: “Proportion of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity that are covered by protected areas, by ecosystem type (SDG indicator 15.1.2)’- this should refer to ‘sites for terrestrial and inland water biodiversity that are covered by protected areas or other protections (e.g. OECMs) type (SDG indicator 15.1.2)’ |
| 2 | 11 | C | 44 | | Indicator states: “Proportion of terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecological regions which are conserved by PAs or OECMs’ – this should refer to ‘Proportion of terrestrial, inland water and marine ecological regions which are conserved by PAs or OECMs. |
| 2 | 11 | C | 46 | | The Ramsar Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (rMETT) (which is a revised version of the terrestrial METT tool) can be applied to inland water PAs.<https://www.ramsar.org/sites/default/files/documents/library/cop12_dr15_management_effectiveness_e.pdf> |
| 2 | 12 | C | 49 | | Protected Area Connectedness Index can be linked with the River Connectivity Status Index (CSI) for inland waters, so that PA connectivity can be compared against extent of river fragmentation (ie,. so that PA connectivity can be optimized in regions where the ecosystem is not fragmented. |
| 2 | 12 | C | 51 | | The Ramsar Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (rMETT) (which is a revised version of the terrestrial METT tool) can be applied to inland water PAs |
| 2 | 12 | A | 52 | | The IUCN Freshwater Conservation Committee and Marine Conservation Committee are developing an initiative to promote the use of the term ‘aquascape’ – this highlights the connectivity between the marine and freshwater systems, and also recognises the latter is not simply an extension of the landscape. |
| 2 | 12 | C | 54 | | New indicator: Proportion of Conservation Dependent species (IUCN Green Status of Species Index)  Supporting organisation: IUCN  Baseline: 2025  Frequency of updates: Annually |
| 2 | 12 | C | 54 | | New indicator: Proportion of Threatened species improving in recovery status (IUCN Green Status of Species Index)  ***Green Status of species***  Supporting organisation: IUCN  Baseline: 2025  Frequency of updates: Annually |
| 2 | 12 | C | 53 - 54 | | New indicator: species that require recovery actions due to intrinsic processes, with 2020 baseline of 1,751 species across comprehensively assessed taxonomic groups.  Supporting organisation: IUCN?, BirdLife?  Baseline:  Frequency of updates: |
| 2 | 12-13 | C | 56 | | Suggest using ‘Proportion of illegally harvested and/or trafficked wildlife’. |
| 2 | 13 | C | 58 | | In many cases there is not the data to determine whether fisheries are sustainable – it is important that data is collected, and appropriate assessments are developed/updated. |
| 2 | 13 | C | 58 | | New Indicator (in addition to existing indicator): A new ‘Sustainable Watershed & Inland Fisheries index’ is being proposed for development. This will incorporate a nationally-applied method for assessing the adoption of ecosystem-based management approaches for inland fisheries (see T8.1). The method could be applied nationally, or by river catchments, depending on spatial origin of fisheries data. The method, could be applied to assessing trends in proportion of inland fisheries resources harvested within established harvest limits.  Supporting organization: There is a non-binding agreement to cooperate on developing this index between FAO, USGS and several other partner organizations (e.g. Conservation International), to have a first version ready by 2022.  Baseline: 2022  Frequency of updates: Every 2 years |
| 2 | 13 | C | 59 | | New Indicator: A new ‘Sustainable Watershed & Inland Fisheries index’ is being proposed for development. This will incorporate a nationally-applied method for assessing the adoption of ecosystem-based management approaches for inland fisheries (see T8.1). The method could be applied nationally, or by river catchments, depending on spatial origin of fisheries data. The method could be applied to assessing trends in proportion of inland fisheries resources harvested through sustainable harvest practices.  Supporting organization: There is a non-binding agreement to cooperate on developing this index between FAO, USGS and several other partner organizations (e.g. Conservation International), to have a first version ready by 2022.  Baseline: 2022  Frequency of updates: Every 2 years |
| 2 | 13 | C | 61 | | The indicator proposed is: ‘Proportion of traded wildlife that was poached or illicitly trafficked (SDG indicators 15.7.1 and 15.c.1)’. Alternate suggestion is: ‘Proportion of illegally harvested and/or trafficked wildlife’ It could also be useful to have an indicator related to fisheries (**inland and** marine) that addresses illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (IUU) - if such an indicator exists. |
| 2 | 13 | C | 62 | | In many cases there is not the data to determine whether fisheries are sustainable and implement limits/quotas – it is important that data is collected, and appropriate assessments are developed/updated. |
| 2 | 15 | C | 81 | | Plastic debris can range from macro- to micro-. Does this indicator aim to include all types of plastic pollution? |
| 2 | 15 | C | 81 | | Indicators should include inland water systems, not just coastal systems,i.e.: (a) Index of coastal eutrophication; Index of inland water eutrophication; and (c) plastic debris density (SDG indicator 14.1.1) |
| 2 | 15-16 | B | 86-88 | | The only indicator stated is 14.1.1, in row 89 (https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/files/Metadata-14-01-01.pdf) which seems to be focused on levels of nitrogen, phosphorus and chlorophyll a (as applied to coastal systems). Clarification of what is being measured, how, and what is defined as excess would be very helpful. |
| 2 | 16 | B | 89 | | Trends in levels of pollution with **inland water** and marine plastic |
| 2 | 16 | C | 89 | | (a) Index of coastal and inland water eutrophication; and (b) plastic debris density (SDG Indicator 14.1.1) [note SDG 14.1.1 refers only to marine pollution; inland water pollution should be linked to SDG indicator 6.3.2.] |
| 2 | 17 | C | 103 | | New Indicator: A new ‘sustainable watershed & inland fisheries index’ is recommended for the T8.1 monitoring element ‘Trends in sustainable fisheries management’. The current indicator listed for that element, SDG Indicator 14.4.1, has only been applied to marine capture fisheries, and there are insufficient existing data to allow this indicator to be applied to inland waters fisheries. The recommended new ‘sustainable watershed and inland fisheries index’ will build upon a measure of watershed health and will incorporate a nationally-applied method for assessing the adoption of ecosystem-based management approaches for inland fisheries. The method could be applied nationally, or by river catchments, depending on spatial origin of fisheries data. The method could be applied to assessing trends in inland fish stocks.  Supporting organization: There is a non-binding agreement to cooperate on developing this index between FAO, USGS and several other partner organizations (e.g. Conservation International), to have a first version ready by 2022.  Baseline: 2022  Frequency of updates: Every 2 years |
| 2 | 17 | C | 104 | | Note that SDG indicator 14.7.1 refers only to marine resources. The Post 2020 Framework must address this and provide an indicator that can be applied to inland water fisheries, with respect to ‘Sustainable fisheries as a percentage of GDP in small island developing States, least developed countries and all countries.’ This could presumably draw on the sustainable watershed & inland fisheries index’ discussed for row 103. |
| 2 | 17 | C | 105 | | New Indicator: A new ‘sustainable watershed & inland fisheries index’ is recommended for the T8.1 monitoring element ‘Trends in sustainable fisheries management’. The current indicator listed for that element, SDG Indicator 14.4.1, has only been applied to marine capture fisheries, and there are insufficient existing data to allow this indicator to be applied to inland waters fisheries. The recommended new ‘sustainable watershed and inland fisheries index’ will build upon a measure of watershed health and will incorporate a nationally-applied method for assessing the adoption of ecosystem-based management approaches for inland fisheries. The method could be applied nationally, or by river catchments, depending on spatial origin of fisheries data. The method could be applied to assessing trends in sustainable inland fisheries management..  Supporting organization: There is a non-binding agreement to cooperate on developing this index between FAO, USGS and several other partner organizations (e.g. Conservation International), to have a first version ready by 2022.  Baseline: 2022  Frequency of updates: Every 2 years |
| 2 | 18 | C | 106 | | The proposed indicator is “Degree of implementation of international instruments aiming to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (SDG indicator 14.6.1)”. Note that SDG 14 tends to be applied to marine stocks and not to inland water stocks. The Post 2020 Framework must address this and provide an indicator that can be applied to inland water fisheries. |
| 2 | 18 | C | 107 | | Note that SDG indicator 14.B.1 refers only to marine resources. The Post 2020 Framework must address this and provide an indicator that can be applied to inland water fisheries, with respect to ‘Degree of application of a legal/regulatory/ policy/institutional framework which recognizes and protects access rights for small-scale fisheries’ |
| 2 | 18 | C | 108 | | ­MSC Certified Catch; **with equivalent sustainability certification scheme applied to inland fisheries**. [add text in bold to cover inland fisheries] |
| 2 | 18 | C | 109 | | Note that SDG indicator 14.B.1 refers only to marine resources. The Post 2020 Framework must address this and provide an indicator that can be applied to inland water fisheries, with respect to ‘Degree of application of a legal/regulatory/ policy/institutional framework which recognizes and protects access rights for small-scale fisheries’ |
| 2 | 19 | C | 110 | | At regional levels there may be other taxonomic groups that represent important bycatch species (e.g. some species of fishes; some aquatic mammals) for which there are Red List data /Red List Index data for all species. |
| 2 | 19 | C | 112 | | At regional levels there may be some groups of aquatic plants for which there is Red List data / Red List Index data for all species. |
| 2 | 19 | C | 113 | | Current indicator is for fish stocks; need to have something more invertebrate focused. Red List Index for decapods might become available. |
| 2 | 20 | C | 124 | | There is a need to add indicators for inland water aquaculture, that include some measure of proportion of aquacultured species within biologically sustainable levels. An appropriate indicator has not been identified, but might be based on the sustainable watershed and inland fisheries index noted for T8.1. Also, as MSC has been referenced previously, Aquaculture Stewardship Council certification and/or others such as Aquaculture Alliance may be options |
| 2 | 21 | A | 129 | | Regulation of **inland water** quantity, quality, location and timing |
| 2 | 21 | B | 129 | | Trends in natural **inland water** ecosystems proving good ambient water |
| 2 | 21 | C | 129 | | Stuart Crane (UNEP) has previously mentioned that a new set of indicators will be used for SDG 6.6.1 and it will be important for the Post 2020 Framework to adopt their structure:  (i) Assessment of extent of water bodies will disaggregate lakes from reservoirs, so that changes in natural compared to non-natural ecosystems can be compared  (ii) An indicator on global water quality including trophic state (monthly and annual data) and turbidity. I recall this would be developed around a 5 year baseline from 2006-2010 data then use of 3 years of recent satellite data to compare change. |
| 2 | 21 | C | 129 | | Another indicator for ‘Trends in natural freshwater ecosystems proving good ambient water’ could be the Freshwater Provisioning Index for Humans (Green, P.A., Vörösmarty, C.J., Harrison, I., Farrell, T. Saenz, L. & Fekete, B.M. (2015). Freshwater ecosystem services supporting humans: pivoting from water crisis to water solutions. Global Environmental Change 34, 108–118)  Supporting Organization: City University of New York  Baseline: 2021?  Frequency of updates: A baseline and could be updated on a scale relevant to rates of population change (every 2-5 years). |
| 2 | 21 | C | 131 | | An recommended indicator for timing of flows would be the proportion of river basins, in a country, where environmental flows are provided in accordance with the e-flow methodology of SDG indicator 6.4.2 (Dickens, C., Smakhtin, V., Biancalani, R., Villholth, K.G., Eriyagama, N. and Marinelli, M. (2019). How to Include Environmental Flows into “Water Stress” Indicator 6.4.2 Guidelines for a Minimum Standard Method for Global Reporting. Report to the Food and Agricultural Organisation of the UN. Rome. 32 pp. License: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO). |
| 2 | 22 | B | 139 | | Trends in contributions to human health and well-being from **inland waters** (rather than wetlands, which defines a different set of ecosystems) |
| 2 | 22 | C | 139 | | Need to suggest indicators for ‘Trends in contributions to human health and well-being from **inland waters’** |
| 2 | 30 | C | 179 | | MSC Certified Catch; **with equivalent sustainability certification scheme applied to inland fisheries**. [add text in bold to cover inland fisheries] |
| 2 | 33 | B | 208 | | This monitoring element should also include indicators for (i) ‘Trends in potentially environmentally harmful elements of government support to water management’ (eg. subsidies for pumping aquifers for irrigation; poorly planned water-related infrastructure); Trends in potentially environmentally harmful elements of government support to marine and inland fisheries’ (e.g. fuel for fisheries, subsidies for poor fish and aquaculture practices; see SDG 14.6 which addresses the need to prohibit certain forms of fisheries subsidies which contribute to overcapacity and overfishing) |
| 2 | 36 | C | 226 | | New indicator: Growth in number of species with Green Status assessments  ***Green Status of species***  Supporting organisation: IUCN  Baseline: 2021  Frequency of updates: Annually |
| 2 | 37 | C | 230 | | ‘Proportion of total research budget allocated to research in the field of marine technology (SDG indicator 14.A.1)’. Why is marine technology specifically called out here? Research budgets also go into freshwater technology and engineering; and various aspects terrestrial systems. |
| 2 | 38 | C | 236 | | New indicator: Number of IUCN Green Status of Species assessments  ***Green Status of species***  Supporting organisation: IUCN  Baseline: 2021  Frequency of updates: Annually |
| 3 | 41 | A | after 11 | | Assessment of extent of inland water bodies (based on a revision of SDG 6.6.1 [for Goals A and B, Targets 1 and 10] |
| 3 | 41 | A | after 11 | | Assessment of global water quality (based on a revision of SDG 6.6.1) |
| 3 | 42 | A | after 41 | | Freshwater Provisioning Index for Humans (Green, P.A., Vörösmarty, C.J., Harrison, I., Farrell, T. Saenz, L. & Fekete, B.M. (2015). Freshwater ecosystem services supporting humans: pivoting from water crisis to water solutions. Global Environmental Change 34, 108–118) [for Goal B and Target 10] |
| 3 | 42 | A | after 45 | | Green List of Protected Areas (<https://www.iucn.org/theme/protected-areas/our-work/iucn-green-list-protected-and-conserved-areas>) [for Target 2] |
| 3 | 42 | A | after 45 | | The Green Status of Species<https://www.iucn.org/commissions/species-survival-commission/resources/iucn-green-status-species>) [for Goal A and Target 3] |
| 3 | 44 | A | after 112 | | Proportion of river basins, in a country, where environmental flows are provided in accordance with the e-flow methodology of SDG indicator 6.4.2 (Dickens, C., Smakhtin, V., Biancalani, R., Villholth, K.G., Eriyagama, N. and Marinelli, M. (2019). How to Include Environmental Flows into “Water Stress” Indicator 6.4.2 Guidelines for a Minimum Standard Method for Global Reporting. Report to the Food and Agricultural Organisation of the UN. Rome. 32 pp. License: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO). [for Goals A & B] |
| 3 | 45 | A | after 123 | | Ramsar Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (rMETT) (which is a revised version of the terrestrial METT tool) can be applied to inland water PAs.<https://www.ramsar.org/sites/default/files/documents/library/cop12_dr15_management_effectiveness_e.pdf> [for Target 2] |
| 3 | 45 | A | after 126 | | River Connectivity Status Index (CSI) (Grill, G., Lehner, B., Thieme, M. et al. 2019. Mapping the world’s free-flowing rivers. Nature 569, 215–221). [for Goal A; Targets 1 & 2] |
| 3 | 45 | A | After 130 | | Sustainable watershed & inland fisheries index |

*Comments should be sent by e-mail to* [*secretariat@cbd.int*](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int)***no later than 25 July 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> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)