**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. Columns A, B of the tables provide draft monitoring elements and indicators to be used at the global level to monitor progress in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Further column C provides information on the baseline year for the indicator and on the frequency that the indicator is updated where known. Review comments are being sought on columns A, B and C only.

## II. Submitting Comments

1. To ensure that your comments are given due consideration, please send them by e-mail to [secretariat@cbd.int](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**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FAO Review comments on the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework** | | | | | |
| *Contact information* | | | | | |
| **Surname:** | | | | Hoffmann, Wertz, Friedman, Baumung, Diulgheroff, Gill, Lidder, Ye, Camilleri, | |
| **Given Name:** | | | |  | |
| **Government** (if applicable)**:** | | | |  | |
| **Organization:** | | | | FAO | |
| **Address:** | | | |  | |
| **City:** | | | | Rome | |
| **Country:** | | | | Italy | |
| E-mail: | | | | cgrfa@fao.org | |
|  |  | ***Comments*** | | | |
| **General comments** | | | | | |
| The importance for the indicators to be based on **agreed international statistical standards and methodologies**, for easier adoption in countries,is emphasized. This will likewise facilitate the development of a unified data collection, monitoring and reporting process, to ensure that biodiversity data are integrated into and add value to the processes already in place under the sustainable development and climate change data frameworks. It should also promote the **use of existing indicator frameworks** in order to reduce reporting burden on Parties.  The Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework should strengthen bottom up national statistical systems. As a fundamental aim, any framework proposed for measuring progress on delivery of Post 2020 Framework’s Goals and Targets should seek to support and strengthen national statistical systems and other relevant offices to promote country engagement in biodiversity monitoring for reasons of improving country ownership and bottom up engagement. | | | | | |
| The **links to the current SDG** frameworks should be clearer. Aligning the Post- 2020 GBF with existing global institutional commitments like the SDGs will enable connected conservation actions that build on each other, thus improving both effectiveness and efficiency of individual actions that local and regional actors will take. For example, while the SDGs are mentioned in the Zero Draft, there are no clear operational links to them. The absence of this will undermine the effectiveness of the framework. | | | | | |
| FAO does not support the idea of setting in place a core set of indicators for the Post 2020 Framework prior to the definition of the Frameworks Goals and Targets. FAO is concerned that indicators are being developed before goals and targets have been agreed. Parties have not yet negotiated the complete set of goals, milestones and targets, nor the specific formulation of each goal, milestone and target, and one assumes that these will substantially change during the course of the negotiations. A very likely challenge may occur that new or substantially altered goals, milestones and targets are agreed by parties but that there will be no opportunity to discuss indicators for these new elements, at least not in SBSTTA24.  FAO does support the establishment of a standard indicator **assessment process**, with criteria described in the monitoring framework. Indicators may need to respond to changes in the decade(s) ahead, recognizing the shifting availability of information and availability of innovative technology.  The process of making commitments (against Targets) and encouraging engagement in monitoring across national, regional and international levels could be promoted by setting in place a standard indicator methodology, linked to competent UN Agencies. The methodology for assessing the suitability and utility of indicators would encourage clarity in the definition of Targets, and deliver a tier’ing score for potential indicators, with the hope that there will be more harmonized adoption of Targets and Tier 1 indicators by countries within the first decade of the Frameworks delivery.  The CBD, UN Agencies and Multi-Lateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) would support their Parties/Members and consolidate what has been learnt while moving Tier 1 indicators to the next level. | | | | | |
| Targets, Tools and Indicators need to facilitate action (and recording of progress against action) for a range of activities across highly variable CBD Parties, and different actors within individual countries’ contexts.  Therefore, the Post 2020 Framework needs to present a menu of scale’able options for biodiversity conservation and management rather than a prescriptive ‘one size fits all’ approach, to facilitate effective action and buy in. Countries may choose targets (from a menu) based on local context (instead of a standard set for all). | | | | | |
| In order to facilitate full engagement and buy-in in the implementation of the Post-2020 Framework, to facilitate transparency and help locate significant gaps in resources and capacity that can impact the implementation of the framework, a new approach is needed.  For example, the CBD secretariat, with help from relevant UN Agencies could provide a mechanism for countries to select and describe their commitments, the target(s) and indicator(s) they choose based on local context.  By putting in place a mechanisms to help countries **self-propose commitments**, countries are more likely to be engaged and note any shortfall in capacity and resourcing to achieve their stated aim(s); this would be visible to potential donors or collaborators and would likely stimulate more effective partnerships, collaborations and external support activity and increase transparency. Most importantly this would increase effective implementation of the framework through a variety of centralized (central government) and distributed (local scale public and private) activity. | | | | | |
| The current Zero Draft start to firm up language around Targets and Indicators with terminology for which there is currently no **clear definition** or general understanding (e.g. “intact areas”; “wilderness”; “sites of particular importance for biodiversity“; “strict protection”). With man-made climate change rapidly evolving, there is likely no locations where human pressures are absent.  History has proven that definitions of key terms need to be clear from the beginning so that time is not wasted in the years following formal adoption arguing about what those definitions should be. Making a process for defining such terms is needed.  Reference should be made to clear and concise definitions of each term so that Parties to the CBD are more adequately set up for successfully implementing measures that fulfills the intent of the target. Where continued work is needed this should also be flagged in a related Post 2020 process/workplan, to make sure there is harmonized understanding amongst Post 2020 Framework participants.  **Operational definition of biodiversity**  An immediate impediment to any analysis is the lack of an operational definition of biodiversity in relation to sustainable use sectors. For fishing, there are a wide range of measures of biodiversity, none of which are broadly accepted as preferred. At present we tend to fall back to ranking species by the risk of extinction when looking at biodiversity concerns (Hilborn et al. 2020, doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsaa139), which is an unsatisfactory end point of biodiversity decline.  **Operational definition of Ecosystem Measures**  Since 2019, Parties have signed off a requirement for monitoring the “Health of Ecosystems” (CBD/COP/14/L.19). As of today, there still no working and accepted definition of what that is. Many ecosystem component measures are available, and a few indexes amalgamate these measures, but few diverse system measures are recognized as accurate or sufficient, and these still require improvement and global agreement of their resulting measures.  **Operational definition of Acceptable levels of risk**  "Acceptable adverse impact". At present this term is used in relation to deep sea benthic environments for example. The thresholds for these types of measures need to be discussed/negotiated.  Setting up the Post 2020 framework, on definitions that have no agreed meaning or accepted mechanism for measurement of change strengthens the argument for the need to support on-going cooperation and flexibility in the development of Targets and Indicators for monitoring. Our collective view of the systems we wish to influence will need to be progressed over the next 10 years, and the CBD, in concert with relevant UN Agencies, can play a fundamental role in progressing both understanding and practices in a collaborative and iterative fashion. | | | | | |
| Goals and targets should guide **action** until 2030. The **logical framework** should be much more simplified and strengthened, e.g. A6 belongs to milestone 1rather than 2. So far, it is not really possible to align 2030 targets to 2030 milestones and 2050 goals. There are far too many indicators at the different levels.  The 2030 milestones should be a result of the 2030 targets, and the monitoring should support the 2030 targets and aggregate up to 2050 goals. Indicators for goals and targets should be mostly the same, and aggregate up, so that action at different levels achieves the 2030 target, the 2030 milestone and moved towards the 2050 goal. | | | | | |
| The monitoring framework and the information document on indicators differ in several places. As mentioned above, the presentation of goals, targets and indicators could be much simplified, and criteria for selecting indicators should be provided in the monitoring framework. In view of the urgency to act, we recommend to adhere to the SDG framework, the use of existing indicators or proxies; and have provided a list of other monitoring systems in use.  The multiple appearance of the same indicator is confusing. There are repetitions of indicators (sustainable harvesting from aquatic ecosystems in both T4 and T8 for example, conservation of genetic resources for food and agriculture in T8 and T9), and examples of indicators not used appropriately. In T8 for example *ex situ* conservation of plant and animal genetic resources (SDG indicator 2.5.1) is used to monitor ‘Trends in terrestrial wild species of fauna used for food and medicine’.  Considering the process of limiting the number of Targets and Indicators versus supporting engagement, suggestion for indicator prioritization include:   * **reduce number of indicators** (lack of data; costs and resources vis-a-vis data-intensive reporting) * focus on better understanding the **baseline**of threats (instead of progress towards threat minimization) * focus on **clear, measurable and feasible**indicators (currently still ambiguous indicators and lack of data) * **(re)assessment**(the ability) **of indicators** (to deliver information on progress) based on indicator aspects such as: **alignment**with goal/target; **geographical**coverage; fit for **national**use; etc. (for instance, the traffic light model) | | | | | |
| **Table** | **Page** | **Column letter** | **Row no** | | **Comment** |
| 1 | 4 | B | 36 | | Under Goal A,A5. Maintain Genetic diversity, it is not clear why ‘Trends in the diversity of wild species’ is included, given that the target is at genetic level. There is already an indicator for wild relatives. Maybe it is meant to be under A4? |
| 2 | 10 | C |  | | T1.4. (area of converted agricultural land) add SDG 2.4.1. sub-indicator 8 (10% of natural land …) |
| 2 | 12 | C | 53 | | ‘Red List Index (SDG indicator 15.5.1)’ which is the indicator for SDG Target 15.5: Take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt the loss of biodiversity and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species, does not measure what is in column B of this line, i.e. Trend in ex-situ conservation measures. This indicator seems inappropriate. |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | Always make reference to the correct SDG target or indicator numbers |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | General approach to the monitoring framework: there is already a well-tested and understood hierarchy of assessment tools, i.e. goals - targets/objectives - indicators - verifiers.  What is called "milestone" in the proposed post-2020 monitoring framework would actually be a target or objective, "element" an indicators, and what is called an "indicator" would be a verifier. This application of terms as done here risks generating confusion. |
| 1 | 2 | C | 2 | | FAO pointed out already that this indicator (tree cover loss) is different from the global definition of "forests" and recommends its deletion. |
| 1 | 4 | C | 39 | | This is SDG 2.5.2. |
| 1 | 5 | C | 51 | | FAO considers this indicator approach (to request “certified forests”) problematic, if this logic is followed, all PAs should also be requested to have verified impacts on biodiversity conservation. |
| 2 | 8 | c | 10 | | For consistency, please make reference to SDG 15.4.2 in both Table 2 and Table 3. While the SDG Indicator 15.4.2 is mentioned in the document ‘Draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework for review’ (p.8, Table 2) as one of the Indicators to be used for monitoring the element ‘Trends in extent and rate of change of other terrestrial ecosystems’, it has not been included in the document ‘Indicators for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework’ (pp. 42-43, Table 3) |
| 2 | 8 | c | 8 | | Trends in land cover change (SDG indicator 15.3.1) - incorrect use of 15.3.1 as it refers to a sub-indicator of 15.3.1 |
| 2 | 8 | C | 1 | | For this monitoring element, FAO suggests “forest area with long-term forest management plans” as additional relevant indicator, from FAO’s Global Forest Resources Assessment. |
| 2 | 9 | c | 21 | | ‘Percentage of cropped landscapes with at least 10% natural land’  is mentioned as available data by Bioversity International. We cannot find online these data nor the metadata, therefore suggest to remove.  The inclusion of natural land is an agreed sub-indicator under SDG 2.4.1.-biodiversity component. Yet it is not available from 2015, as 2.4.1. is still a tier 2 indicator. |
| 2 | 9 | c | 21 | | ‘Percentage of cropped landscapes with at least 10% natural land’ is mentioned to assess ‘Trends in forest and agriculture lands as a proportion of total land area’ |
| 2 | 9 | c | 24 | | Use correct SDG: Proportion of land that is degraded over total land area (SDG indicator 15.3.1) – correct title of 15.3.1 |
| 2 | 10 | c | 29 | | ‘Percentage of cropped landscapes with at least 10% natural land’ is mentioned to assess ‘Trend in the area of converted agricultural lands restored’  What would be the baseline of degraded cropland that has been restored? |
| 2 | 12 | C | 55 | | The setting a % number of *‘reduced HWCs’* might be a rather complex exercise. Reduction of HWCs could be addressed from various angles, such as i) reducing crop/livestock losses ii) reducing retaliation or anger towards species; iii) reducing actual killing of species because of HWC; iv) reducing negative interactions in general. Further clarification of the term is necessary.  In relation to the monitoring elements (i.e. *trends in human-wildlife conflicts*) these can be further expanded as follows:   * Species and conservation areas (e.g. for which and how many species HWC is a threat; where do most HWCs occur; which countries have the most HWC probability); * People and communities (e.g. how much agricultural land area is prone to HWC; how many people are (directly) affected by HWC globally and which groups are most affected); * Economic impacts (what does this issue cost countries; how do countries approach HWC in policy and legal frameworks and etc);    Capacity & knowledge; Policy & resources (e.g. To what extent do countries have detailed HWC management strategies and/or policies) |
| 2 | 13 | A | 56,61,64 | | Strong suggestion to define well the terms “harvest”, “use” and “trade”. |
| 2 | 13 | B | 56 | | The question of legality involves the assumption that the legal framework is appropriate to support sustainability and safety, which is not really the case in many countries. Harvest may be legal but still unsustainable and unsafe because regulations are inappropriate. Illegal harvest may not be unsustainable. Legality act as an effective enabling condition to sustainability and safety only **if  it is aligned with ecological, socio-cultural and economic realities**. That covers customary practices that may not be legally recognized but still act as some form of regulations. It is a bit weird that legality appears as an end, not a mean to sustainability and safety. |
| 2 | 13 | B | 58 | | Trends in proportion of biological resources traded within the established limits/quotas/ Trends in proportion of biological resources used within the established limits/quotas: it is unclear why these are necessary to reach the target. Sustainability can be reached only if cumulative impacts of all uses (whether self consumptive and non consumptive uses, or for uses after trade) are considered. So for sustainability purposes, quotas of harvesting are enough. Quotas for trade or uses will be relevant if you want to secure a part of the resources for self uses by specific users (eg indigenous people). This idea is not reflected in the target. |
| 2 | 13 | C | 57 | | SDG indicator 14.6.1 measures the implementation of instruments to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing. However, the monitoring element under which this indicator is proposed only covers resources harvested legally, therefore the indicator is more broad with the inclusion of the unreported and unregulated elements. We would suggest placing the indicator instead under the “sustainable harvest practices” monitoring element (column B, row 59). |
| 2 | 13 | C | 58 | | Establishing harvest limits may be challenging for many species. In many cases, it is only trends in population status that will indicate that harvest limits have been reached/exceeded (indicial method). It would be more realistic and feasible to measure *Trends in number of countries where harvest rate are fixed based on monitoring data* (and not arbitrarily). Again behind this is the idea that sustainability is reached through measures adapted to ecological realities.  Also on “Trends in proportion of biological resources harvested within the established harvest limits” - why are proposed indicators limited to only fish stocks? there are other types of biological resources, e.g. wild meat, medicinal plants, timber. |
| 2 | 13 | C | 59 | | This relates very much to the implementation of the CBD decision on voluntary guidelines for sustainable wildlife management, and hence to the FAO-coordinated Sustainable Wildlife Management Programme which is proposing indicators to assess the implementation of these guidelines and their impact because, which could be considered in the monitoring framework. However, since those guidelines cover Targets 4 and 8 and some aspects of 15, it is difficult to see how best to link the Voluntary Guidance and SWM indicators to this framework. In principle, the formulation of these targets may be more aligned with the different components of these voluntary guidelines for instance. |
| 2 | 13 | D | 57 | | Correct baseline date, availability is every two years. |
| 2 | 15 | B | 86-88 | | The monitoring element for pollution due to pesticides is separated from herbicides. Herbicides are, of course, a part of pesticides and thus, as it stands, the elements are redundant. Perhaps one is meant to be insecticides and the other herbicides? |
| 2 | 16 | b | 87 | | Why not use in C the SDG Indicator 6.3.2 “Proportion of bodies of water with good ambient water quality”  or refer to SDG 12.4? |
| 2 | 17-18 | A | 103 | | Alternative wording for component T8.1 for your consideration: “Responsible management for the sustainable use of aquatic wild species of fauna and flora, and harvesting of fisheries resources” |
| 2 | 18 | 0 | 103 | | The difference between Target 4 and target 8 is not obvious because at the end both go down to sustainable management. Target 8 only goes more into the details of different uses and differences between aquatic and terrestrial. One would expect target 8 to focus more on equitable sharing of benefits ie how do you ensure that the sustainable management benefit to all users, especially most vulnerable ones, and how do you secure those benefits for those vulnerable users. There are some indicators related to those aspects, but in general especially the elements of monitoring are not consistent with this interpretation of the target. |
| 2 | 18 | D | 106 | | Correct baseline date, availability is every two years. |
| 2 | 19 | 0 | 114 | | The components of the targets, monitoring elements and indicators are not related to each other at all. |
| 2 | 19 | C | 114 | | FAO considers this indicator to be in a wrong place; it focuses on genetic resources of domesticated animal and plant species, and not at all on wild species. None of these indicators specifically measures the use of terrestrial wild species of fauna used for food and medicine.  For example, SDG indicator 2.5.1 measures the number of plant varieties and livestock breeds for food and agriculture that are secured in conservation facilities. This indicator does not exclusively address wild species and also focusses on conservation rather than on use. |
| 2 | 19 | B | 114 | | What about flora, e.g. medicinal plants which provide significant health benefits and used in medicine? The element should read: ‘Trends in terrestrial wild species of fauna and flora used for food and medicine’. |
| 2 | 19 | b/c | 115 | | Move the 2 next to T9, as they don’t relate to T8.2. Sustainable management of terrestrial wild species of fauna and flora  Use Average income of smallscale food producers, by sex and indigenous status (SDG indicator 2.3.2) |
| 2 | 19 | b/c | 116 | | Use Volume of production per labour unit by classes of farming/pastoral/ forestry enterprise size (SDG indicator 2.3.1) |
| 2 | 20 | A/B | 117 | | Agricultural biodiversity/ biodiversity for food and agriculture includes the functional groups that provide essential ecosystem services, such as pollinators, soil biota and natural pest control agents.  With this in mind, it could be considered to add a monitoring element ‘trends in natural pest control agents’ below the monitoring elements ‘trends in soil quality’ and ‘trends in pollinators’.  A possible indicator could be the Red List Index (insecta, amphibia,…). However, the Red List Index has its limitations, as it does not list any species by functional group (which would be ‘natural pest control agents’ in this case). |
| 2 | 20 | c | 123 | | This is SDG 2.5.2.; but there is no monitoring of wild relatives under FAO’s monitoring of 2.5.2. |
| 2 | 20 | B | 123 | | To measure monitoring element ‘Trends in genetic diversity of domesticated animals and of wild relatives’ SDG indicators 2.5.1 and 2.5.2 should both be mentioned.  In the current document only SDG indicator 2.5.2 is listed |
| 2 | 20 | T9.1. |  | | ‘Trends in area of agriculture under sustainable practices’ is a key element of the entire GBF and can make an enormous difference in achieving other targets.  The way agriculture under sustainable practices is measured (with SDG indicator 2.4.1 and area under conservation agriculture) is not complete/appropriate.  SDG 2.4.1 has its limitations,  **Target 9 should make reference in its wording not only to ecosystems, but also to species and genetic resources** |
| 2 | 20 | c | 119 | | Remove ‘conservation agriculture’ and replace by:  Production practices and approaches considered biodiversity friendly such as those listed in FAO’s State of the World’s Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture report (FAO. 2019. *The State of the World’s Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture*, J. Bélanger & D. Pilling (eds.). FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture Assessments. Rome. 572 pp. <https://doi.org/10.4060/CA3129EN>,) Table 5.2 **Reported trends in the adoption of selected management practices and approaches, by production system**  Justification: conservation agriculture is only one of several management practices that can be considered sustainable and/or biodiversity-friendly (often integrated approaches), and that are used in different economic, social and environmental contexts: agroecology, agroforestry, integrated crop-livestock, organic agriculture, integrated pest management, sustainable soil management, pollinator management, etc. |
| 2 | 20 | T 9 |  | | ‘Productivity gaps to be reduced by at least 50%’: this would need to be clarified (what are productivity gaps, productivity of what, what is the baseline), and there seem to be **no indicators or measures to verify progress against this target in the framework.** Remove?  FAO has a definition of ‘yield gap’ and models for crop systems; FAO and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) have developed the Agro-Ecological Zones (AEZ) methodology over the past 30 years for assessing agricultural resources and potential.  <http://www.fao.org/nr/gaez/about-data-portal/yield-and-production-gaps/en/>; or  <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4695e.pdf> |
| 2 | 23 | C | 144 | | Add after row 144 as possible indicator: Number of countries that have taken measures to provide that genetic resources utilized within their jurisdiction have been accessed in accordance with prior informed consent and that mutually agreed terms have been established, as required by the domestic access and benefit-sharing legislation or regulatory requirements of the other country. |
| 2 | 25 | A | 152 | | Add ‘and across all sectors’ in the description of Component target T13.1: ‘Biodiversity reflected in policies and planning at all levels and across all sectors’. |
| 2 | 30 | b/c | 179 | | B Trends in a proportion of supply chains which are legal and sustainable  C MSC Certified Catch  What does that mean? Share of MSC Certified Catch in overall capture fish sold? |
| 2 | 31 | B | 193 | | To measure monitoring element ‘Trends in demand for more environmentally friendly products’, perhaps the two following indicators could be introduced:  - Consumption of local food products per capita  - Consumption of organically produced food products per capita |
|  |  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  | | Additional rows can be added to this table by selecting “Table” followed by “insert” and “rows below” |

FAO COMMENTS ON THE MONITORING ELEMENTS

Indicator gaps and improvements:  
*Please note that any current indicator omissions might also be the result of*[*provisions 4 and 5*](https://www.cbd.int/sbstta/sbstta-24/post2020-monitoring-en.pdf)*(see I. Background)*

* adequate integration of **social and cultural indicators** (currently integrated under GA5; T8.2; T19.4; and T20.1)
* add **wildlife indicators** based on proposal by CPW for SBSTTA24 (forthcoming)
* **prevent mismatch** between Goals/Targets and indicators: **propose adequate indicators to measure** forest fragmentation; extent of forest ecosystem; genetic diversity; legal harvesting of biological resources
* **limit overlapping/recurring indicators**under Goals ánd Targets (for instance by providing only the Targets (not Goals) with a set of indicators)
* **integrate existing SDG indicators** under FAO custodianship (done, see [table 3](https://www.cbd.int/sbstta/sbstta-24/post2020-monitoring-en.pdf)):  
  SDG 2.4.1 (integrated under T9.1)  
  SDG 2.5.1b (integrated under GA5, T8.2 and T9.1)  
  SDG 2.5.2 (integrated under GA5 and T9.1)  
  SDG 14.4.1 (integrated under T4.1 and T8.1)  
  SDG 15.2.1 (integrated under T9.3)

**Main areas of intervention, for which FAO has instruments and monitoring systems in place** (see separate document)

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)