

**Submission of the World Bank Group in response to Notifications 2020-045 and 2020-053,
“Peer review of draft documents for the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on
Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA 24)”**

Review comments on the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework				
<i>Contact information</i>				
Surname:	Ruta			
Given Name:	Giovanni			
Government (if applicable):				
Organization:	The World Bank Group			
Address:	1818 H St NW			
City:	Washington D.C.			
Country:	United States			
E-mail:	gruta@worldbank.org			
<i>General Comments</i>				
Consider providing guidance to countries on how to effectively track the comprehensive set of goals, targets and indicators proposed in this framework.				
Consider emphasizing the role of country-level action in each target, monitoring element and indicator, to promote accountability and ownership of the monitoring framework.				
Consider developing a set of select <i>core indicators</i> for 2030 and 2050 that captures the key logic and outcomes of the post 2020-framework, which every country would need to track.				
Marine ecosystems could be given more prominence in the monitoring framework.				
[Editorial comment] Given than certain indicators are used in multiple parts of the framework, consider organizing them in a way that minimizes repetition and results in a unique set of indicators.				
[Editorial comment] Consider indicating which elements in the framework require close engagement of the countries in data collection and monitoring (as opposed to those generated from global datasets).				
<i>Specific Comments</i>				
Table	Page	Column letter	Row number	Comment
1	2	B	13-14	Consider changing the monitoring element from “trends in wetlands” to “trends in area of wetlands.”
1	2-3	C	15-28	Some of the proposed indicators may be more suitable for inferring the integrity and quality of an ecosystem and not the degree of its fragmentation.
1	5	B	51-63	Consider incorporating the contribution of fisheries and consumptive uses of biodiversity.
1	5	B, C	63	Consider adding a monitoring element/indicator related to disease buffering. This can be measured by forest fragmentation overlapping with human and livestock settlements.
1	5	B	64-67	The trends in provision of material contributions of nature depend not only on the conservation status but also on demographic trends (i.e. population increase) and economic trends. For this reason, it is important not to look at them in isolation from economic indicators. The proposed monitoring

				elements/indicators on nature's contributions to people could be calibrated with economic indicators.
1	6	C	68-71	Consider adding an indicator on the contribution of nature-based tourism to GDP at country level.
2	9	C	23	The Ecoregion Intactness Index may not be granular enough. Consider an indicator that tracks at smaller spatial units of 10,000 ha using remote sensing data. Please note the suggested indicator is different from Biodiversity Intactness Index.
2	12	C	55	Possible indicators for T3.2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “% of cropped area raided by wild animals” • “% of cases where compensation is paid for livestock/human loss/injury due to wildlife.”
2	13	B	59-60	Consider eliminating these monitoring elements as they can be subjective.
2	15	C	78-80	Possible indicator for T5.5: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Trends in habitat area recovered from invasive alien species (< XX% of IAS observed after 3 years of recovery)”
2	16	B	91-95	Consider expanding the list of heavy metals (including others besides lead) and adding a monitoring element for organic compounds.
2	16	B, C	97-99	Consider revising the monitoring elements and indicators under T7.1 to better capture the role of ecosystems and biodiversity in climate mitigation, adaptation and disaster risk management. <p><u>Possible element 1: “Trends in carbon stocks in different ecosystems.”</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible indicator: “Area of vegetated ecosystem conservation that contribute to carbon sequestration/sinks” (Tons of Carbon per hectare (tons C / ha)) <p><u>Possible element 2: “Trends in carbon stocks in urban nature.”</u> (e.g. parks, green roofs/walls)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible indicator: “Area of vegetated ecosystem conservation that contribute to carbon sequestration/sinks” (Tons of Carbon per hectare (tons C / ha)) <p><u>Possible element 3: “Trends in contribution to flood risk prevention/control”.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible indicator: “Flood intensity with ecosystem presence/degraded/absent” <p><u>Possible element 4: “Trends in contribution to adaptation to sea-level rise”.</u> Possible indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Trends in water level changes and impacts on coastal erosion or accretion” • Inward migration of coastal ecosystems such as

				<p><i>mangroves, wetlands, and beach/dunes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Coral reef accretion/erosion rates (reef budget)</i> <p><u>Possible element 5: “Trends in contribution to adaptation to ocean acidification”</u>. Possible indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Calcification rates of coral reefs and seashells”</i> • <i>“Ecosystem sensitivity to thermal stress”</i> • <i>“Phytoplankton productivity”</i> <p><u>Possible element 6: “Trends in contribution to adaptation to increased ocean warming”</u>. Possible indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Annual sea/ocean temperature and related ecosystem health”</i> • <i>“Primary production (phytoplankton biomass)”</i> • <i>“Fisheries productivity (fish biomass and catches)”</i>
2	17	B, C	101-102	<p>Consider revising the monitoring elements and indicators under T7.2, to better capture efforts to minimize negative impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems from climate mitigation, adaptation and disaster risk management.</p> <p><u>Possible element 1: “Trends in integration of biodiversity consideration in design of climate change mitigation projects.”</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible indicator: <i>“Area of vegetated ecosystem conservation that contribute to carbon sequestration/sinks”</i> (could be measured in Tons of Carbon per hectare (tons C / ha)) <p><u>Possible element 2: “Trends in integration of biodiversity consideration in design of slow onset climate adaptation projects”</u>. Possible indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Area of ecosystem that contribute to adaptation or prevention of slow-onset climate events (droughts, sea-level rise)”</i>, differentiated by conservation, restoration, afforestation/introduction. • <i>“Provision and valuation of ecosystem services/co-benefits as a result of these measures to help overall societal resilience.”</i> ES can include food security, livelihood maintenance, erosion control, water quality, etc. <p><u>Possible element 3: “Trends in integration of biodiversity consideration in design of fast onset climate adaptation projects”</u>. Possible indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Area of ecosystem that contribute to adaptation or prevention of fast onset climate impacts (extreme rainfall, flooding, storm surge, cyclones/hurricanes)”</i>, differentiated by conservation, restoration, afforestation/introduction. • <i>“Provision and valuation of ecosystem services/co-benefits (including food security, livelihood</i>

				<p><i>maintenance, erosion control, water quality</i>) as a result of these measures to help overall societal resilience.” ES can include food security, livelihood maintenance, erosion control, water quality, etc.</p> <p><u>Possible element 4:</u> “<i>Trends in integration of biodiversity consideration in design of disaster risk reduction projects</i>” (non- climate related events i.e. volcanos, tsunamis, earthquakes). Possible indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “<i>Area of ecosystem that contribute to the prevention or protection from non-climate related events (volcanos, tsunamis, earthquakes)</i>”, differentiated by conservation, restoration, afforestation/introduction • “<i>Provision and valuation of ecosystem services/co-benefits as a result of these measures, to help overall societal resilience</i>”. ES including food security, livelihood maintenance, erosion control, water quality etc.
2	18	C	103-113	<p>Consider adding an indicator to T8.1 to capture invasive species. Possible indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “<i>Number of exotic/invasive fish species cultivated as commercial in controlled waterbodies and captured from natural aquatic ecosystems (rivers/wetlands)</i>”
2	19	C	112	<p>Possible indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “<i>Indigenous aquatic plants as a proportion (%) of total aquatic vegetation in monitored wetlands/riverine ecosystems</i>”
2	20	C	120	<p>Possible indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “<i>Status of soil organic matter/nematodes and microbial biomass (PGPR/VAM)</i>”. Depending on the level of analysis that could be carried out/undertaken, the microbial biomass may be dropped.
2	21	B	128	<p>Consider revising or eliminating the proposed monitoring element (T10.2). One suggestion is to be more specific in the monitoring element and replace the term “hazardous”. The term is problematic because it is defined as a dangerous situation or event that carries a threat to humans, and it encompasses a very broad variety of events: (i) those that NBS can mitigate (e.g. floods, droughts, hurricanes, tornadoes, landslides, or mudslides); and (ii) those that NBS cannot mitigate (e.g. volcano eruptions, earthquakes).</p>
2	21	A, B, C	129-131	<p>Consider complementing T10.3 with the following target element: “<i>Regulation of saltwater quality</i>”, monitoring element: “<i>Trends in natural ecosystems proving good ambient water</i>”, and possible indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “<i>Location and extent of coastal-marine ecosystems</i>” • “<i>Water quality in ecosystem area</i>” • “<i>Nutrient and heavy metal absorption by ecosystems</i>”
2	22	C	133-139	<p>Consider consolidating T11.2 into two broad sets of indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “<i>Trends in nature-based tourism or recreational use</i>” (please see comments above on lines 68-71); • “<i>Trends in wild plant species- based products used in</i>

				<i>wellness industry.”</i>
2	26	C	154	Possible indicator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Trends in creation of green jobs in various development sectors”</i>
2	26	C	155	Possible indicator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Trends in budget allocation for enhancing biodiversity/natural resources.”</i>
2	27	C	162-166	Consider the following additional indicators for this important target: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Countries with established forest area/cover national targets”</i> • <i>“Trends in progress toward meeting national forest area/cover targets for countries with established targets”</i>
2	28-29	B	167-176	It is important to capture not only the total amount of waste in the indicators, but also what is being discarded, to reflect the shift to less harmful materials (e.g. paper replacing plastic, timber replacing certain construction materials). The total amount of waste may not decrease, but progress can be made on reducing the proportion of the most harmful waste.
2	29	B	177	While technically excellent, the proposed indicator may cause challenges because certification is a voluntary action of the private sector. An alternative indicator could track policy actions at the country level that create the enabling environment for/support greater adoption of certification by the private sector.
2	29	B	178	Consider incorporating this in the private finance Component (please see below), to reflect the importance of aligning broader private financial flows with biodiversity goals, not only scaling up direct investments in biodiversity conservation. It would be
2	34	C	211	For T18.1 (c), consider changing the terminology in the indicator from “financial plans” to “investment plans.”
2	35-36	B	217, 220	Consider introducing private finance as its own Component (column A) that combines both domestic and international flows. The distinction between the two can be too subtle to track.

2	35-36	C	217, 220	<p>Possible proxy indicators to gauge how much countries are doing to scale up private financial flows for biodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Government introduced biodiversity/ecosystem-relevant financial reporting guidance”</i> and/or • <i>“Government introduced biodiversity/ecosystem-relevant financial reporting requirement”</i> • <i>“Volume of concessional finance applied to mobilize private investment and mobilization factor”</i> <p>The UN PRI is a potential future data collector.</p> <p>In addition, consider introducing indicators such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Issuance of green bonds and green loans with proceeds used for biodiversity/ecosystem restoration or conservation”</i> (please note this requires an investment taxonomy or an in-depth analysis of green instruments) • <i>“Issuance of sustainability linked bonds and sustainability linked loans with KPIs that include biodiversity ecosystem restoration or conservation targets”</i> (please note this requires an investment taxonomy or an in-depth analysis of sustainability-linked instruments)
2	36	C	219	<p>Consider complementing this indicator with a more specific one which sets country-level goals for greater levels of biodiversity-friendly incentives and expenditure (e.g. subsidies for sustainable agriculture) and lower levels of harmful domestic expenditure (e.g. harmful subsidies) (OECD database).</p>