**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-2) 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-3) 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:** | | | | Dunbar | |
| **Given Name:** | | | | William | |
| **Government** (if applicable)**:** | | | |  | |
| **Organization:** | | | | United Nations University Institute for Advanced Study of Sustainability | |
| **Address:** | | | | 5-53-70 Jingumae, Shibuya-ku | |
| **City:** | | | | Tokyo | |
| **Country:** | | | | Japan | |
| E-mail: | | | | [isi@unu.edu](mailto:isi@unu.edu) | |
|  |  | ***Comments*** | | | |
| **Table** | **Page** | **Column letter** | **Row number** | | **Comment** |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | The indicators in general should not only be looking for be looking for "loss" (negative), but also "increase" (positive) trends, impacts, etc. to inspire people and give credit where it is deserved. |
| 1 | 2 | C | 1-28 | | Trends in area, fragmentation and quality of social-ecological systems, cultural landscapes, and the like should be included. |
| 1 | 2 | C | 15 | | There are no indicators to measure connectivity for between conserved and managed ecosystems, and also connectivity between pristine & secondary nature. We need to focus not only on fragmentation of certain ecosystems, but connectivity between different ecosystems across the landscape. |
| 1 | 4 | B | 37-39 | | It should include marine/freshwater species in fisheries and aquaculture. |
| 1 | 4 | C | 37 | | “Socioeconomically” should be changed to “socio-ecologically” to capture the spirit of this indicator. “Culturally valuable species” needs to be defined and clarified better. |
| 1 | 5 | C | 60 | | Indicators should include acidification and eutrophication, and water temperature |
| 1 | 6 | B | 64-71 | | Indicators need to account for trade-offs |
| 1 | 6 | B | 64 | | Energy supply should account for not only biofuels, but also things like fuel wood, agricultural residue used for burning, etc. |
| 1 | 7 | B | 81-84 | | Indicators should consider quality as well as quantity of capacity building, transfer and cooperation |
|  |  |  |  | |  |
| 2 | 8 | C | 1-5 | | Terrestrial indicators should be added, as well as freshwater ecosystems |
| 2 | 8 | B | 6-22 | | There are no indicators to measure connectivity for between conserved and managed ecosystems, and also connectivity between pristine & secondary nature. We need to focus not only on fragmentation of certain ecosystems, but connectivity between different ecosystems across the landscape. |
| 2 | 8 | C | 29 | | An indicator should include something like “Extent of agricultural lands converted to using biodiversity-friendly management practices” |
| 2 | 8 | C | 6-34 | | Trends in extent and rate of change, and degraded area of social-ecological systems, cultural landscapes, and the like should be included. |
| 2 | 10 | B | 30-34 | | Integrated landscape governance (landscape planning and its implementation) should be included to better capture connectivity. |
| 2 | 11 | B | 38 | | OECM indicators need to include human, societal, cultural elements, as OECMs are social-ecological systems |
| 2 | 11 | C | 39 | | OECM coverage of KBAs should also be included |
| 2 | 11 | C | 42 | | Marine ecosystems should also be included in this |
| 2 | 11 | B | 43 | | “Ecological representativeness” has been defined to include cultural values, so the indicators should include nature-culture links |
| 2 | 11 | C | 43-48 | | Indicators are needed in all these categories also for marine and coastal areas. |
| 2 | 12 | C | 52 | | Number of countries incorporating landscape approaches in their NBSAPs is an indicator currently evaluated by UNU-IAS, and can contribute here. |
| 2 | 13 | A | 56 | | Consideration of legal harvesting should also consider whether the laws are culturally appropriate. |
| 2 | 13 | B | 60 | | It is not clear what “safe harvesting” means. Safe for humans? How does this contribute to biodiversity? |
| 2 | 13 | B | 63 | | It is not clear what “safety of trade operations” means. |
| 2 | 14 | B | 66 | | It is not clear what “safe use of biodiversity” means. |
| 2 | 16 | B | 91-95 | | Pollution should include heavy metals. |
| 2 | 16 | B | 91-95 | | Pollution should include persistent organic pollutants (POPs). The impact of POPs is global as they are transferred and transported in long distances. POPs affect the species through directly harming organisms and through bioaccumulating up the food chain. |
| 2 | 18 | B | 105 | | Impacts from ghost nets and other abandoned fishing equipment need to be considered. |
| 2 | 18 | A | 103-116 | | The target is about human well-being, but these indicators do not capture these aspects. |
| 2 | 18 | A | 103-116 | | Human well-being needs to include cultural aspects as well. |
| 2 | 19 | C | 114-116 | | The target element is about wild species, but the indicators are all about cultivated species. |
| 2 | 20-21 | A | 117-126 | | Integrated management on the landscape scale should be included, as a landscape approach can contribute or can be one kind of “sustainable practices” for agriculture. |
| 2 | 22 | B | 134-139 | | Trends in contributions to human health and well-being from social-ecological systems, cultural landscapes, and the like should be included. |
| 2 | 25 | C | 152 | | For part “(b) Integration of biodiversity into national accounting and reporting systems”, this should also include subnational and local government planning. |
| 2 | 27 | B | 162-166 | | “Negative impacts on biodiversity” as a quantifiable object is still very unclear. To make these targets action-oriented, guidance is needed on what are negative impacts. |
| 2 | 27 | C | 162-166 | | Negative impacts on cultural aspects of biodiversity should also be included. |
| 2 | 27 | C | 162-166 | | Indicators for this target should also include food loss (in addition to target 15). |
| 2 | 27 | C | 164 | | Target 14 is on production and 15 is on consumption, so consumption indicators should come under 15. |
| 2 | 28 | C | 172 | | This indicator is duplicated from row 167. |
| 2 | 29 | C | 177 | | Agricultural certifications could also be included. |
| 2 | 31 | C | 193 | | Indicators may include success in eco-labelling. |
| 2 | 34 | C | 212-216 | | Indicators should also try to capture effectiveness of use of financial resources, as indicated in the target. |
| 2 | 36 | C | 224 | | It would be better to add “with biodiversity safeguards” to environmentally-sound technologies. |
| 2 | 37 | C | 233 | | These indicators (in general) show a bias towards developed countries. Many people in the world do not have access to zoos, aquariums, etc., and the indicators need to consider these situations more, as well as differing concepts related to biodiversity, such as those held by IPLCs. |
| 2 | 37 | C | 233 | | Awareness efforts need to go beyond charismatic animals. |
| 2 | 38 | B | 236-238 | | Indicators could include participation in networks created to promote knowledge sharing. |
| 2 | 38 | B | 239-245 | | Monitoring elements should include other aspects related to representation, including information and knowledge-sharing, scientific and technical transfer, capacity-building, etc. for IPLCs, women, youth. |
| 2 | 38 | C | 239 | | Include local knowledge along with traditional knowledge. |
| 2 | 39 | C | 243 | | Include trends in legislation related to rights over resources. |
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|  |  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  | | 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 25 July 2020****.*
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