**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 (components the draft goals and targets), B (monitoring elements), C (indicators) and D (indicator baseline year and frequency of updates) of 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:** | | | | Hofsvang | |
| **Given Name:** | | | | Ellen | |
| **Government** (if applicable)**:** | | | |  | |
| **Organization:** | | | | Rainforest Foundation Norway | |
| **Address:** | | | | Mariboesgate 8 | |
| **City:** | | | | 0183 Oslo | |
| **Country:** | | | | Norway | |
| E-mail: | | | | [ellen@rainforest.no](mailto:ellen@rainforest.no) | |
| ***General Comments*** | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| 1. **Need to strengthen emphasis on the quality and type of forest ecosystems in the framework:** Tropical rainforests are key ecosystems both with regard to halting the loss of biodiversity, buffering against climate change and upholding water and rainfall patterns on which large areas of food production depend. The monitoring framework needs to be improved in order to provide incentives and monitoring tools necessary to protect the remaining large areas of contiguous tropical rainforests, with a specific focus on the intact or least disturbed forests, as these are cornerstones in the global effort to halt the loss of terrestrial biodiversity. The framework needs to be more specific on types and quality of forests ecosystems to be monitored, to avoid covering up a conversion of biodiversity rich natural forest ecosystem with less complex planted forests or even monoculture plantations. The indicator “forest area as a percentage of definition of total area” may be a useful indicator for the SDG (depending on the definition of forest used and supplementary indicators), but it is not a good indicator to monitor trends for forest ecosystems and generate the information needed for policy measures within in a biodiversity framework. The combined pressure from deforestation, degradation, fragmentation and increasing temperatures because of climate change requires special attention from the international community to the remaining tropical rainforest regions. | | | | | |
| 2. **The important role of indigenous peoples and local communities** in protection and sustainable use of biodiversity is almost invisible in the goals/targets/monitoring framework. We believe that for the framework to be effective, it is necessary that knowledge generated on global level reflect local realities, approaches and solutions. Neither in the conservation goal a or the sustainable use/benefit to people goal B is the key role of IPLCs for protection of biodiversity reflected. The contributions of IPLCs to biodiversity conservation, the human rights of IPLCs to maintaining their livelihood and culture in their traditional areas and the need for the international community to intensify actions to stop the increasing violence and threats against indigenous and environmental human rights defenders should be explicit in this framework.  Compared to earlier drafts the emphasis on the role of local and indigenous knowledge seems to be weakened. The importance of local and indigenous knowledge in the protection and sustainable use of biodiversity should be made more explicit in the draft.  In a post 2020-framework, the NBSAPS (or similar national strategies) should be align with the global framework and structured around some common monitoring and reporting topics and tools. This underscores the importance of a global framework where the roles of IPLCs are reflected; a GBF without emphasis on IPLCs role will be an incentive for national strategies to overlook IPLCs role, rights and contributions, while a GBF reflecting IPLCs role may incentivize national government to stronger emphasis on IPLC in biodiversity protection and management. | | | | | |
| 3. **Drivers of deforestation and biodiversity loss** is invisible in the goals section (table 1) and has a very limited space in the target section (table 2). We will not be able to halt biodiversity loss without explicit, targeted efforts to change the driving forces behind loss of biodiversity. Land degradation, including deforestation and conversion of natural ecosystems drives loss of biodiversity, and there is a huge variation in business practices within the sectors with the larges footprints on biodiversity. Change of public policies driving deforestation may to some extent ne covered under target 13 and 14, but the draft framework lacks incentives for better monitoring and practices of the major sectors driving biodiversity loss. It also lacks incentives to mobilize potential positive contribution by private sector, investment strategies and supply chain management (the formulations in target 14 are weak and general). How to tackle drivers of deforestation, including private sector drivers and both domestic and international industry and financial actors, must be specified in the GBF for it to be relevant and effective.  The goals, components and indicators on drivers of biodiversity loss in the GBF should be formulated in a way which requires/incentivize reporting on drivers in national biodiversity plans and reporting (NBSAPs, national reports etc). | | | | | |
| 4. T**he current post 2020 preparation and review process:** RFN acknowledge the efforts to include a broad range of actors in in the preparation of the post 2020 GBF, despite the difficult circumstances created by CIVID19, including webinars for various interest-groups. However, there has been serious shortcomings especially regarding the availability of documents in other languages than English, making the process less accessible for many indigenous and local organizations. These organizations represent people who are among the most affected by the biodiversity crisis, have valuable knowledge of biodiversity and management strategies and established international rights in decision making processed affecting their traditional lands. In the seven main rainforest countries where RFN work in partnership with indigenous and local organizations, we see how the pandemic has hit indigenous peoples extremely hard, taking all the capacity of social movements and NGOs. In light of the language- and access problems, and the severe situation in among many indigenous groups due to COVID, the SBSTTA&SBI meetings should consider additional measures to ensure the necessary input from IPLCs to the GBF. To be effective, the GBF needs to be relevant to the local communities living in and depending on the ecosystems in question, and the current process has not enabled the necessary broad IPLC input. | | | | | |
| 5. **The review-process for this monitoring document:** While we appreciate the opportunity to review the document at this stage, and that goals and targets should be discussed at OEWG3, the draft nature of the goals/targets creates limitations to the possibility to give relevant input on monitoring elements and indicators. Monitoring elements and many indicators/ indicator data sources will have to be revised as the goals are revised. Goal B and its components (as well as related targets relevant for “benefits to people from biodiversity”) is a particularly problematic part. The goal and components need to be revised in order to reflect the ambition to uphold natures capacity and ability to provide regulatory, material and other services to people, not the benefit at resource use as such. The development aspect of biodiversity management is key to efficient conservation policies, but the goal formulation does not incentivize sustainable management.  The strong interconnection between biodiversity and climate, and the importance of halting land degradation and conversion in order to uphold natures capacity to deliver ecosystem services to people, must be clearly formulated in goal B. The extremely important role of nature for disaster risk reduction, and the need to work closely with the humanitarian sector should be explicit, and the reference to the Sendai framework included (ref earlier GFB drafts). We will also emphasize that goals and targets do not need to be formulated as a in order to be SMART or measurable. Conclusion: The possibility of formulating the monitoring elements and indicators for B is limited, and particular effort should be made by SBI /SBSSTA to suggest possible improvements to be reviewed by OEWG3 and preparatory processes. | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| ***Specific Comments*** | | | | | |
| **Table** | **Page** | **Column letter** | **Row number** | | **Comment** |
| 1 | 2 | A | 1-14 | | Components A1 and A2: We strongly support a goal on natural ecosystems which includes extent, integrity and connectivity as components.  However, we fear that separating “extent” (A1) with the proposed indicators, and combining “integrity” and “connectivity” (A2), may lead to bias towards “extent of forest“ and lack of focus on the quality of the forest ecosystems, their diversity and their resilience and ability to provide long term ecosystems services.  Ecosystem integrity and connectivity are not always related, and the two concepts should be separated in order to link the relevant monitoring indicators. |
| 1 | 2 | C | 1, 2 | | Comments on indicators for forest ecosystems:  Forest as proportion of land area may give a misleading picture of the state of forest ecosystems and their biodiversity. The indicator needs to monitor the decrease or increase in forest extent, separate natural forest from plantations/planted forest and specify forest biome (as a minimum tropical, sub-tropical, temperate and boreal).  While “tree cover loss” is relevant and interesting on a global scale is does not provide y\the necessary information to assess the trends of forest ecosystems/biodiversity necessary for a post 2020 framework. We need data on deforestation trends/forest extent as specified above, and also extent of forest restored based on diversity and native species.  In addition, we suggest a new indicators: Number of countries that have halted deforestation and degradation of natural forest ecosystems. |
| 1 | 2 | C | 16 | | There is an indicator gap under element “Trends in fragmentation and quality of forest ecosystems” under component A2.    The Forest Landscape Integrity Index (FLII) measures forest condition as determined by degree of anthropogenic modification. The index integrates data on a) forest extent, b) localized or direct anthropogenic pressures on forests, c) anthropogenic pressures based on proximity to direct pressures, and d) anthropogenic alteration of forest connectivity, and is presented as a map that is available at a 300-meter resolution. The index can be scaled to jurisdictional or ecologically relevant boundaries, and used as an indicator for many global goals and targets that concern the integrity of forest ecosystems.  The FLII is undergoing peer-review at this time (see Grantham et al. 2020). The current baseline is 2019, but it will be updated in 2020 and annually through 2030.    We recommend adding new indicator “Forest Landscape Integrity Index” to fill the existing gap for element “Trends in fragmentation and quality of forest ecosystems” (T1, R15). |
| 1 | 2 | C | 16 | | This monitoring element should be moved to goal 2, as goal 1 concerns natural ecosystems and goal 2 concerns benefit to people and should include the important element of agrobiodiversity. |
| 1 | 3 | A | 29 | | The monitoring element should be used to monitor an improved goal formulation (the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, has been improved and sustained), and the current draft formulation (in goal and milestone) of reduction of extinction by xx% should be deleted. |
| 1 | 4 | A | 42-50 | | The components, monitoring elements and indicators for “protection of critical ecosystems” should be broadened to include critical intact ecosystems not covered by protected areas or other protection measures and should include indicators for assessing the state of the ecosystem not only the extent. The establishment of protected areas does not in itself guarantee protection of biodiversity.  The remaining areas of intact tropical rainforests should be considered critical ecosystems for protection of biodiversity globally, and trends in protecting the integrity of these forests should be monitored under this goal. |
|  |  |  |  | |  |
| 1 | 5 | A | 51-71 | | The goal needs to be reformulated, and the monitoring components (B1-B3) adjusted and clarified.  The components should focus on nature’s ability to provide regulating, material and other benefits in the long term, not on as in the current draft the degree of utilization of these benefits as such. As they are formulated in the draft the components will hardly provide useful information on the status of ecosystems ability to provide benefits, or incentives for sustainable use of biodiversity.  The components should include explicit links to nature based climate solutions, the NDCs and the Paris agreement, and highlight the benefits from maintaining biodiversity for climate mitigation, adaptation and resilience.  There should be reference to the Sendai Framework for disaster risk reduction to facilitate closer cooperation and exchange of knowledge with development- and humanitarian organizations involved in disaster risk reduction. |
| 1 | 5 | C | 56 + 58 | | The indicator should be broadened to include forest ecosystems contribution to carbon storage, climate- and water regulation. “Number of certified forest areas under sustainable management …” will be misleading as it will only cover part of such benefits provided by forests. The formulation could be included as a sub-indicator to monitor the trend in improved formal management of forest areas for the benefit of climate/water. |
| 1 | 6 | A,B, C | 72-76 | | The components and monitoring elements must be expanded to explicitly include traditional and local knowledge and the role of IPLCs in building and using such knowledge to maintain biodiversity.  Indicator should be added to monitor to what extent IPLCs benefit from the utilization of genetic resources and related traditional knowledge. |
| 1 | 7 | B | 77-80 | | The trends should not only monitor funding for biodiversity protection and management, but to which extent this funding is additional to existing ODA levels. |
|  |  |  |  | |  |
| TARGETS |  |  |  | |  |
| 2 | 8-10 | A | 1-34 | | The components of the targets are covering critical aspects, but they need to be framed by a revised and more ambitious target formulation; By 2030, 100% of the planet should be under multi-sectoral spatial management plans that specifically integrate and prioritize biodiversity, retaining existing intact and wilderness areas and restore degraded natural ecosystems and connectivity. The plans are developed or assessed through multi stakeholder participatory processes with attention to the special rights, knowledge and role of IPLCs for biodiversity. |
| 2 | 8 | B | 6 | | The monitoring element “trends in extent and rate of change of forests ecosystems”, should be reformulated to include quality/intergrity-aspects; “trends in extent, integrity and rate of change of forests ecosystems”. The indicator on primary forest deforestation is important and must remain. See also comments under Goal A above regarding forest indicators |
| 2 | 10-12 | A | 35-52 | | We welcome a goal to increase the protection of biodiversity through an increase in protected areas and other effective conservation measures, but strongly recommend that the rights, role and contribution of IPLCs are explicit part of the components of this target. This can be included in the target formulation, or added as a new component of the target (A). We recognize the “equitable governance” in T2.4., but this does not solve the issue of IPLCs role and rights. |
| 2 | 20 | C | 125 | | We recommend two new, additional indicators under target 9:  Number of investors and companies with potential impact on forest ecosystems which implement zero deforestation policies.  Number of investors and companies committed to due diligence policies with regard to biodiversity and indigenous peoples rights. |
| 2 | 25 | A | 151 | | The special role of IPLCs with regard to traditional knowledge, and their rights to benefits from utilization should be recognized. |
|  |  |  |  | |  |
| 2 | 27 |  |  | | Target 13 on mainstreaming and its components and monitoring elements are extremely important for the range of goals in a post 2020 GBF.  National strategies (NBSAPS) and reporting should include trends for inclusion of biodiversity in planning and strategies, in EIAs and in spatial planning. |
|  |  |  |  | |  |
| 2 | 29 | C | 178 | | Mobilizing the financial sector to implement biodiversity and will be key to turn the global trend of biodiversity loss.  We suggest the trend (number) of investors committed to 0-deforestation policies as one indicator under T14.3 |
|  |  |  |  | |  |
| 2 | 33-34 | A, B, C | 205-210 | | We strongly support the Target 17 components, especially the T 17.2, its monitoring elements and indicators. Much more emphasis should be put on national reporting on these elements compared to what was the practice for such topics under the Aichi targets. |
| 2 | 38 | A, B, C | 239-240 | | This target and its components are the most important part of the framework in order to enable meaningful participation and avoid violation of rights for IPLCs. The target components currently included must be maintained as a minimum for the GBF to be relevant on the ground. See also general comments. |
|  |  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  | | 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****.*

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)