

Guidelines and template for the review of the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

I. Background

1. The second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group¹ 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, 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:
 - a. Please provide all comments in writing and in an MS Word or similar document format using the table provided below.
 - b. Please provide full contact information for the individual/Government/organization submitting the comments.
 - c. 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.
 - d. 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.
 - e. If you refer to additional sources of information, please include these with your comments when possible or provide a complete reference or hyperlink.
 - f. 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.
 - g. 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

¹ [CBD/WG2020/REC/2/1](https://www.cbd.int/doc/working-groups/2020/CBD-WG2020-REC-2-1.pdf)

baseline (i.e. the year data is first available) and how frequently the indicator is updated (i.e. monthly, yearly, every two years etc.).

- h. All review comments will be posted on the webpage² 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.

III. Template for Comments

4. Please use the review template below when providing comments.
5. 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				
<i>Contact information</i>				
Surname:	Wheatley			
Given Name:	Amanda			
Government (if applicable):				
Organization:	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)			
Address:				
City:	Apia			
Country:	Samoa			
E-mail:	peterd@sprep.org ; amandaw@sprep.org ; juneyw@sprep.org			
<i>Comments</i>				
Table	Page	Column letter	Row number	Comment
1	2	B	25-26	<p>There are no monitoring element that takes into account the protection of migration routes connecting core habitats of migratory species both for marine and terrestrial.</p> <p>Fragmentation is really only applied to specific habitats not the whole of the complex of habitats that might be required to protect migratory species. This approach requires cooperation across jurisdictions such as through international agreements like the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS).</p>

² <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/post2020>

				There also needs to be an indicator that measures connectivity across the different ecosystems for both terrestrial, freshwater and marine.
1	3	A	29 – 33	Species extinction and trends in abundance indicators looks good. It is important to maintain all indicators as they tell us different important things about biodiversity loss e.g. loss of abundance can disrupt ecosystem connections even before extinction or near extinctions occur.
1	4	A	42-50	Protection of critical ecosystems. Trends in coastal and marine areas conserved. Level of protection provided for biodiversity is key. Would suggest to provide different indicators for the different levels of protection which also includes areas that are conserved by local communities.
2	8	B	1-5	Spatial Plans are not really a guarantee of good ecological outcomes. Suggest to include words around effectively implemented spatial plans. Integrity of freshwater systems are inadequately covered in the draft. Reference to freshwater is mainly in the context of providing water for humans and not the ecosystem itself.
2	8	B	21-22	Suggest to include land under cultivation in the monitoring elements
2	8	B	21-22	Suggested indicator for land under cultivation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of total land area under cultivation
2	10	A	35-38	The target includes a value of at least 30% of the planet, would suggest to include a footnote to denote that the planet includes marine, freshwater, terrestrial, high seas etc. The target also talks about connectivity and representativeness as well as focusing protection toward areas of special significance for biodiversity. These are elements that were in the Aichi target. Need to consider if this target will inspire further ambitious advances in protected areas. Also are the targets appropriate for the Pacific and do they adequately take into account LMMAs and OECMs that exists in the Pacific
2	10	C	35-38	Suggest to consider an additional indicator as there is a gap for measuring marine protection between T2.1 <i>Coverage of protected areas in relation to marine areas</i> and T2.3 <i>Protected Area Coverage of key biodiversity areas</i> .

2	11	C	39-42	<p>KBAs are areas of global importance – which need to be assessed – a major process in itself and one which is important as we need to at a minimum protect the most important sites. However, between just protecting any marine area (or even a representative area (as in T2.3) and globally important sites, are other possibly ‘nationally important’ sites which could also be prioritized. An example might be Important Marine Mammal Areas, need to include an indicator, and this might be particularly important for the Pacific where we do have a capacity issue.</p> <p>To get a KBA process up and running takes time and most countries will have identified at least some priority marine sites but they might not meet the KBA standard.</p>
2	11	C	42	To include marine ecosystems
2	13	C	56	<p>How would this indicator be measured? Suggestion to include another indicator related to bycatch of Species of Special Interest should be included as ‘sustainable levels’ generally only refers to stock levels of target species.</p> <p>Alternatively consider definitions of the monitoring elements to include these aspects. Would need to define what safe harvesting operations are and how will these be measured?</p>
2	15	C	79	Suggested indicator Percentage of priority sites with invasive species management.
2	15	B	81-85	Suggest to include freshwater quality and lagoon water quality into the monitoring elements.
2	16	B	89-90	Monitoring Elements relating to marine plastic. This is a key concern for the Pacific Island Countries. Suggest to consider other indicators for example establishing baselines for levels of marine plastic ingested in a seabird ‘indicator species’. In the northern hemisphere – northern fulmar is being used while here in the south we could use another wide-ranging pelagic species such as the wedge-tailed shearwater which can be done at a few sites around the Pacific.
2	16	C	89-90	<p>Suggest indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the number of national container deposit programmes • Per capita generation of municipal solid waste recycled • Percentage of household waste capture by authorised waste collection.
2	16	C	91	Suggest an indicator on the number of countries with national, state or municipal composting programmes

2	16	C	96	<p>Suggested indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the quantity of healthcare waste, used oil and e-waste. • Number of marine pollution incidents • Number of port waste reception facilities
2	16	B	98	Suggest to include a monitoring element on Funding for ecosystem-based adaptation with an indicator on Trend in annual funds received to implement ecosystem-based approaches to climate adaptation.
2	19	B	110-111	<p>Monitoring trends in populations for albatrosses and petrels is a relatively easy indicator but due to long generation times, it is a very slow response time to get a negative or positive action to reduce their bycatch. Suggest to consider other indicators which could tell us over a shorter time span if actions have a positive effect. E.g. levels of compliance among fishing fleets with conservation and mitigation measures to protect Species of Special Interest.</p>
2	19	B	114-116	T8.2 includes both terrestrial fauna and flora yet the monitoring elements only refers to fauna being used for food and medicine.
2	19	C	114-116	There are no indicators that reflects the Target which is on wild species of fauna and flora, the indicators are about cultivated species.
2	21	C	127-131	<p>Nature Based solutions to Natural Hazards maybe relevant to consider. Do the indicators actually drive this target? The indicators could be met through non-nature-based solutions leading to biodiversity loss.</p> <p>For example. Hard engineering solutions to coastal erosion could give the results in the indicators but may not lead to biodiversity outcomes.</p>
2	21	C	128	<p>Suggested indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of annual climate-related deaths from declared disasters. • Total annual dollars of financial loss occurring due to climate-related disaster (cyclones, floods, landslides, drought) national government losses
2	25	A	152-156	This target is on mainstreaming biodiversity across all government sectors and national policies including Environmental Impact Assessment and the inclusion of biodiversity into national accounts. It will be important that this Target is discussed across other Government Ministries to ensure that this is achievable and does not place unachievable burden on Pacific Countries.
2	27	C	159-161	Suggested indicator on the number of environment cases

