**Template for the review of the document on scientific and technical information to support the review of the proposed goals and targets in the updated zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework**

**TEMPLATE FOR COMMENTS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Contact information* | | | |
| **Surname:** | | | Prof. Bernhard Misof, Dirk Neumann |
| **Given Name:** | | |  |
| **Government** (if applicable)**:** | | |  |
| **Organization:** | | | German Natural History Research Collections (Deutsche Naturwissenschaftliche Forschungssammlungen, DNFS e.V. - https://www.dnfs.de) , c/o Zoological Research Museum (ZFMK), Bonn |
| **Address:** | | | Adenauerallee 160 |
| **City:** | | | 53113 Bonn |
| **Country:** | | | Germany |
| E-mail: | | | [B.Misof@leibniz-zfmk.de](mailto:B.Misof@leibniz-zfmk.de), [neumann@snsb.de](mailto:neumann@snsb.de) |
| ***General comments*** | | | |
| The consortium of the German Natural History Research Collections ‘Deutsche Naturwissenschaftliche Forschungssammlungen’ (DNFS) represents and pursues the interests of German Natural History Museums, Herbaria and major Botanic Gardens. The collections archive and hold more than 100 mio natural history specimens of organismal life. DNFS institutions are closely members of the Consortium of European Taxonomic Facilities (CETAF). Many DNFS members actively engage in Environmental Genomics, the Barcode of Life initiative and biodiversity monitoring (e.g. Metabarcoding). Our research institutions are major aggregators of biodiversity data and among the leading data providers for GBIF and BOLD. The non-commercial biodiversity research of DNFS members is directed towards the three goals of the CBD, Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals. Our research provides the scientific basis and expertise for many of the goals and targets of the post-2020 GBF, we are engaged in capacity building, training and research collaborations with scientists worldwide and welcome the opportunity to comment on the monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to support the work of the SBSTTA-24 to improve the present draft monitoring framework for the 2050 Goals and the 2030 targets.  The post-2020 GBF aims counteract to dramatic loss in global biodiversity. By introducing specific goals and targets various, the success of actions and contributions to improve the current situation should measured. This requires to increase our knowledge and understanding of biodiversity. We welcome and support this effort which – among other items – puts a focus to scientific contributions, non-monetary benefit sharing and engagement in capacity building, education, training and scientific collaboration within the context of the CBD and beyond.  The goals of the CBD, SDGs and post-2020 GBF broadly overlap, and the introduction of the proposed goals and targets will increase the visibility of taxonomic and biodiversity research. The efforts to increase the knowledge on biodiversity, habitats and their functions and ecosystem-services undoubtedly need to be intensified. The Nagoya Protocol aimed to stimulate this by fostering scientific collaborations and benefit sharing. However, since 2014 international research collaborations decreased markedly. In the perception of many CBD and NP countries ‘barely no benefits were delivered’, which lead to frustrations in biodiversity-rich countries. At the same time also among scientists engaged in biodiversity research the frustration increased because of the growing complexity and diversity of the regulatory landscape CBD, NP and non-NP/CBD countries, which makes it increasingly difficult to carry out research projects timely.  The post-2020 GBF has the potential to heal some of obvious deficiencies and frustrations through the introduction of indicators and parameters that are designed to objectively measure the desired and necessary progress, to slow down biodiversity loss and to increase the scientific capacities and expertise to understand, sustainably use and conserve global biodiversity. However, there is also the risk that imprecise or improper indicators could perpetuate or even lead to new frustration, which would be unfortunate. | | | |
| Section III in Annex 1 of the report of ‘DSI’ AHTEG (CBD/DSI/AHTEG/2020/1/7) highlights the role, need and relevancy of non-monetary benefits for capacity building. It also emphasizes the key role of research infrastructures for the sustaining these achievements, and the requirement to foster and intensify this capacity building that enables countries to develop their own endogenous research capacities to identify, understand, monitor and manage their own biodiversity.  To overcome the taxonomic impediment, education, training and capacity building through research collaborations need to be intensified. The successful measuring and monitoring of the post-2020 GBF goals and targets requires more taxonomic expertise and skilled researchers that do the job. The fundamental role of taxonomy for biodiversity discovery and understanding has been emphasized in the [call for action](https://www.cbd.int/gti/doc/gti_forum_2020_statement.pdf) by participants in the Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI) Forum, held from 2-4 December 2020: The post-2020 GBF depends on effective action to maintain and strengthen long-established taxonomic expertise to discover Earth’s biodiversity and on the sharing of data and information to support conservation and sustainable development.  This is currently not reflected in sections II, III and IV, even though ***increased investment in education, training and career opportunities in taxonomy*** has repeatedly been addressed in GBO-4, GBO-5, in Annex 1 of the report of ‘DSI’ AHTEG (CBD/DSI/AHTEG/2020/1/7) and is reflected under goal 5 and target 11 in the post-2020 GBF itself. ***We would welcome respective amendments to this draft version that reflect this need***. | | | |
| The time-scale for figure 1 (page 3) is unclear. ***The current graph implies on its x-axis, that the starting point for measuring is 2010***. For the measurement of biodiversity loos, several baselines have been proposed so far, for example a *pre-human disturbance, pre-industrial*, *IPEBES 1970*-baseline, or more recent ones like *CBD-adoption* or “*2000*” (cf. point 5 in *Information Document prepared for SBSTTA24 by UNEP-WCMC in collaboration with the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership*). ***Moving the starting point even further into the 21st century seems unhelpful***, because this would set the benchmark to an already impoverished and largely degraded condition of biodiversity and habitats.  In our view, the measure on “trends in biodiversity”, species abundance and species occurrence should reflect change in species composition and occurrence over long time scales. It is obvious to us, that ***a well-defined, relevant and broadly accepted baseline is needed to set the context within which trends for individual indicator can be evaluated***. This is essential for measuring of the desired goal or target outcome. | | | |
| ***Specific comments*** | | | |
| **Page** | **Paragraph** | **Comment** | |
| 3-4 | 11 | The graph suggests that the starting point to measure Indicators of Biodiversity would be 2010. Measuring of goals and targets would therefore reflect potential increases from a largely degraded and impoverished biodiversity landscape (see also general comments). With a starting point set that late the immense biodiversity loss could hardly be recorded and measures would most likely deliver biased data on both the proposed inflexion point and net gain of biodiversity. **We propose to choose** a baseline IPEBES (at least the 1970-baseline, but preferably **a *pre-industrial baseline***). ***Such a baseline is capable to reflect the true degree of biodiversity loss on earth and could be backed against specimen data in Natural History Collections around the world***. Data aggregated e.g. on GBIF or BOLD from historic collection objects held in Natural History Collections ***often date back to the early 19th century***. Such an early starting point would be crucial for a detection of the anticipated trend reversal, and would have high relevancy for SDGs and Aichi Targets as well. | |
| 4 | ***Goal A*** | Evaluation of the increase (or decrease) of the genetic diversity of populations requires broad application of population genetics to understand the genetic diversity of species over their entire distribution range, the genetic diversity within populations and among populations within the entire distribution range of the species. This requires increased access to such samples, comparison of Genomic Sequence Information retrieved from them, and analysis and comparison of this data against Genomic Sequence Information held in Sequence databases such as INSDC or BOLD. These are key requirements for the measuring of any effects (positive and negative) under Goal A.  Various and sometimes detrimental factors, such as fast dispersal of invasive species (founder effects), fragmentation and/or subsequent isolation of species or adaptation to new or changed environmental parameters affect the genetic diversity of populations. While coarse data on genetic diversity of selected (often farmed, cultivated or otherwise commercially exploited) species might be available, such data is unavailable for most species on Earth. For ***the evaluation of the genetic diversity of organisms*** found in the wild, ***free unrestricted access to*** biodiversity datasets and specifically sequence uploads ***to INSDC databases such as GenBank, EMBL, BOLD and similar data sources is essential***.  ***Analytical results need to be backed against to reference organisms and voucher specimens held in Natural History Collections, otherwise the evaluation of the genetic diversity of previously unknown populations is impossible***. The same applies for any measure on “health”, “resilience” of or “threats” to the genetic diversity of populations. ***With regard to the heated debate to restrict access to ‘DSI’ by introducing pay-walls or subscription systems*** we ***would like to urge SBSTTA-24 to underline the importance of free, unrestricted access to ‘DSI’ for non-commercial taxonomic and biodiversity research***. Without this, it will be impossible to deliver data for the baselines and trends under Goal A. The same applies for the aligned targets in the post-2020 GBF, and also for Aichi Targets 9, 11 and 19, and specifically for the contributions to SDG targets 14&15, if these should be reasonably be measured. | |
| 4 | 15 | Item 15 refers to “*The extent and integrity of ecosystems* *for the protection of species* …”). While the ecosystem as such surely is relevant in this perspective, it is in our view worth keeping in mind that ***ecosystems always maintain some sort of equilibrium, even if it is on a low, impoverished, degraded level with less species or lower ecosystem-services***. ***The major threats*** for ‘*natural ecosystems*’ and the ‘*genetic diversity*’ as ***addressed in Goal*** ***A*** ***however are habitat loss and loss of habitat quality***. Thus it might be worth rephrasing this sentence as “*The extent and integrity* ***and quality*** *of* ***natural habitats*** *are essential* for the protection …”. Rationale: Programmes aiming to improve the situation usually have a specific focus to improve or restore habitat quality (cf. EU Water Framework directive, RAMSAR R-METT Tracking tool, etc.). | |
| 4 | 16 | *“Natural” ecosystems are understood to be those whose species composition is predominantly native …”* – In our view it might be worth changing this to: *“Natural” ecosystems are understood to be those whose* ***original*** *species composition is predominantly native…”* **Rationale:** An impoverished natural ecosystem with only 2 instead of originally 10 native species can be in a perfect compositional functionality. As this sentence is currently phrased, the return of just 1 species would imply 50 % increase in natural ecosystem quality, which is not the case if these figures are referred to the ***original*** species composition. ***To avoid biased measures, the original species composition should be compared***. | |
| 4 | 17 | *“While the status and trends of ecosystem****s*** *vary by ecosystem type …”* (minor typo);  […] *“area, ~~overall, currently,~~ both the extent and integrity”* – there seems to be a minor glitch, we suggest deletion of *“overall, currently”* or rephrasing of this section;  […] “*This would lead to further extinctions, further reductions in the abundance of species populations and genetic diversity and continued decline*” – there seems to be a minor glitch in this enumeration, and we suggest to change the text to : “*This would lead to further extinctions, further reductions in the abundance of species****, recruitment of*** *populations ~~and~~* ***, loss of*** *genetic diversity and continued decline*” | |
| 5 | 18 | Second sentence in 18 … *“elsewhere, and restoring both converted and degraded ecosystems in order to reverse overall trends.”* – The current formulation “*reverse overall trends*” just implies to reverse trends, which could include to “*reverse overall [positive] trends*” (which would make no sense of course). It might be useful to rephrase this sentence to improve its clarity: *“elsewhere, and restoring both converted and degraded ecosystems in order to reverse overall* ***negative*** *trends.”*  […] *“Models, scenarios and other studies suggest that an increase in the extent of natural ecosystems of the order”* – it is unclear what exactly is meant here, the increase and *extent of natural habitats*, or the *restoration of original natural ecosystems*. It might be worth rephrasing this sentence to *“Models, scenarios and other studies suggest that an increase* ***and*** *extent of natural* ***habitats******and restoration of original natural*** *ecosystems of the order”* to reflect both parameters (which ought to be measured with different indicators). | |
| 5 | 19 | Third sentence to last. *“So, achieving no net loss in biodiversity by a certain date would require achieving no net loss in ecosystem extent at an earlier date.”* – The key driver here is not loss in ecosystem extent, but loss of ***quality and integrity*** *of* ***natural habitats***. We suggest changing this sentence to: *“So, achieving no net loss in biodiversity by a certain date would require achieving no net loss in* ***the quality and integrity of natural habitats*** *at an earlier date.”* For example, hydroelectric dams impact the seasonality of flow regimes of rivers. This change in the seasonal variation negatively impacts the spawning migration and recruitment of many fish species in sub-Sahelian Africa. Even though the ecosystem itself remains largely intact (roughly same species equilibrium but on lower level), it definitely hugely impacts habitat quality and species recruitment and consequently has socio-economic effects on local fisheries. | |
| 6 | 24 | *“The status of threatened species continues to decline and will continue to do …”* – even though it seems clear what is meant here, the current sentence could be misinterpreted: if the status of threatened species declines, i.e. the number of threatened species *decreases*, the overall situation *improves*. However, the opposite is mentioned here, we thus suggest to rephrase this sentence to *“The ~~status~~* ***number*** *of threatened species continues to* ***increase*** *~~decline~~ and will continue to do …”* | |
| 6 | 25 | *“… as well as to maintain or improve the population abundances and the natural geographical extent of all species.”* – if abundances should grow again, it is increase the recruitment, otherwise abundances remain stagnant on a low level. It might be worth reflecting this, otherwise it remains unclear how the trend should be reverted. We suggest changing the text to: *“… as well as to maintain or improve the population abundances****, species recruitment*** *and the natural geographical extent of all species.”* | |
| 6 | 27 | Besides the “*ecological role of species”*, many species and especially freshwater or marine species have an important economic role as protein supplies as well. While the connotation and reasoning of this paragraph is clear, it is not intuitive that without proper management of affected populations or species negative trends in many species can simply be reversed. We suggest to slightly adjust the sentence to *“Efforts should prioritize* ***tools that manage to*** *retain~~ing~~ and restore~~ing~~ local population diversity, abundances and ranges of species …”* **Rationale:** without application of appropriate tools prioritizing to retain and restore populations will not lead to immediate action and thus anticipated improvements (see also item 28, where “*management interventions*” is explicitly mentioned). | |
| 7 | 29 | It is unclear, to which “Genetic diversity” is referred here: to the overall genetic diversity of organismal life on earth, to the genetic diversity within species, to the genetic diversity between or to that within populations? It might useful to add more context to improve the clarity. | |
| 7 | 30 | Last sentence (minor typo): *“…continue, including on farm****s*** *and ex situ for domesticated species.*” | |
| 7 | 34 | “… *(b) regulating services, such as*…” might be worth changing to “… (b) ***regulatory*** services, such as …” | |
| 8 | 37 | Second to last sentence: “*However, the continued provision of these contributions may be compromised by the ongoing decline in ecosystems extent and integrity as well as in the decline of the regulating services that support such provision*.” – It might be worth changing this to: “*However, the continued provision of these contributions may be compromised by the ongoing* ***loss and degradation of habitats which lead to*** *decline in ecosystems extent and integrity as well as in the decline of the regulating services that support such provision*.” **Rationale:** the key driver in the loss of vital ecosystem services is habitat loos and habitat degradation, i.e. respective ecosystems are no longer functioning properly and thus deliver fewer benefits to people. | |
| 9 | ***Goal C*** | The Nagoya Protocol distinguishes between monetary and non-monetary benefit sharing. Because the modes of access and utilization in commercial and non-commercial user sectors hugely differ, consequently monetary and non-monetary benefit sharing are supposed to deliver different kinds of benefits. ***We would appreciate a more refined approach that would reflect the differences of commercial and non-commercial research*** as well as ***monetary and non-monetary benefits sharing contributions*** – especially in Goal C and associated targets – even though collecting relevant data on non- monetary benefit sharing may pose challenges. Nevertheless, non-monetary benefits are essential not only for the post-2020 GFB, but also for SDGs and the CBD. Realized progress on Aichi Targets indicates that engagement in capacity building, training and research collaborations in biodiversity research has to be intensified. We are concerned that non-monetary benefit sharing has been considered by some negotiators as “nice to have”. ***This seems unfortunate, as most of the currently generated benefits are of non-monetary nature and shared largely unnoticed***. | |
| 10 | 45 | Second sentence: “*Further proposed targets related to the integration of biodiversity values in planning processes (target 13),* ...” implies that biodiversity has an intrinsic (monetary) value, which is not the case, even though biodiversity surely should be valued more. A said above, ***we would appreciate a more refined approach that would also highlight the different needs especially of basic (taxonomic) research, which largely deliver non-monetary benefits*** that increase our knowledge and understanding of biodiversity, but no immediate values. | |
| 14 | 59 | First sentence: *“Relevant actions related to this aspect of the proposed target include species reintroductions, species recovery actions (such as vaccinations, supplementary feeding, provision of breeding sites, planting and protection of seedlings) and ex situ conservation.”* – it is unclear, what exactly is meant with “*provision of breeding sites*”. Does this refer to artificial restoration of lost (natural) breeding sites? We propose to change this to: “…*, supplementary feeding,* ***protection and restoration*** *of breeding sites, planting and protection of seedlings) and ex situ conservation.”* **Rationale:** Relevant actions to promote the recovery of species should foremost concentrate to protect existing breeding and nursing sites, to restore them so that they are fully functioning again, instead of providing replacements (which likely are less useful than the natural ones). | |
| 15 | 63 | 6th sentence: *“About a third of the worlds’ marine fish stocks are overfished …”* – This conclusion likely refers to commercially exploited stocks and respective fishery statistics, but for most marine species that are affected and negatively impacted by commercial activities the data is incomplete or even absent (cf. conclusions for deep sea fisheries and fish meal production which do not mention any sort of bycatch or negative impacts on habitats e.g. through dredging activities; <http://firms.fao.org/firms/fishery/755/en>). – ***We suggest to connect Target 4 more closely with targets1-3 more closely*** and to adjust the second to last sentence so that these secondary aspects of commercial exploitation are reflected: “*Promoting sustainable* ***harvesting and*** *use* ***that reduces direct and indirect negative effects on natural ecosystems and habitats*** *is therefore integral to achieving the 2050 Vision and the proposed Goals of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework*.” | |
| 16 | ***Target 5*** | According to item 5 on page 2, sections III and IV should set a focus on deliverables for the 2050 Vision. Control and monitoring of Invasive Alien Species (Target 9) is a key component for (Goal B - *Reduce the direct risks on biodiversity and promote sustainable use*) in the GBO-5. In this draft for the post-2020 GBF, this is reflected in target 5, and section III in this draft should *Provide information to inform considerations of the level of ambition, particularly with respect to the quantitative elements of the proposed goals and targets* (item 5 (c)).  However, the previous elements “*Identification, control and management of pathways for introduction of invasive alien species*” (T5.1.) and “*Effective detection, identification, prioritization and monitoring of invasive alien species*” (T5.2.) for the 2030 milestones in the zero draft are no longer mentioned, even though the provide crucial information to inform considerations and decisions in the post-2020 GBF.  As commented already for the monitoring elements and indicators, monitoring elements T5.1 & T5.2 are closely linked to Aichi Target 9 and 19, components A4 & A5 under Goal A (see [comments](https://www.cbd.int/api/v2013/documents/7BB2BDEC-1E73-A179-0193-BDC15908C744/attachments/VBIO.pdf) on 1/3/C/34-35 & 1/4/A/36) & SDGs 14 & 15. ***Identification*** of *invasive alien species* thus has broad overlap with identification of species in general and the required expertise. ***The need to quantify the abundance undesirable and/or costly alien and invasive species is highlighted in CBD/SBSTTA/24/INF/9 on page 12 a well, but this item is not covered in this current draft version, and we suggest its inclusion***. We suggest the following modification to the second sentence in item 68: “*This requires limiting new introductions****, increased taxonomic expertise for identifying,*** *~~and~~ eradicating or controlling those invasive alien species that pose a significant risk for threatened species or the provision of ecosystem services.*” **Rationale:** CBD/SBSTTA/24/INF/9 highlights the close connection of *Goal A* and Target 5. Without (increased) taxonomic expertise it will be difficult to detect and to respond to IASs timely. | |
| 17 | 71 | Second sentence: “*Pesticides, a type of biocide, directly kill some organisms and indirectly harm others*.” – ***pesticides kill often both targeted and untargeted organisms*** directly; this should be reflected by changing this to “*Pesticides, a type of biocide, directly kill ~~some~~* ***targeted and untargeted*** *organisms and indirectly harm others*.” instead of saying just “some organisms”.  Fourth sentence: “*Artisanal mining often pollutes freshwater ecosystems with hazardous materials like mercury and cyanide*.” – ***this applies to mining in general***, not only artisanal mining; we propose to delete “artisanal”: “*~~Artisanal~~ Mining often pollutes freshwater ecosystems with hazardous materials like mercury and cyanide*.” | |
| 22 | ***Target 12*** | Target 12 closely connects to Goal A and with all post-2020 targets that monitor species (e.g. Target 5). Research directed towards the first two goals of the CBD, SDG 14&15 and Aichi Targets 9 & 19 strongly depends on access to biological material in CBD states and research partnerships with scientists form Provider Countries and collaborations directed towards Aichi Targets 9 & 19. However, [access has slowed down since 2014](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13127-017-0347-1). It would be worth highlighting in this section that more harmonized measures, for example under NP Art. 8a are needed to stimulate and promote joint research and capacity building in this sector (see also section III in CBD/DSI/AHTEG/2020/1/7). ***We suggest highlighting the relevancy of non-monetary benefits sharing and to connect target 12 more closely with closely with Goal D and targets 3, 5 & 13.*** by adjusting item 90 as follows: “*However, there is little systematic information on benefits shared (see Goal C).* ***Especially the role of non-monetary benefit sharing through international scientific collaboration, joint research and publication, technology transfer and education and capacity building is undervalued besides its key contributions for the post-2020 monitoring****. This …*” | |
| 23 | 91 | If 2030 milestones should be achieved, Target 13 should include elements to lower the existing burdens to access GR. Without this, Goal A and most elements in the post-2020 GBF cannot be monitored sufficiently. This not only applies for access to GR in Provider Countries and in-situ collecting and recording of species, but specifically to free unrestricted access to ‘DSI’ on INSDC databases, which is essential for many post-2020 metrics. Besides all challenges of the current regulatory landscape, we propose the following change to the last sentence of item 91: “***Joint*** *progress towards this and* ***closely connected*** *target****s*** *will support the attainment of most of the proposed goals and targets of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.*” (cf. also the necessity for joint engagement in various occasions in CBD/SBSTTA/24/INF/9). | |
| 24 | 95 | Last sentence – likely this is a minor typo? “*and agreements.98 The actions taken the reach this target could directly …*” – should likely read “*and agreements.98 The actions taken ~~the~~* ***to*** *reach this target could directly …*” | |
| 25 | 98 | First sentence – minor typo “*Generally. actions towards…*” – likely should be a comma instead of a period after “Generally”: “Generally~~.~~**,** actions towards…”  Second sentence – minor typo?: “*This will be required action across society, with governments having a particularly important role to play in …*” – likely should read “*This will ~~be required~~* ***require*** *action across society, with governments having a particularly important role to play in …*”  Last sentence – minor typo “*and/or produced.102 The actions taken the reach this target could…”*– likely should read “*and/or produced.102 The actions taken ~~the~~* ***to*** *reach this target could…”*  We suggest ***connecting Target 15 more closely with Target 13***. | |
| 27 | ***Target 18*** | The text of this target in detail refers how damaging subsidies should be redirected into funds that support the post-2020 GBF. However, it does not give details on the requirements to *implement the strategy for capacity-building and technology transfer and scientific cooperation to meet the needs for implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework*, as originally proposed for 2030 milestones, and in the second half of the proposed target. The need for capacity building in the biodiversity research sector and specifically relevant research infrastructures has been emphasized not only in the AHTEG on ‘DSI’ (see section III in CBD/DSI/AHTEG/2020/1/7), but also in the [call for action](https://www.cbd.int/gti/doc/gti_forum_2020_statement.pdf) of scientists around the globe that participated in the meeting of the Global Taxonomy Initiative in Berlin in December 2020.  Without adequate funding of research infrastructures and capacity building it remains unclear how the post-2020 GBF monitoring should be operational. Also, related SDGs cannot be sustained. ***We therefore encourage the addition of an element how and where funds should be used to support strategies to increase capacity-building, technology transfer and scientific cooperation*** and a more close connection of Target 18 with Aichi Target 19.  Proposed addition to item 110: “*In addition, processes related to access and benefit sharing (proposed target 12) have the potential to generate some of the funding necessary to address the funding needs associated with the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework****, especially the joint collaboration that fosters generation, sharing and assessment of knowledge and data on biodiversity****. Furthermore, this target will support all of the other proposed targets.*” | |
| 29 | 114 | Even though data platforms like GBIF, BOLD surely provide essential data and information on biodiversity, ex-situ facilities are an important aggregator of biodiversity related knowledge, associated research and for scientists worldwide. Increased accessibility to objects and related information is key not only for many post-2020 goals, targets and indicators, but also for Aichi Targets 19 & 9 and SDGs 14 & 15. We therefore suggest to expand the last sentence to “*Scaling up* ***access*** *use and support of* ***relevant research infrastructures promoting*** *~~recent~~ technological advances in monitoring, cataloguing and sharing biodiversity information will be important to filling information gaps*.  The Target elements “*promotion of research and education*” currently are not covered in this section, even though the 2030 milestones T19.3 (promotion of biodiversity in education) and T19.4 (availability of research and knowledge…) specifically refer to these. It might be worth covering promotion of research in this section, because it seems to be covered nowhere else. Without qualified and trained researchers, most of the monitoring elements can hardly be sufficiently monitored.  “*This includes efforts to address major imbalances in the location and taxonomic focus of biodiversity studies and monitoring as well as to,* ***intensify training and education of people engaged in biodiversity related sciences to be able to*** *address knowledge gaps related to the consequences of biodiversity loss for people, including indigenous peoples and local communities, women, …*” | |

*Comments should be sent by e-mail to* [*secretariat@cbd.int*](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int) *by 22 March 2021*