

# **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 Group<sup>1</sup> 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](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:
  - 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

---

<sup>1</sup> [CBD/WG2020/REC/2/1](https://cbd.int/WG2020/REC/2/1)

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 webpage<sup>2</sup> 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***

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**

| <b>Review comments on the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework</b> |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Contact information</i>   |  |
| <b>Surname:</b>  | REBUT  |
| <b>Given Name:</b>   | Elise  |
| <b>Government</b> (if applicable):   | France   |
| <b>Organization:</b>   | Ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires étrangères |
| <b>Address:</b>  | 27 rue de la Convention                          |
| <b>City:</b>   | 75015 Paris                                      |
| <b>Country:</b>  | France   |
| <b>E-mail:</b>   | elise.rebut@diplomatie.gouv.fr                   |
| <i>Contact information</i>   |  |
| <b>Surname:</b>  | PERIANIN   |
| <b>Given Name:</b>   | Laurence   |
| <b>Government</b> (if applicable):   | France   |
| <b>Organization:</b>   | Ministère de la Transition écologique            |
| <b>Address:</b>  | La Grande Arche Sud                              |
| <b>City:</b>   | 92055 La Défense                                 |
| <b>Country:</b>  | France   |
| <b>E-mail:</b>   | laurence.perianin@developpement-durable.gouv.fr  |

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

|       |      | Comments      |            |   |
|-------|------|---------------|------------|---|
| Table | Page | Column letter | Row number | Comment   |
|       |      |               |            | <p>We appreciate the proposed exercise but stress that the indicators must answer precise questions and that it is therefore difficult to define them upstream of the negotiation of targets.</p> <p>A large number of indicators are offered. It is important that the different actors can prioritize their use and choose the appropriate indicators according to the level of integration considered (global, regional, national, local, etc.). A small number of headlines indicators, globally relevant and disagreeable to smaller scales, need to be defined.,.</p> |
| 1     | 2    | C             | 8          | We support the inclusion of live coral cover as a priority indicator.   |
| 1     | 2    | C             | 9          | We support the inclusion of global coral reef extent as a priority indicator as recommended.  |
| 1     | 2    | C             | 15         | We recommend to add the Forest Landscape Integrity Index (Grantham et al., 2020) or an equivalent.  |
| 1     | 2    | C             | 16         | An indicator on land use and conversion should be added here  |
| 1     | 2    | C             | 42         | We propose to include, in addition to the protected area coverage, the protected area downgrading, downsizing and degazettement (PADDD) indicator to assess quality and change in protected areas.  |
| 1     | 3    | B             | 24         | We recommend the inclusion of additional indicators (i.e. new rows after row 24) within “Trends in fragmentation and quality of coral reefs” in line with the ICRI recommendation. This recommends the following indicators would include as a priority: 1) <b>Fleshy algae cover and cover of other key benthic groups</b> , 2) <b>Reef fish abundance and biomass</b>   |
| 1     | 3    | B             | 34-35      | We recommend the inclusion of an additional indicator (i.e. a new row after row 35) within “Trends in species abundance,” to include <b>“Reef fish abundance and biomass”</b> in line with the ICRI recommendation.   |
| 1     | 4    | C             | 36         | An indicator on the fitness of species would be useful to evaluate the health and genetic diversity of species.   |
| 1     | 4    | C             | 37         | The indicator sounds too much general and should be defined more precisely.   |
| 1     | 4    | B             | 37 - 39    | The genetic diversity of marine and freshwater species should also be taken into account.   |
| 1     | 4    | C             | 38         | This is an indicator for <i>ex situ</i> conservation, but it tells nothing about the <i>in situ</i> diversity on-farm, i.e. nothing about the resilience/ sustainability of agricultural ecosystems per se.   |
| 1     | 4    | C             | 38         | This refers to institutional conservation of genetic resources. An indicator should be devoted to community seed banks.   |
| 1     | 4    | C             | 38         | If it is accepted for domestic species, the same indicator would be relevant for A-5- Trends in the diversity of wild relatives.  |
| 1     | 4    | C             | 41         | <p>This indicator sounds too much general and should be defined more precisely</p> <p>We recommend to add an indicator on evolution of phylogenetic diversity of known species?</p>   |

|   |    |   |         |   |
|---|----|---|---------|---|
| 1 | 4  | C | 36-41   | This component A5 lacks indicators on the evolutionary dynamics of domestic species and their wild relatives.   |
| 1 | 4  | C | 48      | We recommend to add an indicator focusing on « global stocks of irrecoverable carbon ».   |
| 1 | 4  | B | 62      | Regarding the trends in regulation of hazards and extreme events: the number of deaths, missing and affected people does not provide information on the regulation of dangers: if regulation improves, but the dangers also (increase in extreme events eg), the number of deaths - etc.- can stagnate for example. The number of deaths etc. rather gives information on the impact (Trends in impacts of hazards and extreme events). |
| 1 | 5  | C | 51      | We recommend to replace the indicator with “number of High Conservation Value and High Carbon Stock areas under sustainable management with verified impact on habitat conservation/restoration”  |
| 1 | 5  | C | 56      | We recommend to replace the indicator with “number of High Conservation Value and High Carbon Stock areas under sustainable management with verified impact on carbon sequestration/storage”.   |
| 1 | 5  | C | 58      | We recommend to replace the indicator with “number of High Conservation Value and High Carbon Stock areas under sustainable management with verified impact on water quality”.  |
| 1 | 6  | B | 63      | The trends should include a specific focus on sustainable use for provision of energy supply.   |
| 1 | 6  | C | 77      | In addition to ODA, the framework should also consider other international financial flows.   |
| 1 | 6  | C | 77 - 80 | In order to be coherent with the current framework, the contribution of private sector and of charitable organizations in terms of resources mobilization should be considered within the domestic and international categories, and not as new categories.   |
| 1 | 7  | D | 80      | The baseline year should not be 2020, as the Covid-19 pandemic is bound to have an effect on philanthropic funding.   |
| 2 | 8  | C | 8       | We support this indicator for natural areas Vs managed areas changes tracking.  |
| 2 | 9  | C | 7       | We recommend to replace “primary forest deforestation” with “primary forest degradation”.   |
| 2 | 9  | B | 14      | We support the inclusion of live coral cover as a priority indicator.   |
| 2 | 9  | B | 14      | We recommend the inclusion of additional indicators within “Trends in extent and rate of change of coral reefs” to include the following indicators, in line with the ICRI<br>Recommendation : Fleshy algae cover and cover of other key benthic groups; Fish abundance and biomass.  |
| 2 | 10 | B | 35      | We recommend to add new monitoring element to track the “proportion of HCV and HCS areas within protected areas”.   |
| 2 | 11 | B | 43-45   | We recommend the inclusion of an additional indicator (i.e.   |

|   |    |         |           |   |
|---|----|---------|-----------|---|
|   |    |         |           | new row after row 45) within “Trends in ecological representativeness of areas conserved”: [Percentage/ area] of coral reefs included in effectively managed MPAs and OECMs as recommended by ICRI.   |
| 2 | 11 | B, C    | 44        | UNESCO biosphere reserves should be mentioned.  |
| 2 | 11 | C       | 39        | KBA in OECM should be taken into account.   |
| 2 | 12 | C       | 48        | We recommend to replace the indicator with “number of High Conservation Value and High Carbon Stock areas under sustainable management with verified impact on biodiversity conservation”.  |
| 2 | 12 | B       | 52        | We recommend to add a monitoring element to ensure traditional knowledge and IPLC interests are taken into account in PA and OECM management.   |
| 2 | 15 | A, B, C | 81 - 96   | <p>For pollution linked to pesticides, it is important to insist on solutions, namely the promotion of biocontrol solutions and certain agro-ecological practices (such as heterogeneous covers or agro-ecological infrastructures), the mobilization of public research to find alternatives and reduce the harmful effects of plant protection products on biodiversity or the deployment of tools to optimize the use of plant protection products. It should be noted that the promotion of agroecology and, in particular, of certified organic farming (which prohibits the use of synthetic phytosanitary products), also makes it possible to respond to this challenge. On this issue, it is also necessary to have indicators that take into account the risk level of the indicators.</p> <p>For pollution linked to excess fertilization, there is indeed an issue of reducing dependence on fertilizers from non-renewable natural resources. However, for biodiversity, considering that these are essential elements for the nutrition of soils and plants, the question is not so much the reduction of their use but rather the limitation of leaks to water and air by sustainable management of fertilizers, as well as the limitation of synthetic fertilizers (cf. production costs and greenhouse gas emissions). In addition, one of the main issues is to ensure that the fertilizers obtained from recycling do not represent a risk for soil biodiversity, given their content of undesirable elements (heavy metals, plastics, endocrine disruptors, etc.) or how they are used to avoid emissions to water and air (eg landfill). Certain agro-ecological practices, such as integrated management of soil fertility or the diversification of rotations and extension of rotations with the integration of legumes, make it possible to respond to this challenge.</p> |
| 2 | 16 | B       | 97        | We recommend to replace this point with “trends in High Carbon Stock ecosystem conservation”.   |
| 2 | 16 | B       | 98        | Like the DRR indicator n ° 99, it could be possible to just put “number of countries that include biodiversity as a tool for enhanced adaptation in their Adaptation Communication under the UNFCCC”.   |
| 2 | 18 | A       |           | Wellbeing should be defined and captured in the monitoring elements.  |
| 2 | 20 | C       | 117 - 119 | Target n ° 9 is devoted to managed ecosystems, a category   |

|   |    |      |     |   |
|---|----|------|-----|---|
|   |    |      |     | which does include agriculture, aquaculture and forestry. The key issues of soil quality, pollinators and the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and domesticated races are well identified. For agriculture, it would be appropriate to be more specific and promote approaches or practices whose beneficial effects for biodiversity have been established. In particular, thanks to its integrated and systemic vision, agroecology (which includes certified organic farming) makes it possible to reconcile the sustainable use of biodiversity and food security. This internationally recognized and defined approach is based on three key principles: (i) increase functional biodiversity in agroecosystems (including wild and cultivated); (ii) strengthen biological regulations and (iii) complete major cycles (carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus, etc.). Agroecology seeks to reduce the consumption of energy, water, fertilizers, plant protection products and veterinary drugs, especially antibiotics. In addition to its comprehensive approaches, the framework could highlight practices that can also be integrated into conventional systems, such as biocontrol, agroforestry, integrated soil fertility management, integrated pest management, genetic and species diversificationof plants cultivated in associations or crop rotations, or the diversification of domesticated breeds. Otherwise, these elements should be included in the indicators. |
| 2 | 20 | C, D | 120 | We propose the inclusion of the following monitoring element « Trends in soil organic carbon stocks (e.g. SDG 15.3.1 indicator, also linked to FAO Global Soil Organic Carbon)  |
| 2 | 22 | B    | 139 | We recommend to add a monitoring element on the“level of incorporation of green and blue trail measures at the subnational and local policy scale”.   |
| 2 | 28 | C    | 167 | The term “binding” is missing for countries and “compulsory” for companies. On the other hand, it seems more interesting to study the effect of policies and their results than their mere adoption.  |
| 2 | 29 | C    | 177 | Putting FSC and PEFC at the same level does not seem appropriate to me, in particular for questions of quality of the specifications and level of verification of indicator achievement by audit teams<br><br>We recommend to add an indicator on “commodity certification improvement through better sustainable criteria inclusion regarding ecosystem and forest degradation in supply chains”<br><br>Agricultural certifications could also be added.   |
| 2 | 29 | C    | 179 | We recommend to add an indicator on “Import share by Parties of commodities generating deforestation and ecosystem degradation in producing countries”.   |
| 1 | 34 | D    | 211 | Funding needs, and therefore gaps, should be estimated as regards national biodiversity objectives, e. g. funding needs to reach the targets set in the NBSAP or to implement correctly the NBSAP.  |
| 2 | 38 | B    | 238 | We recommend to add a monitoring element on the evolution of biocultural diversity  |
| 2 | 39 | C    | 245 | We recommend to add an indicator on girls’ inclusion in   |

|  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
|  |  |  |  | decision-making processes and national and subnational reform towards equality improvement and access to education. |
|--|--|--|--|---|

*Comments should be sent by e-mail to [secretariat@cbd.int](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int) no later than 25 July 2020.*