

## **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. 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:
  - 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> [CBD/WG2020/REC/2/1](#)

- 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 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>	Wulf			
<b>Given Name:</b>	Friedrich			
<b>Government (if applicable):</b>				
<b>Organization:</b>	Friends of the Earth Europe			
<b>Address:</b>	Rue d'Edimbourg 26			
<b>City:</b>	B-1050 Bruxelles / Brussel			
<b>Country:</b>	Belgium			
<b>E-mail:</b>	<a href="mailto:Friedrich.Wulf@pronatura.ch">Friedrich.Wulf@pronatura.ch</a>			
<i>Comments</i>				
<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Column letter</b>	<b>Row number</b>	<b>Comment</b>
General remark				
0	0	0	0	At OEWG-2, it was decided that SBSTTA-24 was to carry out a scientific and technical review of the updated goals and targets, and related indicators and baselines, of the draft global biodiversity framework. (CBD/WG2020/REC/2/1, para 3). However, the documents related to the peer review exclude the goals and targets themselves from the review. <u>This deviation from agreed procedure is not acceptable.</u> It is also not logical and risky that the indicators are

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

				<p>being discussed before the actual goals and targets are agreed.</p> <p>We understand that the updated formulations have been inserted for context only and that the formulations will be further discussed at OEWG-3 and COP.</p> <p>Nevertheless, other wordings have been proposed at OEWG-2 and the indicators should match the agreed goals and targets. <u>We therefore also suggest indicators that take into account possible other options for the goals and targets.</u></p> <p>Finally, there needs to be an opportunity to adapt the indicator framework, add new ones where relevant and delete irrelevant ones, after the goals and targets have been agreed by COP.</p>
Goals				
1	2	C	1	<p>Forest, as defined by FAO, encompasses a wide variety of habitats ranging from primary natural forests to monoculture tree plantations consisting of Alien species, such as Eucalypts in South America, Portugal or South Africa. Their ecological value varies widely, and the mere area of forest as such does not tell us about biodiversity. We suggest to differentiate and only use as indicator for forest ecosystems the expanse of <b><u>primary forests, naturally regenerated forests and planted forests excluding subcategories consisting of introduced species</u></b>, as defined in FRA 2015, pp. 7 and 8., ideally taking into account the diversity of trees and other plants which would grow there naturally</p>
1	2	B-C	1-14	<p>Semi-natural grasslands are missing, should be added; also savannah, peatlands, wetlands, floodplains, chapparal, steppe, fynbos, macchia, chapparal, heathlands, tundra – we need to monitor the extent of all natural and semi-natural ecosystems. This would reflect the scope of ecosystems that already was included in Aichi target 5.</p>
1	2	A-C	1-28	<p>A1 and A2 look at the expanse/quantity and quality of major biomes. However, this information is too general to be useful. It would be important to have <b><u>indicators of the area/range of different habitats that are in good ecological status</u></b> – so a combination of A1 and A2. For example, it is important to know the area of semi-natural xerothermic grasslands in good status (e.g. with orchids), as well as that of degraded grasslands, while the area of grassland alone will not give us sufficient information -it might all consist of sown, intensive, monoculture grasslands, highly fertilized and with no ecological value. We feel that a combination of A1 and A2 should be added.</p>

1	3	A2–A3	15-33	We suggest adding the concept of “favorable conservation status” (FCS) for habitats and species and monitor its percentage in relation to the overall number of valuable Habitats and species.
1	3	C	15	We suggest to use the effective mesh size ( <i>m<sub>eff</sub></i> ) as indicator for fragmentation, as used by EEA and FOEN, e.g. here: <a href="https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/mobility-and-urbanisation-pressure-on-ecosystems-2/assessment">https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/mobility-and-urbanisation-pressure-on-ecosystems-2/assessment</a>
1	3	C	16	We suggest to use regionally adapted versions of the farmland bird index <a href="https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/ENV_BIO2">https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/ENV_BIO2</a> to monitor biodiversity on farmland. We acknowledge this indicator is not available globally yet, but it would be good if this concept could be widened. If other indicators to measure agricultural biodiversity are available in other regions, these could be taken in to account too – even if they are not directly comparable: the main objective is to be able monitor regional and (sub-)national <b>trends</b> over time.
1	3	C	20	“Degraded land” is very general. We suggest to clearly define criteria on what is “degraded”, and to split this up according to different habitats (degraded forests, degraded grasslands etc.)
1	4	C	42,44,46,49	Not all protected areas deliver for Biodiversity. We suggest to understand/define “Protected areas” under the GBF as those belonging to IUCN Categories I-IV and also include OECMs that provide effective conservation outcomes.
1	4	C	46	“key biodiversity areas” are not yet fully identified for all countries, for some such as Switzerland it only encompasses IBAs (for birds) – more work is needed here. We also would suggest to include Natura 2000 and (potential) Emerald sites in Europe, as these are the areas that have been identified to have major importance for biodiversity.
1	4	B	51	We suggest to include an indicator on management here, e.g. on the percentage of protected areas and OECMs having an inclusive and effective management (including management plans and traditions that have positive conservation outcomes), or the IUCN Green List Index ( <a href="https://www.iucn.org/theme/protected-areas/our-work/iucn-green-list-protected-and-conserved-areas">https://www.iucn.org/theme/protected-areas/our-work/iucn-green-list-protected-and-conserved-areas</a> ), which gives information on protected areas that are inclusively and well managed and give the desired conservation outcomes
1	5	C	51	We recommend to define “sustainable forest management” from a biodiversity and social

				perspective, and we suggest to delete “certified” because this is not necessary/redundant if you look at “verified” conservation impacts.
1	5	B2	64-67	It is not the CBD’s objective to increase material production of goods and services for humans. Rather, it is to ensure that any use is done sustainably so biological resources will remain available in the future (objective 2 of the Convention on sustainable use, 2050 vision). <b>We therefore strongly suggest use the <u>percentage of overall production which is done in a sustainable way as indicator</u>, e.g. “percentage of food produced by organic farming or using agro-ecological practices.”</b> , rather than using absolute production as indicator.
1	6	C	77	ODA does not always include biodiversity support, and there are other international finance flows that include biodiversity-related funding. Parties are already reporting on their biodiversity funding addressing all these funding flows under the strategy for resource mobilisation; this reporting should be used as a basis for monitoring international finance flows.
1	6	C	New	We suggest to add biodiversity-related contributions to the GEF to the indicators
1	6	C	New	Add an indicator on the number of countries that have assessed and described their <b>needs</b> for biodiversity-related funding, detailing the percentage that is needed for specific measures that protect biodiversity and related actors, particularly IPLCs.
<b>Targets</b>				
2	8	A	1-34	We would suggest to separate the target into a) a part concerning the trends of asking to <b>stop the loss of valuable natural habitats</b> , as foreseen in <b>Aichi target 5</b> , and b) another asking for the <b>establishment of spatial planning as a tool and important instrument to conserve biodiversity</b> . Mixing both adds confusion – it already seems difficult to separate habitats (action target 1) and protected areas (action target 2). These two need to be kept separate as well. Concerning the components in row A, T1.1 is separate from T1.2-1.5 which could also be pulled together under the heading “state of ecosystems”.
2	8	A	1	It will be difficult to assess the area of ecosystems under spatial planning. It will be easier to monitor a) how much of the overall area of the country is under spatial planning and b) how many countries have a layer with priority areas

				for biodiversity. c) how well these spatial planning tools are followed up upon over time, and particularly so for the areas planned to be biodiversity rich
2	8	B, C	1-5	We note that the indicators for spatial planning do not list any indicators for the <b><u>area under spatial planning on land.</u></b> Such an indicator should be added
2	10	A	1-34	This target is closely related to goal A. All our remarks concerning habitats in Goal A apply here as well.
2	10	B-C	35	As stated under Goal A, only protected areas corresponding to IUCN-Categories I-IV and OECMs that provide effective conservation outcomes should be counted towards the 30% are target for biodiversity.
2	10	B- C	35-52	Remarks on Goal A concerning protected areas and OECMs (rows 42-50) equally apply to target 2.
2	11	C	(39-)40	The percentage of important areas covered by protected areas should also include potential Emerald and Natura 2000 sites – these are important sites for key species and habitats, as listed in the annexes of the Bern Convention and the EU Nature directives.
2	11	C	46	We suggest to use the number/percentage a) of areas that have inclusive and effective management plans (including IPLC management on their own terms) and b) of areas included in the IUCN green list (see our comment on goal A, table 1, row 51)
2	11	C	52	Number of countries that have legislation addressing pressures emanating from outside of Protected Areas / OECMs that have impacts inside
2	11	C	54	Further indicator could be the Conservation status of species according to Art. 12/17 reports in the EU
2	15	C	82-84	Add Indicator: Proportion of agricultural land exceeding critical loads of N/P
2	16	C	97	This could also look at the area/extent of intact peatlands, wetlands and other carbon-rich ecosystems.
2	18	C	105	According to SDG 14.4.1, this means fish stocks are at or above the abundance level that can produce maximum sustainable yield (MSY)- so the area under MSY fishing should be monitored
2	20	C	118	We have grave concerns using SDG Indicator 2.4.1 as this already includes productivity, and it is not CBD's mandate to call for increased production. The CBD needs to ensure that agriculture is sustainable, i.e. has a rich and typical biodiversity and continues to do so. We suggest using the <u>percentage of land under agroecological practices / organic farming</u> as indicator instead.
2	20	C	119	Conservation agriculture needs to be clearly defined. Is it area of agricultural land that gets funding for certain

				measures, or is this synonymous with agroecological farming, high nature value (HNV) farming or agriculture that delivers certain outcomes such as the occurrence of certain lead species?
2	20	C	125	As stated in our comments on Goal B, this requires to clearly define sustainable forest management and <u>forests</u> . Measuring Forest area only without distinguishing between natural forests and monoculture alien tree plantations does not tell us anything about the state of forest biodiversity. We therefore suggest to differentiate and only use as indicator for forest ecosystems the expanse of primary forests, naturally regenerated forests and planted forests excluding subcategories consisting of introduced species, as defined in FRA 2015, pp. 7 and 8. Additional indicators could be: % of deadwood, occurrence of characteristic forest species (fungi, deadwood beetles, other characteristic species), area covered by specific forest habitat types. SDG Indicator 15.2.1 does not give any information about species composition/biodiversity and is therefore not sufficient.
2	21	C	132	Green spaces for people need to be accessible for people, so the indicator also needs to be within easy walking distance – <u>the indicator should report on the areas of cities which is within 500 m of the next green space for recreation.</u>
2	25	C	152-160	Integrating biodiversity considerations needs to look into planning and legislative processes and decisions that are subject to an assessment of their impacts on biodiversity (biodiversity proofing) – the number of countries who have established and apply such a biodiversity proofing mechanism should be an indicator for target 13
2	27	C	162-174	In addition to the material footprint, it would also be good to assess and monitor land and water footprints. The ecological footprint is very aggregated and does not allow to target specific pressures.
2	28	A	167-176	Need to clearly define “sustainable” when looking at <u>production practices</u>
2	29	C	173	Sustainability reports only make sense if they compile data according to a standard format – otherwise these reports result in self-advocating shiny glossy brochures which do not tell us the impact of the company’s efforts. Rather than these reports, it would be important to establish and enforce stronger international legally binding rules for transnational companies and their global value chains that ensure that they fully respect human rights and operate within safe ecological limits.

				Also, we suggest to monitor the number of countries who make false claims in sustainability reports a legal offense.
2	29	A	177-179	Need to clearly define “ <b>sustainable</b> supply chains”
2	29	B	177-179	Change to: Trend in proportion of trade and investment regulations ensuring global environment and biodiversity standards
2	29	C	New	Countries whose national and international trade, investment and customs policies ensure global environment and biodiversity standards are adhered to
2	29	C	177	Replace voluntary certification schemes by area of primary forests, naturally regenerated forests and planted forests excluding subcategories consisting of introduced species.
2	29	C	New	Related to comment above: proportion of countries that require to integrate international standards for biodiversity in their trade and investment policies
2	29	C	New	Related to comment above: countries that have adopted legally binding duty of vigilance and due diligence obligations for international corporations in their international trade and investment policies and/or signed the upcoming UN Treaty on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights
2	29	C	New	Indicator on the amount of telecoupling, per country
2	30	C	181	Consumption patterns are, to a large extent, influenced by governments, and the (mostly supply-driven) market which does not sufficiently take the costs of biodiversity use into account. We therefore would underline the importance of this indicator, as well as the three new ones we suggest for target 14 / p.29.
2	34/35	C	New	A prerequisite for removing incentives harmful for biodiversity is to have an overview over these. This has been an important steppingstone towards Aichi target 3 which almost no party has fulfilled. We therefore suggest adding as indicator under 17.2. the following: <b>“Number of countries that have undertaken a complete assessment of the incentives and harmful to biodiversity across all sectors and all levels”</b>
2	34/35	C	New	For the same reasons, we should also have an indicator <b>“Sum of perverse incentives and other financial flows harmful for biodiversity, across all sectors and levels” (expressed in monetary terms)</b>
				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.