**Review Comment Template for the document on indicators for the draft goals and targets of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework**

Parties and stakeholders are invited to make suggestions of indicators (currently available or under development) that may be used to measure progress towards the post-2020 framework. The draft components and elements of the monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework are based on updated draft goals and targets, as was requested by the second meeting of the OEWG, and presented in document <https://www.cbd.int/sbstta/sbstta-24/post2020-monitoring-en.pdf>.

Please note: there are two tables in this document, one for suggestions for indicators for the draft monitoring elements of goals, and another table for indicators for the draft monitoring elements of targets

**Instructions for providing input on indicators and completion of indicator tables (for goals and targets):**

* Please do not add columns to the tables below
* Please add rows for additional indicators related to monitoring elements for specific components from goals (table 1) and components from targets (table 2). The information of draft components and monitoring elements for goals and targets is available in document <https://www.cbd.int/sbstta/sbstta-24/post2020-monitoring-en.pdf>
* To add an indicator for specific monitoring elements, please provide the following information:
  + Column 1: copy/paste the component of the goal (enter information in table 1) or target (enter information in table 2) from <https://www.cbd.int/sbstta/sbstta-24/post2020-monitoring-en.pdf>, which the indicator can be used for. This MUST be provided
  + Column 2: copy/paste the specific monitoring element of the goal (enter information in table 1) or target (enter information in table 2), which the indicator can be used for from <https://www.cbd.int/sbstta/sbstta-24/post2020-monitoring-en.pdf>. This MUST be provided
  + Column 3: the published or accepted name of the indicator. This MUST be provided
  + Column 4: the name of the organisation(s) responsible for producing the indicator and keeping it up to date. This MUST be provided
  + Column 5: please state whether the indicator is ready for use today (with an X) or if is still under development (Y). This MUST be provided
  + Column 6: if you are adding a new indicator that is still under development, please indicate the year that you expect it to be available
  + Column 7: for any existing indicator, please add the year of the last update
  + Column 8: please provide the time series for the indicator and frequency of update (e.g. 1990-2020, available every 5 years).
  + Column 9: please state (Y or N) whether there is a published methodology for application of the indicator at the national level
  + Column 10: please state (Y or N) whether any new or existing indicator can be disaggregated at the national level for use by Parties
  + Column 11: please state (Y or N) whether the indicator is aggregated from data that is collected at the national level (e.g. with data from national institutions)
  + Column 12: please state (Y or N) whether any indicator has been used in the 4th Edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-4).
  + Column 13: please state (Y or N) whether the indicator is currently included in the SDG indicator framework and provide the SDG indicator number
  + Column 14: please state whether an indicator is used for any Multi-Lateral Environmental Agreements other than the CBD (e.g. Ramsar Convention, CMS) or is used as an indicator by IPBES, by writing the abbreviated name of the MEA or process
  + Column 15: please enter any further information or relevant links
* Example entries have been provided in the tables below for goals and targets, please follow the same format for each indicator entry
* Inputs should be sent by e-mail to[*secretariat@cbd.int*](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int)no later than 25 July 2020

**For general comments please use the template provided in page 2 below**

**Table 1. Indicators for monitoring elements of the draft goals (with example entries)**

| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **13** | **14** | **15** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Components of the draft Goals**  **(copy/paste text from** [**CBD/SBSTTA-24/post-2020-monitoring.en.pdf**](https://www.cbd.int/sbstta/sbstta-24/post2020-monitoring-en.pdf)**)** | **Goal Monitoring Elements**  **(copy/paste text from** [**CBD/SBSTTA-24/post-2020-monitoring.en.pdf**](https://www.cbd.int/sbstta/sbstta-24/post2020-monitoring-en.pdf)**)** | **Indicator name** | **Responsible Institution for the indicator** | **Available today (X) or under active development (Y)** | **Date of availability for indicator in development (Year)** | **Year of last update (e.g. 2019)** | **Time series and frequency of updates (e.g. 1985-2019, annually)** | **Methodology available for national use (Y/N)** | **Global indicator can be disaggregated for national use (Y/N)** | **National data aggregated to form global indicator (Y/N)** | **Used in GBO-4 (Y/N)** | **SDG indicator (Y/N)** | **Indicator used to measure other MEAs or processes (e.g. Ramsar Convention, IPBES, CMS)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| … |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 2. Indicators for monitoring elements of the draft targets (with example entries)**

| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **13** | **14** | **15** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Components of the draft Targets**  **(copy/paste text from** [**CBD/SBSTTA-24/post-2020-monitoring.en.pdf**](https://www.cbd.int/sbstta/sbstta-24/post2020-monitoring-en.pdf)**)** | **Target Monitoring Elements**  **(copy/paste text from** [**CBD/SBSTTA-24/post-2020-monitoring.en.pdf**](https://www.cbd.int/sbstta/sbstta-24/post2020-monitoring-en.pdf)**)** | **Indicator name** | **Responsible Institution for the indicator** | **Available today (X) or under active development (Y)** | **Date of availability for indicator in development (Year)** | **Year of last update (e.g. 2019)** | **Time series and frequency of updates (e.g. 1985-2019, annually)** | **Methodology available for national use (Y/N)** | **Global indicator can be disaggregated for national use (Y/N)** | **National data aggregated to form global indicator (Y/N)** | **Used in GBO-4 (Y/N)** | **SDG indicator (Y/N)** | **Indicator used to measure other MEAs or processes (e.g. Ramsar Convention, IPBES, CMS)** | **Comments** |
| T2.4  Effective management  and equitable governance of the system of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures | Trends in proportion of protected areas and other  effective area based conservation measures  under various governance regimes | Number of PAs/CAs that have completed a site-level assessment of governance and equity (SAGE) | IIED | Y | 2020 | 2019 | 2019, Annually | Y (in draft) , to be published in September 2020 | Y | Y | N | N | N | IIED is keen to support this but can only do so if adequate funding is available |
| T20.1. Equitable  participation of  IPLCs in decisionmaking  related to  biodiversity and  rights over  relevant resources | Trends in participation of IPLCs in decision-making | Proportion of IPLCs rightsholders and stakeholders who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive by sex and age (using SAGE tool) | IIED | Y | 2020 | 2019 | 2019, Annually | Y (in draft) , to be published in September 2020 | Y | Y | N | N | N | SAGE does not enable disaggregation by disability  IIED is keen to support this but can only do so if adequate funding is available |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **General Comments** | |
| **Page** | **Comment** |
| 58/59 | Target 2.4 is not correctly formulated in the UNEP-WCMC document. Use the correct formulation from the GBF monitoring framework as shown above: **Effective management**  **and equitable governance of the system of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures** |
| 59 | As per my comments on the monitoring framework, the monitoring element “Trends in proportion of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures under various….” Should be framed more broadly: **Trends in governance and equity of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures** as there are two aspects to equitable governance a) type or regime of governance and b) quality of governance and equity (equity being an issue of governance quality as explained in COP-14-DEC-08). At present the monitoring element only contains a) and lacks b) which is equally if not more important. Then, as shown, there should be one indicator for each. |
| 59 | The indicator “Social assessment for Governance and Equity” (SAGE) is an incorrect formulation of the acronym SAGE. As per my comments on the monitoring framework the indicator should read: **Number of PAs/CAs that have completed a site-level assessment of governance and equity (SAGE).** See table 2 above for the correct information for the other data fields |
| 59 | The indicator % of PA/CA and OECMs implementing effective measures to …………………. was proposed by me at the Vilm workshop BUT there is no way to assess this other than country self-reporting which is subjective not objectively verifiable. Therefore until such time as there is a tool to assess this is it not a good indicator. For example a PA authority could review the annual reports of each of its PAs to determine which report on implementation of actinos that are likely to contribute to respect for IPLC knowledge and rights, but this is not realistic at present and subjective reporting in the meantime will give a misleading picture which will be challenged by civil society groups and simply discredit reporting to CBD. |
| 105-106 | See my comments on the GBF monitoring framework where I raise **important** issues with the current indicators and suggest alternatives which include:  **Proportion of** **IPLCs rightsholders and stakeholders who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive by………**  **Proportion of** women **rightsholders and stakeholders who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive by………**  **Proportion of** youth **rightsholders and stakeholders who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive by………**  I take responsive to mean that the inputs of IPLCs/women do actually have an influence of at least some decisions. This is a strong interpretation on the notion of participation which goes beyond the notion of inclusion which is simply about being involved in some way but not necessarily having influence. A governance assessment tool such as IIEDs SAGE tool is needed to generate this information on responsiveness. Since uptake of such tools is very low at present and is never likely to cover all sites in a country, the only way to report on this indictor would be by providing data for a small sample of sites in a given country, or maybe even just one site at this point in time. Ie CBD reporting asks for evidence from at least one site in a country. |