

				vegetation areas as a proportion of total land use” allows to consider any type of native vegetation.
1	5	C	51, 56, 58	The indicator “Number of certified forest areas under sustainable management with <u>verified impacts</u> on habitat conservation/restoration” should not be used excluding other non-certified forest and native vegetation conservation areas provided that those areas are managed under effective area-based conservation measures. It is worth noting that depending on the level of access to environmental information, technical capacities (skilled labor) and financial resources, certifications are not a realistic model and proportional to the conditions of certain local communities. But instead, domestic (national) standards set out in regulations and participative processes can become a valuable opportunity to combine conservation and preservation with socioeconomic development in these local contexts. Finally, all types of native vegetation areas effectively conserved should be used as an indicator towards Goal B.
1	6	B	64	Trends in the provision of energy supply from biological resources should consider the potential of forest resources to meet the future demand for fuel and fibre.
1	6	B	65	Trends in the provision of food and feed from biodiversity should consider a broad range of indicators such as i) access to fruits and other food; ii) soil health and conservation and water conservation and responsible use as key assets to food production; iii) sustainable agriculture practices that promotes the continuous improvement of production with conservation measures; iv) the creation of genetic resources banks on a regional perspective, aimed at accessing and maintaining the diversity of food genetic resources.
1	7	B	79	Considering that CBD is a Party-driven process, potential indicators on the measurement of the resource mobilization efforts from the private sector are not applicable. The source of means of implementation should rely on Parties, banks and organizations. Private sector, philanthropies and other resources should not be considered as a compromised amount to the means of implementation and, therefore, should be considered as voluntary.
2	10	C	29	The existence of native vegetation on farms and other producing landscapes is key to promote sustainable development of agricultural systems. The possibility to recover degraded land is also another key feature that should be considered aimed at promoting the conversion of degraded land to productive lands and also to native vegetation restoration.

2	11	C	38	Other effective area-based conservation measures should include a proportion on native vegetation on private lands, aimed at promoting native vegetation conservation and restoration on farmland. Parties should be encouraged to promote this kind of conservation measures, especially considering the positive biodiversity-climate-soil-water nexus that native vegetation can offer.
2	12	C	48	The proposed indicator - Number of certified forest areas under sustainable management with <u>verified impacts</u> on biodiversity conservation – is not suitable, <i>per se</i> , to measure the scope of the implementation of effective area-based conservation measures. It can be incentivized as a possible instrument, but it is quite relevant to consider that Parties does not engage directly in forest certification schemes. In addition, it is worth noting that depending on the level of access to environmental information, technical capacities (skilled labor) and financial resources, certifications are not a realistic model and proportional to the conditions of certain local communities. But instead, domestic (national) standards set out in regulations and participative processes can become a valuable opportunity to combine conservation and preservation with socioeconomic development in these local contexts.
2	12	C	49/50	Considering the variety of governance types for protected area systems around the world, Parties usually manage different policies, measures and programs aiming to implement and control protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, according to its governance. In this regard, it is quite important to have open indicators considering at least three outcomes: i) scale and effectiveness of native vegetation conservation; ii) restoration of native vegetation on these areas; iii) protection measures or sustainable use categories.
2	15/16	B	86/87/88	FAO has global data regarding the use of pesticides and herbicides. Despite of the existence of data, the rationale and appropriate use of inputs must be promoted. One indicator that should be considered is, therefore, the existence of robust national regulations, including provisions related to the importance of carrying out scientifically-sound assessments and the monitoring of the use of inputs, taking into account proper application technologies, in addition to the relevant safety instructions and requirements (such as using Personal Protective Equipment). Another complementary aspect to be considered in reference to the promotion of responsible and appropriate use of inputs is a better

				<p>understanding of the national dynamics related to crop-pest-climate interactions, which often demonstrates that tropical cultures have pronounced exposure to pests, pathogens and invasive herbs, when compared to other countries and realities.</p> <p>Another indicator should be the implementation of programs to recycle inputs packages as a manner to control and avoid contamination of residues of the products, in addition to the promotion of the use of integrated pest management practices, according to climate and regional characteristics, aimed at achieving effective control practices.</p>
2	20	C	118	<p>Another indicator that should be used to measure the effectiveness of agriculture under sustainable practices is the amount of degraded land restored as a percentage of the total agriculture area degraded. The restoration of degraded land to productive agricultural systems is key to enhance carbon stocks, soil recovery, foster food production which is key to SDG 2, reduce the need for new production areas, and other positive outcomes.</p>
2	20	C	119	<p>Areas of agricultural land under conservation agriculture as an indicator should consider, for instance, the adoption of continuous improvements such as: i) good agricultural practices; ii) technologies that allow to enhance productivity and maximize the outputs per hectare, fostering adaptation of agricultural systems and reducing GHG emissions; iii) conservation and restoration of native vegetation on farms as a trigger to promote carbon stocks, biodiversity corridors and soil conservation, among other benefits; iv) integration of agriculture, livestock and forestry as ways to enhance the total productivity per hectare, promote and enhance soil fertility, avoid degradation and diversify production.</p> <p>The coexistence of different agricultural systems provided they promote and effectively adopt the indicators above is key to foster a resilient and sustainable agriculture.</p>
2	21	C	126	<p>The sustainable management of all types of forest can be supported by forest certification schemes. Considering that those schemes are voluntary and not mandated by Parties regulations, it is not reasonable to agree on an indicator naming specific certification schemes. This could disregard other schemes and mechanisms; the effective management of the forests is the goal, regardless how it has been achieved.</p>
2	22	A	140/145	<p>Considering the basic goals of the CBD and the Nagoya Protocol on ABS, it is extremely relevant to promote, incentivize and support the access, knowledge, research</p>

				<p>and development based on genetic resources. It worth noting that, from a broader perspective, the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS should emphasize the opportunities to shape bioeconomy, including the promotion of country-level joint initiatives and activities involving international partners, and adoption of legislative, political and administrative measures that avoid cumbersome or bureaucratic procedures at national level, beyond the establishment of gene banks (given also the concerns around erosion of genetic diversity).</p> <p>In this sense, it seems quite important to promote the creation of genetic resources banks on a regional basis, especially in countries that are biodiversity rich and/or centers of origin, particularly in developing countries. Those genetic banks should strive the creation and increment of genetic banks, the share of resources on a Nagoya Protocol basis, comprising PIC and MAT protocols, leading to innovation and benefit sharing. Developed countries should support the establishment of those genetic resource's banks in all continents, according to decisions from the Parties aimed at implementing the Post-2020 GBF.</p>
2	29	C	177	<p>The debate around the private sustainable forestry certification schemes and other market-based mechanisms focused on timber products ought not be treated too simplistically. Establishing an indicator that measures area of forests under sustainable management, based on the expectation that only two voluntary certification schemes have potential to measure such level of sustainability, corresponds to the assumption that all countries and producers have equal access and enough economic resources to afford the certification processes. In practice, considering the reality of several countries, especially the underdeveloped or developing ones, keeping the forest standing means no additional redundant neither bureaucratic procedures. But instead, positive incentives for forest protection are needed, which cannot be exclusively provided by certifications. Furthermore, even in FSC and PEFC certified areas, it is not possible to state that the evidence of positive impacts on conservation and restoration will always be measurable, quantitatively, at the end of the process. Moreover, such benefits should not be assumed.</p> <p>As regards to social inclusiveness, depending on the level of access to environmental information, technical capacities (skilled labor) and financial resources, certifications are not a realistic model and proportional to the conditions of certain local communities. But instead,</p>

				<p>domestic (national) standards set out in regulations and participative processes can become a valuable opportunity to combine conservation and preservation with socioeconomic development in these local contexts. Within the scope of the World Trade Organization (WTO) the issue of voluntary certification schemes has always been widely discussed: sometimes by affirming that the schemes are not within the scope of the WTO, sometimes by stating that they can represent a measure adopted to protect the domestic industries and, therefore, corresponding to non-tariff barriers to international trade. Despite the fact that non-governmental schemes do not fall within the scope of the term “standardizing bodies” for the purposes of the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT Agreement), voluntary certifications schemes, as indicators admitted in the Post-2020 GBF, can further accentuate the asymmetries between countries by creating impacts not consistent with WTO rules and based on the expectation that all forest products should be certified (in line with market demands).</p> <p>In this sense, the CBD should not promote specific certification schemes as ways to assure sustainable production. The use of voluntary certification can be a way to promote sustainable production, but Parties should agree on the best ways to promote it as targets that would be managed and supported by Parties.</p>
2	33	A	203-204	To allow an objective indicator, the restoration and compensation for damages to biodiversity caused by LMOs must be based on the concept of damage and significant from Article 2.2 (b) and Article 2.3 of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol.
2	35	B	217	Considering that CBD is a Party-driven process, potential indicators on the measurement of the resource mobilization efforts from the private sector are not applicable. Efforts should be strived to creating effective and reliable sources of funding from Parties to support the implementation of the Global Biodiversity Framework. Voluntary funding from the private sector could be considered as a separate source of funds, not controlled or managed by Parties.
2	37	C	231	Indicator 12.6.1 requires data on the number of companies publishing sustainability reports. However, a decision from the Parties cannot, <i>per se</i> , mandate and create obligations to the private sector within the CBD. It is important to understand that the full development and effective application of voluntary and mandatory reporting frameworks or policies are subject to national circumstances and well-recognized sustainability

				standards by and across sectors, which are adopted at national level and company level. In general, this is a process that requires time and capacity building in the field of SDG reporting, in order to avoid the creation of new reporting standards or frameworks. In this sense, pilot-testing are needed to validate the proposed methodology for data collection. Further developments and considerations are needed before turning the indicator 12.6.1 into an indicator of the GBF.
				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 no later than 25 July 2020.