**Guidelines and template for the review of the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework**

## Background

1. The second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group[[1]](#footnote-2) 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:
   1. Please provide all comments in writing and in an MS Word or similar document format using the table provided below.
   2. Please provide full contact information for the individual/Government/organization submitting the comments.
   3. 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.
   4. 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.
   5. If you refer to additional sources of information, please include these with your comments when possible or provide a complete reference or hyperlink.
   6. 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.
   7. 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.).
   8. All review comments will be posted on the webpage[[2]](#footnote-3) 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***

1. Please use the review template below when providing comments.
2. 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**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Review comments on the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework** | | | | | |
| *Contact information* | | | | | |
| **Surname:** | | | | Demers  Navarrete Frías | |
| **Given Name:** | | | | Nicole Renee  Carolina | |
| **Government** (if applicable)**:** | | | | - | |
| **Organization:** | | | | The Alliance of Bioversity International and International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) | |
| **Address:** | | | | Viale dei Tre Denari 472/a | |
| **City:** | | | | Maccarese (Fiumicino) | |
| **Country:** | | | | Italy | |
| E-mail: | | | | [nicole.demers@cgiar.org](mailto:nicole.demers@cgiar.org) ; [c.navarrete@cgiar.org](mailto:c.navarrete@cgiar.org) | |
|  |  | ***Comments*** | | | |
| **Table** | **Page** | **Column letter** | **Row number** | | **Comment** |
|  |  |  |  | |  |
| 1 | 2 | C | 15 | | Goal A2. We suggest including a new indicator: “Proportion of agriculture that is diversified under agroforestry, intercropping, crop rotation, mixtures or other diversification practices”. |
| 1 | 2 | C | 16 | | Goal A2. We suggest adding the following indicator “Agrobiodiversity Index (ADBI)”. ABDI has been developed by the Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT and will be produced annually as from 2021 for XX countries*.*  The [Agrobiodiversity Index methodology v.1.0](https://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/106478) was released in March 2019. The document resulted from a thorough process of formulation, carried out in consultation with potential users and science partners to make sure the tool could address their needs. From May to September 2019, a consultation process was opened to gather further feedback on the document and identify areas for improvement. Based on this feedback, in 2020 the Agrobiodiversity Index team is releasing an updated version of the methodology (version 2.0) both as a report and as a peer-reviewed paper. The latter has already been submitted to a well-known scientific journal and is currently under review, under the following title: *Jones S., Estrada-Carmona N., Juventia S., Dulloo E., Laporte M-A., Villani C., Remans R. (forthcoming). Monitoring biodiversity in our food systems.* |
| 1 | 4 | C | 36 | | Goal A5. We suggest adding the following indicator which in included in the BIP/WCMC indicators document: “[Comprehensiveness of conservation of socioeconomically as well as culturally valuable species](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1470160X18308781?via%3Dihub)” (responsible is Alliance of Bioversity and CIAT, and Crop Trust; more info in the link)  We also suggest adding an indicator on wild species abundance such as the “Red list Index for crop wild relatives”. |
| 1 | 4 | C | 37 | | Goal A5. We suggest adding an element of nutrition to the indicator proposed, i.e. "nutritionally valuable species" |
| 1 | 4 | C | 37-39 | | Goal A5. We suggest adding the following indicator which is included in the BIP/WCMC indicators document: “Agrobiodiversity Index (ADBI)”. ABDI has been developed by the Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT and will be produced every 2-3 years as from 2021 for over 50 countries.  The [Agrobiodiversity Index methodology v.1.0](https://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/106478) was released in March 2019. The document resulted from a thorough process of formulation, carried out in consultation with potential users and science partners to make sure the tool could address their needs. From May to September 2019, a consultation process was opened to gather further feedback on the document and identify areas for improvement. Based on this feedback, in 2020 the Agrobiodiversity Index team is releasing an updated version of the methodology (version 2.0) both as a report and as a peer-reviewed paper. The latter has already been submitted to a well-known scientific journal and is currently under review, under the following title: *Jones S., Estrada-Carmona N., Juventia S., Dulloo E., Laporte M-A., Villani C., Remans R. (forthcoming). Monitoring biodiversity in our food systems.* |
| 1 | 4 | C | 40 | | Goal A5. In addition to Red list index for domesticated animals, we can also provide a Red list index for crop wild relatives. Suggest including a separate indicator “Red list Index for crop wild relatives”. |
| 1 | 5 | C | After 59 | | Goal B1. We suggest adding an indicator that reflects lower water consumption through agriculture adaptation, measured by “Proportion of drought resistant or low water demand crops or varieties adoption throughout the growing period” AND “Proportion of low input farming practices and downstream mitigation practices adopted to prevent and reduce runoff and non-source pollution”. FAO crop data could be used but better ways of capturing crop and varieties names and adoption/changes in practices would be needed. |
| 1 | 5 | B | 64-67 | | This needs to address access and control over these resources, disaggregated by sex. Also, need to measure food and nutrition diversity and security. |
| 1 | 6 | B | 65 | | Goal B2. There is no mention of nutrition. We suggest rewording and adding the qualifier “nutritious”: "Trends in the provision of nutritious food and feed from biodiversity". |
| 1 | 6 | C | 65 | | Goal B2. We suggest adding the following indicators:  i) indicator for the nutritional functional diversity of food in supply;  ii) indicator for the proportion of energy from non-staples, roots or tubers;  iii) Number of species, varieties and breeds in regional and national databases with food composition tables which include reliable nutritional value information on food biodiversity and associated traditional knowledge; iv) Number of people trained to deploy and benefit from nutritionally rich biodiversity (repeated under target 15.1 and 15.2);  v) Number of new markets developed for food biodiverse products with high nutritional value, including more nutritious convenience foods based on biodiverse products (repeated under target 15.1 and 15.3);  vi) Number of countries with policies in place which provide subsidies/incentives for the sustainable production of healthy biodiverse foods (repeated under target 17);  vii) Proportion of countries that have increased production and availability of food biodiversity with sustainable agricultural management practices (repeated under target 9.1);  viii) Number of countries that have in place national food-based dietary guidelines which highlight the importance of food biodiversity not only for healthy diets and nutrition outcomes but also the many other multiple benefits including environmental sustainability and social equity (repeated under target 15.1);  ix) Number of countries implementing the *Voluntary Guidelines on Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Policies, Programmes and National and Regional Plans of Action on Nutrition* and *Voluntary Guidelines on Food Systems and Nutrition* (to be endorsed by CFS in 2020), as well as other relevant instruments, tools and voluntary guidelines for transforming food systems (repeated under target 13.2);  x) Number of countries that have mainstreamed biodiversity for food and nutrition into relevant national development strategies and plans including National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs), Multi-sectoral Nutrition Plans, National Agricultural Plans, National Climate Change Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) and National Climate Change Adaptation Plans (NAPs) and other relevant national development strategies and plans (repeated under target 13.2). |
| 1 | 6 | B-C | 66 | | Goal B2. We understand this Monitoring Element as also referring to materials contributions in terms of livelihoods. We would like to put more emphasis on the use of those materials by people. An indicator to measure this would be: “Income levels changing due to sales of nutritionally rich biodiverse products” |
| 1 | 6 | B | 68-71 | | Indicators for B3 should capture the experiences of women and men from different cultural groups, including marginalized groups. |
| 1 | 6 | B-C | 72-74 | | Goal C1. The monitoring elements listed here, trends in access and trends in the benefits, repeat what is already monitored under the Target 12. If this repetition between the Goals and Targets is to remain, it makes sense to repeat the indicators for trends in access and trends in benefit sharing form Target 12 as well. The indicator listed here for C1 concerns actual use (as monitored by checkpoints), and not access per se. They are better suited as indicators for 'Trends in utilization of genetic resources' under C2. |
| 1 | 6 | C | 72-76 | | Secure access to genetic resources (and legitimacy of claims to benefits) is connected to tenure security and access to decision-making over resource management. Consider linking with SDG 1.4.2. (sex-disaggregated) and e.g. proportion of women and men in resource user groups. FAO LAT could also be a useful resource. |
| 1 | 6 | C | 72-76 | | Indicators proposed for monitoring elements related to genetic resources and benefit sharing (C1 and C2) should require indicator data to be disaggregated by sex |
| 1 | 6 | C | 74-76 | | Trends in the use of benefits from benefit-sharing schemes oriented towards women’s and/or gender equality projects |
| 1 | 7 | D | 81-84 | | Capacity building indicators should be gender-disaggregated. |
| 1 | 7 | D | 85 | | Trends in access to technology should be gender-disaggregated. |
| **Table** | **Page** | **Column letter** | **Row number** | | **Comment** |
| 2 | 8 | A, B, C | 1-5 | | Land-use plans must address needs and preferences of different land-users. Suggest including ‘area under multi-stakeholder governance arrangements’ or ‘spatial planning plans with embedded multi-stakeholder processes’. |
| 2 | 11-12 | B, C | 46-48 | | Monitoring elements and indicators do not address ‘equitable governance’. Indicators should capture trends in management regimes for protected areas: proportion of protected areas under different types of collaborative/co-/joint management arrangements and sex-disaggregated data on women and men’s participation in active management actions. Include sex-disaggregated data on FPIC and participation in decision-making and access to benefits from certification schemes. |
| 2 | 12 | C | 53 | | Target 3.1. We suggest adding the following indicator: “[Comprehensiveness of conservation of socioeconomically as well as culturally valuable species](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1470160X18308781?via%3Dihub)” (responsible is Alliance of Bioversity and CIAT, and Crop Trust; more info in the link) |
| 2 | 12 | C | 53-55 | | There is increasing evidence that more inclusive management arrangements yield better environmental outcomes. Include indicators for collecting sex-disaggregated data on women and men’s participation in active management actions. |
| 2 | 12 | C | 56 | | Target 4.1 We suggest rewording of the indicator “Proportion of traded wildlife that was poached or illicitly trafficked (SDG indicators 15.7.1 and 15.c.1)” to  “Proportion of traded wildlife fauna and flora that was poached or illicitly trafficked”. This is the term used in the SDGs. Wildlife is often understood to mean only animals, which may lead to lack of reporting on trafficked timber and other plant species. |
| 2 | 13 | A | 56-66 | | Formalization processes are often dominated by export-oriented industries and end up criminalizing poor, informal resource users. Extent of legality solely is hence a poor indicator considering the higher-level objectives of the framework. Need to separate between domestic and export market. Below suggested indicators are amended from the Chatham House framework.  Are there formal consultation processes in place for multi-stakeholder involvement (incl. women and men) in developing policy and legislation to tackle illegal harvest and trade?  Is the legislation and regulation for artisanal and micro-scale enterprises coherent and unambiguous? |
| 2 | 15 | C | After 84 | | Target 6.1 We suggest adding an indicator “Proportion of low input farming practices and downstream mitigation practices adopted to prevent and reduce runoff and non-source pollution”. FAO crop data could be used but better ways of capturing adoption/changes in practices would be needed. |
| 2 | 16 | C | 98 | | Target 7.1. We suggest adding the indicator “Proportion of agriculture land that is diversified under agroforestry, intercropping, crop rotation, mixtures or other diversification practices” or this one “Land use diversity of agricultural landscapes in space and time, at district or country level”. Land use diversity especially relates to the use of different types of cropping and production systems, NOT to non-agricultural land uses. This indicator directly relates to the “spatial and temporal heterogeneity” indicator by Cabell and Oelofse, 2012 (Cabell, J.F., & Oelofse, M. 2012. An indicator framework for assessing agroecosystem resilience. Ecology and Society 17(1): 18) and to the “Landscape/seascape diversity” by UNU-IAS et al., 2014. (UNU-IAS, Bioversity International, IGES, UNDP Toolkit for the indicators of resilience in socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes (SEPLS) UNU-IAS, Tokyo, Japan (2014)). |
| 2 | 16 | C | 98 | | Target 7.1. We suggest adding the following indicator: “Trait diversity of crops and livestock, especially climate related responses”. The indicator on trait diversity relates to the indicator on “high degree of functional and response diversity” by Cabell and Oelofse, 2012. (Cabell, J.F., & Oelofse, M. (2012) An indicator framework for assessing agroecosystem resilience. Ecology and Society 17(1): 18). |
| 2 | 16 | C | 98 | | Target 7.1. We suggest adding an indicator that reflects climate change adaptation in agriculture through crops lower water consumption, measured by “Proportion of drought resistant or low water demand crops or varieties adoption throughout the growing period”. FAO crop data could be used but better ways of capturing crop and varieties names and adoption/changes in practices would be needed. |
| 2 | 16-17 | A, B, C | 97-100 | | In order to contribute to resilience, NBS and EBA must enhance tenure security (SDG 1.4.2.), enhance access to natural resources, improve incomes (SDG 2.3.2.). Include sex-disaggregated indicators for all. NBS must also adhere to FPIC principles. |
| 2 | 18-19 | A, B, C | 103-116 | | None of the indicators are equipped to address the extent to which benefits reach the most vulnerable. Specific indicators needed in line with SDG target 2.1. to measure nutrition and food security as well as health by sex and other pertinent factors (esp. mothers and children). |
| 2 | 19 | B | 114-116 | | Target 8.2. The monitoring element “Trends in terrestrial wild species of fauna used for food and medicine” only considers wild species of fauna, but the component of the target (Column A “T8.2. Sustainable management of terrestrial wild species of fauna and flora”) and its indicator (“Number of plant and animal genetic resources for food and agriculture secured in medium- or long-term conservation facilities” (SDG indicator 2.5.1) Column C/Row114) covers both plants and animals. The framework previously contained the same element for wild species of flora used for food and medicine separately but has been lost. This could be a mistake and the monitoring element should be reworded to also include “flora” i.e “Trends in terrestrial wild species of flora and fauna used for food and medicine”.  We also suggest adding the following indicator which is included in the BIP/WCMC indicators document: “[Comprehensiveness of conservation of socioeconomically as well as culturally valuable species](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1470160X18308781?via%3Dihub)” (responsible is Alliance of Bioversity and CIAT, and Crop Trust; more info in the link). |
| 2 | 19 | C | 115 | | Why only food producers? This should address income of producers of all relevant species and across the value chain. |
| 2 | 20 | C | After 117-119 | | Target 9.1. We propose adding the indicator “Percentage of cropped landscapes with at least 10% natural land” (BIP/WCMC indicators document; 2015, annually). |
| 2 | 20 | C | After 117-119 | | Target 9.1. We suggest adding the indicator “Proportion of countries that have increased production and availability of food biodiversity with sustainable agricultural management practices” |
| 2 | 20 | C | After 117-119 | | Target 9.1 We suggest adding the indicator |Percentage of agricultural land that is organic, including land under conversion to organic” (FAOSTAT). |
| 2 | 20 | C | 117-119 | | Secure rights by sex, countries with legal frameworks that guarantee women’s equal rights to land (FAO LAT), as these targets relate to a key gender-biodiversity priority area (equal engagement and leadership) |
| 2 | 20 | C | 120 | | Target 9.1. We suggest adding the following indicator: “Agricultural soil quality (soil organic C, soil biota diversity)”. The indicator on soil quality is related to the “ecologically self-regulated” indicator of Cabell and Oelofse, 2012, as well as their “coupled with local natural capital” indicator. Further review and comment by soil specialists of the soil quality measures is recommended. (Cabell, J.F., & Oelofse, M. 2012. An indicator framework for assessing agroecosystem resilience. Ecology and Society 17(1): 18). |
| 2 | 20 | C | 120 | | Target 9.1. We suggest adding the following indicator: “Inverse of the Sustainable Nitrogen Management Index (<https://epi.yale.edu/>)” |
| 2 | 20 | C | 122 | | Target 9.1. We suggest adding the following indicator which is included in the BIP/WCMC indicators document: “[Comprehensiveness of conservation of socioeconomically as well as culturally valuable species](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1470160X18308781?via%3Dihub)” (responsible is Alliance of Bioversity and CIAT, and Crop Trust; more info in the link). |
| 2 | 20 | C | 122 | | Target 9.1. We suggest adding the following indicator: “Trait diversity of crops and livestock, especially climate related responses”. The indicator on trait diversity relates to the indicator on “high degree of functional and response diversity” by Cabell and Oelofse, 2012. (Cabell, J.F., & Oelofse, M. 2012. An indicator framework for assessing agroecosystem resilience. Ecology and Society 17(1): 18). |
| 2 | 20 | C | 122 | | Target 9.1. We suggest adding the following indicator: “Level of production of indigenous/native food species, varieties and breeds”. The indicator on indigenous/native food species, varieties and breeds relates to the indicator “honors legacy, while investing in the future” by Cabell and Oelofse, 2012, as well as the indicator “Maintenance and use of local crop varieties and animal breeds” by UNU-IAS et al., 2014 (Cabell, J.F., & Oelofse, M. 2012. An indicator framework for assessing agroecosystem resilience. Ecology and Society 17(1): 18; UNU-IAS, Bioversity International, IGES, UNDP. 2014. Toolkit for the indicators of resilience in socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes (SEPLS) UNU-IAS, Tokyo, Japan). |
| 2 | 20 | C | 125 | | Forest area controlled by LCIP found to perform well and often yield more equitable benefits, include proportion of forest area under collective title (FAO/RRI)  Add share of community-specific legal regimes with specific protections for women’s governance (voting and leadership) and inheritance rights (FAO LAT) |
| 2 | 22 | B, C | 133 | | Trends in species that provide essential HEALTH services to women and men from different socio-economic groups. |
| 2 | 22 | B, C | 133-139 | | What is meant by well-being should be unpacked and captured in relevant sex-disaggregated indicators. Current focus seems to be on health, which does not equate with well-being. |
| 2 | 22-25 | B | 140-151 | | In order to ensure equitable access to benefits, targets must be aligned with SDG1 and 5 indicators aimed at enhancing gender-equitable access and control over land and other resources.  Also consider share of countries with mandatory 1/3 gender quota in resource use groups (or all publicly elected bodies). |
| 2 | 27 | B | 159-161 | | Consider also trends in gender-responsive policies; indicator to be based on established frameworks for assessing gender-integration in policies. |
| 2 | 22 | C | 143 | | Target 12.1 This indicator seems redundant in light of the monitoring element below "Trends in number of countries that have adopted legislative or administrative ..." So it could be deleted, or it could be cut and pasted down to be an indicator for that monitoring element. |
| 2 | 23 | C | 144 | | Target 12.1 This indicator seems redundant in light of the monitoring element below "Trends in number of countries that have adopted legislative or administrative ..." So it could be deleted, or it could be cut and pasted down to be an indicator for that monitoring element. |
| 2 | 23 | C | 145 | | Target 12.1 This indicator seems redundant in light of the monitoring element below "Trends in number of countries that have adopted legislative or administrative ..." So it could be deleted, or it could be cut and pasted down to be an indicator for that monitoring element. |
| 2 | 23 | B | After 145 | | Target 12.1 We suggest adding a Monitoring element as follow: “Increase in genetic resources available under internationally and nationally agreed ABS rules” |
| 2 | 23 | C | After 145 | | Target 12.1 We suggest to add the two following indicators to measure the monitoring element proposed above: “Numbers of plant genetic resources available under the ABS conditions established by the Plant Treaty (based on formal notifications to the Plant Treaty's Governing Body and which is available on the Plant Treaty's Global Information System and the FAO’s World information and early warning system (WIEWS) on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture”. This figure is actively tracked and published by the Plant Treaty Secretariat and the FAO CGRFA Secretariat.  And: “Numbers of genetic resources which contracting parties and/or stakeholders have notified CBD Clearing House Mechanism are potentially available under national ABS conditions (including those implementing the Nagoya Protocol)”. This practice does not yet exist, but could be encouraged, perhaps through a decision of the CBD/COP when adopting the Post 2020 framework. One of the motivations behind community biodiversity registration projects is to know what a community has in its control that it may be willing to provide access to, providing they are able to agree upon ABS terms with the access-seeking party. |
| 2 | 24 | C | 146 | | Target 12.2 We suggest adding the following indicators for monetary benefit sharing: 1. “Amount of money included in the Plant Treaty’s Benefit-sharing fund (BSF)”. Comment: The Benefit-Sharing Fund of the Plant Treaty, as per its current operational manual adopted by the Governing Body, has two sources of income:  -User-based income from the Multilateral System for Access and Benefit-sharing;  -Voluntary contributions from Contracting Parties and others.  2. “Number of ABS agreements with monetary benefit sharing clauses” (not including names of parties to the agreements). Comment: No such mechanism exists (like the Plant Treaty’s BSF) under the CBD/NP mechanism but the CBD/COP could encourage contracting parties to share non-confidential information about monetary benefit sharing through ABS agreements concluded with people/orgs in their own jurisdictions. |
| 2 | 24 | C | 146 | | Target 12.2 We suggest adding the following indicators for non-monetary benefit sharing: metrics to be agreed by CBD/COP in the future. In the resolution adopting the Post 2020 Framework, the CBD/COP could initiate activity to develop metrics for measuring/monitoring relevant non-monetary benefits, in consultation with other relevant MEAs, including the Plant Treaty. |
| 2 | 24 | C | 147 | | Target 12.2 It is important to have information about national measures implementing the Plant Treaty as well. But countries are not required to share that information through the ABS Clearing House Mechanism (CHM).  Two possible solutions: one is to encourage countries to voluntarily share that info through the ABS CHM.  The other is to simply add the phrase "and to the Plant Treaty's Governing Body" to the end of the indicator after "reported to the ABS Clearing-House". |
| 2 | 24 | C | After 148 | | Target 12.2 We suggest adding the following indicators: 1. “Number of countries that have ratified the Plant Treaty and the Nagoya Protocol”; 2. “Number of IPLCs that have developed biodiversity community protocols or other tools for engaging in ABS regimes as either providers or recipients and/or the number of national level implementation mechanisms that formally recognize IPLC protocols” and 3. Number of countries that have integrated ABS within national development strategies and plans including NBSAPs, NAPAs, NAPs, national poverty alleviation plans, national agriculture development plans, etc. From Alliance ABS paper <https://www.cbd.int/api/v2013/documents/2009F679-F104-6CD7-961E-AF2C44CE5618/attachments/CGIAR.pdf> |
| 2 | 24 | C | 150 | | Target 12.3 Here again, as above, it might be useful to monitor the numbers of communities that have adopted biocultural community protocols that address access to their TK, and to monitor the number of countries that include recognition of those protocols in their national ABS laws. |
| 2 | 25 | C | After 152-153 | | Target 13.1. We propose to apply the commitment analysis of the ABD Index to create indicators that facilitate monitoring progress towards T13.1.  The commitment analysis consists in text-mining national legal documentation (e.g. legislation, policies and strategies) to identify what key words related to agrobiodiversity are mentioned. The list of key words has been compiled based on an extensive expert review for the Agrobiodiversity Index case but it can be easily adapted and adjusted for monitoring progress towards T13.1. The text mined sentences containing the selected keywords list is then classified to reflect the level of commitment such as just mentioning or up to tangible and time-abounded efforts. More information on the method available at: <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/12/2/715>.  The commitment methodology of the ABD Index can be applied to different sectors or goals. Responsible: Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT. |
| 2 | 26 | C | 157 | | Target 13.2. We suggest adding the indicator: “Number of countries implementing the *Voluntary Guidelines on Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Policies, Programmes and National and Regional Plans of Action on Nutrition* and *Voluntary Guidelines on Food Systems and Nutrition* (to be endorsed by CFS in 2020), as well as other relevant instruments, tools and voluntary guidelines for transforming food systems” |
| 2 | 26 | C | 157 | | Target 13.2. We suggest adding the indicator: “Number of countries that have mainstreamed biodiversity for food and nutrition into relevant national development strategies and plans including National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs), Multi-sectoral Nutrition Plans, National Agricultural Plans, National Climate Change Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) and National Climate Change Adaptation Plans (NAPs) and other relevant national development strategies and plans” |
| 2 | 27 | C | 159 | | Target 13.3. We propose to apply the commitment analysis of the ABD Index to create indicators that facilitate monitoring progress towards T13.3.  The commitment analysis consists in text-mining national legal documentation (e.g. legislation, policies and strategies) to identify what key words related to agrobiodiversity are mentioned. The list of key words has been compiled based on an extensive expert review for the Agrobiodiversity Index case, but it can be easily adapted and adjusted for monitoring progress towards T13.3. The text mined sentences containing the selected keywords list is then classified to reflect the level of commitment such as just mentioning or up to tangible and time-abounded efforts. More information on the method available at: <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/12/2/715>.  The commitment methodology of the ABD Index can be applied to different sectors or goals. Responsible: Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT. |
| 2 | 31 | C | 187 | | Target 15.1. We suggest adding the indicator: “Number of new markets developed for food biodiverse products with high nutritional value, including more nutritious convenience foods based on biodiverse products” |
| 2 | 31 | C | 187 | | Target 15.1. We suggest adding the indicator: “Number of people trained to deploy and benefit from nutritionally rich biodiversity” |
| 2 | 31 | C | 187 | | Target 15.1. We suggest adding the indicator: “Number of countries that have in place national food-based dietary guidelines which highlight the importance of food biodiversity not only for healthy diets and nutrition outcomes but also the many other multiple benefits including environmental sustainability and social equity” |
| 2 | 31 | C | After 192 | | Target 15.2. We suggest adding the indicator: “Number of people trained to deploy and benefit from nutritionally rich biodiversity” |
| 2 | 31 | C | 193 | | Target 15.3. We suggest adding the indicator: “Number of new markets developed for food biodiverse products with high nutritional value, including more nutritious convenience foods based on biodiverse products” |
| 2 | 33 | C | After 206 | | Target 17.1. We suggest adding the indicator: “Number of countries with policies in place which provide subsidies/incentives for the sustainable production of healthy biodiverse foods”. |
| 2 | 33 | C | After 206 | | Target 17.1. We suggest adding the indicator: “Number of countries that use payments for ecosystem services or that have put in place agricultural policies that reward farms whom use biodiversity to secure habitat and the nature-based solutions they provide”. |
| 2 | 34 | B | 211-221 | | Funding needs and allocation for gender-responsive implementation of the post-2020 framework should be established, indicator needed to guide and track funding allocations |
| 2 | 36 | B | 226 | | This list of indicators must include sex-disaggregated information on women and men’s participation in biodiversity management (trends in participation) as well as access to and control over benefits |
| 2 | 39-40 | C | 244-248 | | Monitoring element: trends in women and girls’ participation in biodiversity conservation and management.  Consider proportion of women and youth in resource user groups, or share of countries with mandatory 1/3 gender quota in resource use groups; participation of women and girls at all levels of decision-making.  Consider SDG indicators on equal land rights (1.4.2.; 5.a.1.; 5.a.2.) |
| 2 | 39-40 | C | 247 | | All monitoring elements and indicators related to youth should be gender-disaggregated. |

*Comments should be sent by e-mail to* [*secretariat@cbd.int*](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int)***no later than 15 August 2020****.*

1. [CBD/WG2020/REC/2/1](https://www.cbd.int/doc/recommendations/wg2020-02/wg2020-02-rec-01-en.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/post2020> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)