

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

TEMPLATE FOR COMMENTS

Review comments on the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework				
<i>Contact information</i>				
Surname:	Shonisani			
Given Name:	Munzhedzi			
Government (if applicable):	South Africa on behalf of the African Group			
Organization:	Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries			
Address:	Environment House, 473 Steve Biko, Arcadia, Pretoria, 0001			
City:	Pretoria			
Country:	South Africa			
E-mail:	smunzhedzi@environment.gov.za			
<i>Comments</i>				
Table	Page	Column letter	Row number	Comment
0	0	0	0	<p>There is an important distinction mentioned in the introduction to the indicators documentation. Global indicators can be automatically disaggregated (e.g. using scripts etc.) but it should be made clear that some global indicators require local interpretation and others do not. For example, “forest extent” is a useful indicator but needs careful local interpretation in a nation dominated by grasslands or desert since the assumed positive situation associated with an increase in forest cover does not necessarily hold. In South Africa, forest increase, as detected both globally (global forest watch) and locally (national land cover change data) indicate a form of land degradation known as “bush encroachment” or invasion by non-native tree species. The fact that a variable can be consistently collected globally does not always mean that it can be interpreted the same way globally.</p> <p>We recommend that this be carefully considered and explained in the GBF indicator documentation.</p>
0	0	0	0	<p>There are global indicators such as Red List Index which can be disaggregated to country-level using only globally assessed taxa, but if there are more extensive taxon groups that have been assessed nationally there is an opportunity to do a national version of the Red List Index that is more useful to the nation but is difficult to compare to other countries. This is particularly common in Land Cover related metrics where global data allows</p>

				<p>for GBO reporting on overall trends in habitat loss while fine-scale data provides better resolution for national reporting. However, the differences in methodology and classifications make it very hard to aggregate this data upwards to the GBO level.</p> <p>We recommend that the “headline” indicators should rather be termed "high-level" indicators or “global” indicators. Calling these indicators “high-level” powers the GBO but the indicators are generally going to be less useful or even be discouraged at the national level, provided alternative indicators exist.</p>
0	0	0	0	General comment: Most indicators are not SMART
1	2	A	0	<p>Marine ecosystems are not monitored by extent, but rather condition.</p> <p>We recommend that another component focusing on monitoring of marine ecosystems condition be inserted.</p>
1	2	B	14 Bis	<p>Goal A Component A1, resilience is an important element to be monitored (column B) and would also require indicators (Column C) at the level of governance institutions that help ensure management of ecosystems and safeguard their resilience and positive trends long-term.</p> <p>To include monitoring elements on Biosafety to support action target 17.</p>
1	2	B	25-26	<p>In addition to “Trends in fragmentation and quality of other marine and coastal ecosystems”, we recommend adding a monitoring element on interconnectivity of marine protected areas which is critical, for example, for the protection of highly migratory species. The WDPA may be used to assess this.</p>
1	3	C	23 - 24	<p>The NOAA Coral Reef Watch identifies areas at high risk of thermal stress and coral bleaching. The Live Coral Cover (LCC) which is listed as a possible indicator is an ecosystem response indicator, whereas CRW measures threat. CRW therefore allows for the creation of management interventions to increase survival.</p> <p>We recommend that the NOAA Coral Reef Watch (https://coralreefwatch.noaa.gov/satellite/index.php) be considered as an indicator for coral reef health/condition.</p>
1	3	C	34-35	<p>It could be argued that a fisheries indicator is from Goal A and specifically section A4 and A5 as well. Unsustainable and excessive fishing obviously threatens the resilience of species and their genetic diversity. The following are several recommended indicators for consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fisheries Management Effectiveness (Ocean Health Index); - Number of fisheries with precautionary science-based management plans; - Changes in the ecological health and stock abundance of fisheries;

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of fisheries where full harvest strategies have been adopted, implemented, or are in development; - Number of fisheries with sufficient observer coverage systems to address illegal and/or unsustainable harvest and to correctly estimate bycatch rates; - Number of fisheries where management is based on formal stock assessments.
1	4	C	36-41	<p>Component A5 of Goal A (Maintain Genetic Diversity) is a welcome addition to the post-2020 GBF. It is important to move beyond the narrow focus of the Aichi Target 13, which focused on cultivated and domesticated species, and consider the importance of genetic diversity in wild species populations.</p> <p>Monitoring elements that could be added to this component are mentioned by Laikre <i>et al.</i>, (2020) (10.1126/science.abb2748):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genetically effective population size; • Number of species or populations in which genetic diversity is being monitored by national agencies or universities using DNA-markers; • A third indicator could be measuring rates of loss of distinct populations within species. <p>Since no specific target has been formulated (Table 2) to address the genetic diversity of wild species, this will have to be addressed urgently to link with component A5 on Maintaining Genetic Diversity.</p> <p>We recommend that the expansion of the genetic targets should include the elements listed above (Laikre <i>et al.</i>, 2020) and need to also consider the indicators listed in Hoban <i>et al.</i>, 2020 (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108654).</p>
1	4	A	42-49	<p>Overall, we do support the inclusion of Key Biodiversity Areas in the development of indicators for Goal A, 6 on “Protection of critical ecosystems”. Indicators which included Key Biodiversity Areas could complement ecosystem representation indices (PARC). There is also a strong link to SDGs which already use the protection of KBAs in Goal 14 and 15 – (14.5.1; 15.1.2 and 15.4.1.).</p>
1	5	C	56	<p>While forests are important for carbon sequestration, soils (especially agricultural) and various types of natural ecosystems also have high potential for carbon sequestration. These should also be considered.</p>
1	6	B, C	64-67	<p>Proposed elements and indicators for Goal B 2. Trends in provision of food from agriculture Indicator; Proportion of agricultural land under sustainable management</p>
1	6	B, C	72-74, 76	<p>The expected indicators should focus on the elements of the target which should relates to benefit sharing and not on the implementation of the instrument such number of designated checkpoints and checkpoint communique.</p>

				<p>We recommend that these indicators focus on the elements of the target such as trends in facilitation of benefit sharing and not on the implementation of the instrument. In addition, the indicators could reflect upon elements such as the number of material transfer agreements, benefit-sharing agreement etc. as, number of R&D projects reported by parties and/or shared in the ABS-CH These monitoring elements seem to be the same because both indicate trends on shared benefit from use of genetic resources – It may be helpful to specify separately in two different indicators: monetary benefits and non-monetary benefits.</p> <p>It could be useful to put an additional indicator that indicates “Number of demands from check points to users to provide information on use of genetic resources” so that a comparison of demands from check points and users providing information on the actual use of GR may indicate actual benefit sharing taking place.</p>
1	6	A	72-73	We recommend addition of this text “Access to genetic resources for their utilization and associated traditional knowledge ”
1	6	B	72-73	We recommend addition of this text “ Trends in access to genetic resources for their utilization and associated traditional knowledge ”
1	6	A	74-76	We recommend addition of this text “Sharing of the benefits from utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge ”
1	6	C	75	We recommend “Number of users that have proved information relevant to the utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge to the designated checkpoints” and “ Number of checkpoints communique published in the ABS Clearing House ”.
1	6	D	75	We recommend “2018, real time”.
1	6	B	74 & 76	We recommend merging of the following monitoring elements: Trends in the benefits from the access to genetic resources shared; and Trends in monetary and non-monetary benefits from access to genetic resources shared. This should read as “ Trends in monetary and non-monetary benefits shared from access to genetic resources for their utilization and associated traditional knowledge ”
1	6	C	74&76	We recommend “Amount of monetary benefits (in USD) received from granting access to genetic resources for their utilization and associated traditional knowledge since entry into force of the Protocol” and “Percentage of non-monetary benefits received from granting access to genetic resources for their utilization and associated traditional knowledge since entry into force of the Protocol”.
1	6	d	74&76	We recommend “2018, approximately every four years”.

2	8	C	3 - 4	It should be noted that in the South African context the portions of coastal areas are included in both integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning frameworks. Clear guidance on reporting is needed in this regard if this monitoring framework does not allow for areas to sit in more than one planning framework
2	8	B	1	Correct the monitoring element that currently reads “ Trends in area under spatial land-use plans” to say “ <u>Increase</u> in area under spatial land-use plans”.
2	8	B	1-5	Component T1.1 – the monitoring element needs to incorporate the extent of land-sea or catchment that is covered by a planning system “that incorporates biodiversity”. Such a systematic biodiversity plans that underpin government approved and implemented land/sea /catchment management plans. “Spatial land use plans” may or may not incorporate biodiversity elements. MSP and Catchment plans can also miss the biodiversity elements. We recommend that words “ <u>that incorporates biodiversity</u> ” be added to all the monitoring elements or the words “ <u>Increase in area of terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecosystems under spatial planning [that incorporate biodiversity]</u> ” be added to the Component T1.1
2	8	B	1-5	We recommend that this component reflect elements of SDG target 15.1 indicator which also formed part of the indicator for the 2011-2020 Biodiversity Strategic Plan i.e. the proportion of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity that are covered by protected areas, by ecosystem type. This will ensure interlinkages between the GBF and SDGs.
2	8	B	6	This metric also includes changes resulting from plantations and agriculture, and so theoretically, could show no net change, even if entire natural habitats are replaced with plantations. Because this metric considers natural forests and plantations interchangeable, it would be difficult to determine when an ecosystem is headed towards a collapsed state (Keenan RJ, Reams GA, Achard F, de Freitas JV, Grainger A, Lindquist E. 2015. Dynamics of global forest area: Results from the FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment 2015. Forest Ecology and Management 352:9-20).
2	8	B	6-11	We recommend adding trends in <u>ecosystem integrity</u> as a monitoring element with the following new indicator: “Ecosystem Integrity” (found within Ocean Health Index).
2	10	B	26	There is no direct mention of the sustainability of fisheries as a metric. As one moves further from the coast (where development, habitat change, pollution etc. are all potential human impacts) then overfishing and damaging fishing practices become one of the prominent ways in which a marine ecosystem is degraded. As stated under the goals section, we recommend the following relevant indicators for consideration:

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fisheries Management Effectiveness (Ocean Health Index); - Number of fisheries with precautionary science-based management plans; - Changes in the ecological health and stock abundance of fisheries; - Number of fisheries where full harvest strategies have been adopted, implemented, or are in development; - Number of fisheries with sufficient observer coverage systems to address illegal and/or unsustainable harvest and to correctly estimate bycatch rates; - Number of fisheries where management is based on formal stock assessments.
2	10	C	30-34	<p>We must ensure that when it comes to “trends in habitat connectivity”, the indicators do not leave out marine protected area connectivity.</p> <p>Large MPAs that encompass multiple habitats, or networks of MPAs that protect migratory pathways and key habitats, can also ensure population connectivity (Boerder et al, 2018). This helps build additional resilience into a changing system through providing refuge for highly migratory species whilst allowing for species’ range shifts.</p> <p>Perhaps the WDPA may be consulted on the best indicator to use for this.</p>
2	11	B	39-42	<p>KBAs represent the most comprehensive and systematic site-scale dataset of areas of particular importance for biodiversity. Coverage by protected areas provides three of the SDG indicators (14.5.1, 15.1.2 and 15.4.1). It is suggested that component T2.2 should be reworded as “Trends in conservation of key biodiversity areas and other areas of particular importance for biodiversity”</p>
2	11	C	39-42	<p>In addition to the standard indicators already included (i.e. proportion of important sites protected) it would be useful to include an extra indicator of the condition/health of the sites if possible.</p> <p>We recommend the inclusion of the following indicator: <u>“Proportion of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity that are in good condition”</u>.</p>
2	11	C	40	<p>T 2.2.Under indicators: it is suggested to add 'marine' in this sentence 'Proportion of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater and marine biodiversity that are covered by protected areas, by ecosystem type. It is further proposed to include here marine sites by ecosystem type too. These could include the proportion of ecosystems such as: coral reefs, deep sea ecosystems (by type, depth, and strata), mangroves, seagrasses, saltmarshes, etc. included in effectively managed MPAs and OECMs.</p>

2	12	A	55	Human wildlife conflict incidents can reduce for several reasons - including the reduction or loss of the wildlife population causing the conflict. As such when measuring levels of human wildlife conflict, it is also critical to measure levels of co-existence. Therefore we propose rewording this component as ""strengthened co-existence as a result of reduced human-wildlife conflicts"
2	12	B	49	We propose an additional monitoring element under component T2.5 as follows: ""Trend in existence of national plans for entire ecologically connected systems of protected areas and OECMs"
2	12	C	51	<p>We recommend adding the following to the indicators measuring increased protection and conservation effectiveness (esp. as it relates to OUTCOMES):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applying IUCN’s Global Conservation Standards to MPAs (main website here); • MPA Guide: Shared Vision to Describe MPAs and the Conservation Outcomes They Provide (other language available here); • IUCN Guidelines on recognizing and reporting other effective area-based conservation measures (main website here); <p>These indicators may also be appropriate under T2.4</p>
2	12	C	56	<p>We note a bycatch related monitoring element is included under Target 8, but it also belongs here if we are talking about sustainable and safe harvest. Suggest including this monitoring element here as well: “Trends in population and extinction risk in bycatch species”.</p> <p>Another example of harvest that is unsustainable and harmful is when it uses bottom trawling, dynamite fishing. Perhaps one indicator to add here is as follows:</p> <p>“Increase in legislation prohibiting destructive fishing activities such as bottom trawling and dynamite fishing, etc.</p>
2	12	C	55	We proposes that an indicator for this component should be developed as follows: "A composite HWC Index including metrics for the human (mortality, injury and perceptions around safety), economic (livelihoods and opportunity costs), and contextual (wildlife and human populations, reprisal killing, and ecosystem health) dimensions of HWC."
2	14	C	68	Both prevention and control measures are important aspects of invasive species management. Prevention is particularly relevant for pre- and at-border pathway management, which is the focus of this indicator.

				We propose that the word ‘or’ be replaced with ‘ <u>and</u> ’: “Proportion of countries adopting relevant national legislation and adequately resourcing the prevention <u>and</u> control of invasive alien species” (SDG indicator 15.8.1)
2	14	C	69	Some alien species introductions are beneficial, with some being used to control biological invasions (i.e. biocontrol agents). We would not want to prevent the introduction of beneficial species. Therefore, what is important is to monitor and report on the rate of illegal introductions. The proposed indicator could be “ <u>Trends in the numbers of unregulated invasive alien species introduction events</u> ”.
2	14	A	70	The way component A is drafted provide some information gap, many countries do not have measures in place to support the detection, identification, or prioritisation and monitoring of invasive alien species. Therefore we need a mechanism to support the implementation of that component of the target. We recommend that this component be rephrased to read as follows: <u>effective measures for detection, identification, prioritisation and monitoring of invasive alien species.</u>
2	14	C	71	We recommend the indicator “ <u>Number of species that are taxonomically verified per country</u> ” here.
2	14	C	72	Under T.5.2 We believe it is important to monitor invasive alien species impacts on sites of particular importance for biodiversity. We therefore support the inclusion of the BIP proposed indicator for target 5 component T5.2: “Proportion of key biodiversity areas threatened by invasive alien species” which is being monitored by the KBA Partnership using data from the World Database of KBAs.
2	14	B	70–72	To achieve the prioritisation of “T5.2. Effective detection, identification, prioritisation and monitoring of invasive alien species” it will be important to have a monitoring element that explicitly relates to knowledge of impact, e.g. "Trends in knowledge about the impacts of invasive alien species". The “Trends monitoring of invasive alien species” might simply refer to abundance, occupancy or extent. The corresponding indicator in C. for an element in B could be something like "proportion of invasive alien species that have an impact assessment as per the EICAT scheme”. This is separate to T5.4 row 77 “Tends in the impact of invasive alien species” as row 77 focuses on what receives impact rather than what causes the impact.
2	14	B	72	We recommend that the word “in” be inserted in the monitoring element “Trends <u>in</u> monitoring of invasive alien species”.
2	14	C	72	We are of the view that the proposed indicator for this element should contain the following elements “ <u>number of invasive alien species verified presence or absence records at a locality with a</u>

				<u>geographic co-ordinate, or in a prescribed area, management or geopolitical unit or site”.</u>
2	14	C	73	It is very valuable to monitor “Trends in invasive alien species vertebrate eradications”. The “trends in invasive species vertebrate eradications” indicator currently only tracks eradications attempts on islands (https://www.bipindicators.net/indicators/trends-in-invasive-alien-species-vertebrate-eradications). Data on eradications attempts are shared in DIISE. Some areas of the world may be under-represented in DIISE (http://www.issg.org/pdf/publications/2019_Island_Invasives/Holmes.pdf) Instead of tallying up the number of eradication attempts, it might be better to state that an island has X number of alien invasive species and has successfully eradicated 20% of those species.
2	15	B	77	We recommend the replacement of “tends” with “ <u>trends</u> ”
2	15	C	77	Monitoring impacts on native species by IAS over time using the Red List Index is very important, however, it is also important to evaluate which IAS are causing the impacts and how this is changing over time (cf. proposed change to row 70–72). In this context, the IUCN’s Environmental Impact Classification of Alien Taxa (EICAT) scheme is very important. Recent research has shown that the IUCN EICAT and Red List of Threatened Species schemes should be used in concurrence (Van der Colff et al. in press). Van der Colff D, Kumschick S, Foden W, Wilson JRU (in press) Are the IUCN EICAT and Red List of Threatened Species schemes complementary?
2	15	B	78–80	We recommend the replacement of “AIS” with “ <u>IAS</u> ” for consistency with other parts of the table.
2	15	C	81	T 6.1 Under indicators: it is suggested to include the following regional (sub)indicators related to eutrophication (based on regional seas indicators for SDG 14.1 (see UN Environment Regional Seas Follow Up and Review of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGS) (UN Environment Regional Seas Reports and Studies No. 208, 2018): -Chlorophyll concentration as an indicator of phytoplankton biomass; -Locations and frequency of algal blooms reported; -Pollution hotspots: concentration of status of selected pollutant contamination in biota and sediments and temporal trends, and number of hotspots; -% of national action plans ratified and operational; -Waste water: % of coastal population connected to sewage facilities; % of waste facilities complying with adequate standards; and % of untreated wastewater. Suggest also including as indicators (based on regional seas indicators under development (see UN Environment (2018). Regional Seas Follow Up and

				<p>Review of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGS). UN Environment Regional Seas Reports and Studies No. 208):</p> <p>-quantification and classification of beach litter items; -amount of recycled waste on land (%) -% of port facilities available</p>
2	15	C	88	<p>T6.3. Reduction of pollution from plastic elements: Trends in levels of pollution from plastic in terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems We propose to add indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate of recycling rate • Average lifespan of products (by product type) • Number of countries developing, adopting or implementing policy instruments to support shifts to sustainable consumption and production
2	16	B	97	<p>T 7.1 Under monitoring elements: suggest adding: “including mangroves, seagrasses, coral reefs, deep water corals, the abyssal plain”</p>
2	16	C	97	<p>T 7.1 It is also suggested</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indicator on above ground biomass stock in forests (Global Core Set of Forest Indicators, UNFF)
2	16	C	98	<p>Proposed indicator(s): (i) Number or percentage of countries that develop and implement National Adaptation Strategies/ Plans; (ii) Number of countries implementing ecosystem based adaptation interventions to reduce vulnerability in communities.</p> <p>Further consideration: Proposal to make use of UNCCD three land-based indicators and associated metrics: land cover (assessed as land cover change), land productivity (assessed as NPP) and carbon stocks (assessed as SOC), as minimum set of globally agreed indicators/metrics, which were adopted by the UNCCD for reporting and as a means to understanding the status of degradation. The indicators and their associated metrics are already used for UNCCD reporting and for the sustainable development goals.</p> <p>To date more than 53 Countries are implementing Land Degradation Neutrality Targets</p>
2	16	B	98	<p>T 7.1 Under monitoring elements: Trends in contribution to climate change adaptation Suggest adding “and ocean acidification” but not with the prefix: "contribution to..."</p>

				Also suggest adding a new monitoring element on trends in the identification of refugia sites and the corresponding adoption of conservation and management measures. This is consistent with the CBD Voluntary specific workplan on biodiversity in cold water areas within the jurisdictional scope of the Convention.
2	18	C	105-109	"Sustainable fisheries management" must incorporate "ecosystem-based fisheries management". This will help insure benefits to communities from other avenues besides harvesting such as tourism or recreation. Suggest including an additional indicator here as follows: "Number of countries using ecosystem-based approaches to manage marine areas (SDG indicator 14.2.1)".
2	23	C	145	Proposed to use the terms in Nagoya Protocol such "Mutually Agreed Terms" instead of fair and equitable sharing of benefits which is certainly the intention of the MATs
2	24	C	146	Estimated % distribution between monetary benefit and non-monetary benefit shared
2	24	C	150	Number of countries having issued ABS permit (or IRCC) for traditional knowledge use in the ABS-CH - and/or number of ABS permit (or IRCC) for use of traditional knowledge published in ABS -CH
2	25	B, C	150-151	We recommend that new indicators on traditional knowledge in the context of benefit arising from genetic resources be considered for inclusion here. Also to include number of MAT concluded, mentioning benefit-sharing from use of traditional knowledge, published in the ABS - CH
2	18	C	105-109	"Sustainable fisheries management" must incorporate "ecosystem-based fisheries management". This will help insure benefits to communities from other avenues besides harvesting such as tourism or recreation. Suggest including an additional indicator here as follows: "Number of countries using ecosystem-based approaches to manage marine areas (SDG indicator 14.2.1)".
2	23	C	145	Proposed to use the terms in Nagoya Protocol such "Mutually Agreed Terms" instead of fair and equitable sharing of benefits which is certainly the intention of the MATs
2	24	C	146	Estimated % distribution between monetary benefit and non-monetary benefit shared
2	24	C	150	Number of countries having issued ABS permit (or IRCC) for traditional knowledge use in the ABS-CH - and/or number of ABS permit (or IRCC) for use of traditional knowledge published in ABS -CH
2	34	C	211	We are of the view that this indicator should not only focus on the number of countries which have assessed funding needs.

				We recommend the inclusion of on the number of countries that have access to and have received funding.
2	36	C	220-221	Article 20 (Financial Resources), put the obligation of financial resources to ensure effective implementation of the Convention and its protocols on the Parties. Although convention makes the provision of a voluntary fund, private sector and charitable organisation do not need to make such contribution. Indicators for this targets should also address elements as recommended on the report for the expert panel such elements include the need for catalysing resources of implementation through generation additional resources from all sources to achieve the three objectives of the Convention.
2	36	C	222-223	The post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework is underpinned by a theory of change that intends to aid ongoing reflection and learning to ensure that capacity development is consistently effective and contributing to expected changes. In this regard, T18.4 and T18.5 should include the wider notion that includes the necessary infrastructure to support the capacity building interventions. This was also reflected upon during the recently concluded online discussion forum on capacity building.
2	36	A	226	T19.1: “Trends in the availability of biodiversity-related information” need an element that focuses on reducing biases in the biodiversity data and filling substantial data gaps in Africa. In addition to tracking growth in species records on GBIF (row 226) we recommend that a metric such as: growth of species records data in “data-poor regions”. Otherwise, this metric will be celebrated as information is gathered, when in reality the data biases continue to grow.
2	38	A	236	T19.4 - It may be useful to add a monitoring element that reflects whether a nation has a functioning national biodiversity observation network (e.g. GEO BON) and or functioning LTER system. This would be a global indicator such as “number of nations with national BON and or Long Term Ecological Research Network”.
2	22-23	A	140-145	We recommend addition of this text “Access to genetic resources for their utilization and associated traditional knowledge ”
2	22-23	B	140-145	We recommend addition of this text “ Trends in access to genetic resources for their utilization and associated traditional knowledge ”
2	22	C	141	We recommend addition of this text “ Total number of permits or their equivalent granted for access to genetic resources for their utilization and associated traditional knowledge with mutually agreed terms (i.e. material transfers and benefit sharing agreements) in place ”

2	24	B	146	We recommend replacement of the monitoring element by “ Trends in monetary and non-monetary benefits shared from access to genetic resources for their utilization ”
2	24	C	146	We recommend “Amount of monetary benefits (in USD) received from granting access to genetic resources for their utilization since entry into force of the Protocol” and “Percentage of non-monetary benefits received from granting access to genetic resources for their utilization since entry into force of the Protocol”.
2	24	D	146	We recommend “2018, approximately every four years”.
2	24	C	150	We recommend addition of this text “ Total number of permits or their equivalent granted for access to genetic resources for their utilization and associated traditional knowledge with mutually agreed terms (i.e. benefit sharing agreements) in place. ”
2	24	D	150	We recommend “2018, approximately every four years”.
2	25	C	151	We recommend “Amount of monetary benefits (in USD) received from granting access to genetic resources for their utilization and associated traditional knowledge since entry into force of the Protocol” and “Percentage of non-monetary benefits received from granting access to genetic resources for their utilization and associated traditional knowledge since entry into force of the Protocol”.
2	25	D	151	We recommend “2018, approximately every four years”.
				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.