

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

I. Background

1. The second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group¹ 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, at your earliest convenience but **no later than 25 July 2020**
2. When submitting comments, please adhere to the following guidelines as much as possible:
 - a. Please provide all comments in writing and in an MS Word or similar document format using the table provided below.
 - b. Please provide full contact information for the individual/Government/organization submitting the comments.
 - c. Please avoid commenting on issues related to grammar, spelling, or punctuation, unless it affects the overall meaning of the text, as the document will be edited as the final draft is prepared.
 - d. To facilitate the revision process please be as specific as possible in your comments. In areas where you feel additional or alternative text or information is required, please suggest, if possible, what this text may look like or what should be included.
 - e. If you refer to additional sources of information, please include these with your comments when possible or provide a complete reference or hyperlink.
 - f. Please focus your comments on columns A (components the draft goals and targets), B (monitoring elements), C (indicators) and D (indicator baseline year and frequency of updates) of tables 1 and 2.

¹ [CBD/WG2020/REC/2/1](https://www.cbd.int/doc/working-groups/2020/02/2020-02-01-cbd-wg2020-rec-2-1-en.pdf)

- g. If you are suggestion the inclusion of additional indicators please provide information on if the indicator is currently operational, the organization supporting its development, its baseline (i.e. the year data is first available) and how frequently the indicator is updated (i.e. monthly, yearly, every two years etc.).
 - h. All review comments will be posted on the webpage² 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.

III. Template for Comments

4. Please use the review template below when providing comments.
5. The complete draft of the monitoring framework has been released in a portable document format (PDF). For tables 1, 2 and 3 column letters and row numbers have been provided as well as page numbers. Please use these as a reference as illustrated in the table below. General comments can be included in the table by referring to Page 0 and Line 0.

TEMPLATE FOR COMMENTS

Review comments on the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework	
<i>Contact information</i>	
Surname:	Walder
Given Name:	Bethanie
Government (if applicable):	
Organization:	Society for Ecological Restoration
Address:	1133 15 th St. NW; Suite 300
City:	Washington, DC
Country:	USA
E-mail:	bethanie@ser.org
<i>General Comments</i>	
It would be helpful to have more indicators for nonforest terrestrial ecosystems such as savannas, woodlands, shrublands, grasslands, alpine, tundra, deserts, etc. Except in one place, everything is forest or other terrestrial.	
Most ecosystems take very long-time frames to achieve full recovery and many restoration projects are only able to achieve partial recovery (Moreno-Mateos et al. 2017, Gann et al. 2019, Moreno-Mateos et al. 2020). Therefore, additional indicators are needed to track proportion of land undergoing restoration (i.e., degradation reversing, but not fully restored). Currently, there is no global system in place to evaluate or monitor completeness or quality of restoration, but the 5-star system and Ecological Recovery Wheel in SER's <i>International principles and standards for the practice of ecological restoration</i> (Gann et al. 2019, https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.13035) provide a framework that can be utilized to do so if sufficient resourcing were available.	

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

<i>Specific Comments</i>				
Table	Page	Column letter	Row number	Comment
1	2	B	1	Suggest splitting this into two Monitoring Elements. 1) “Trends in total area of forest ecosystems” and 2) “Trends in area of native [or natural] forest ecosystems”. Measurements of total forest area will reveal little about native forest biodiversity.
1	2	B & C	14	Suggest a new Monitoring Element “Trends in area undergoing restoration”, indicator TBD.
1	3	B & C	28	Suggest a new Monitoring Element “Trends in defragmentation through restoration”, indicator TBD.
1	3	B & C	33	Suggest a new Monitoring Element “Trends in species recovery”, indicator TBD.
1	5	B	51	Suggest changing “Trends in habitat creation and maintenance” to “Trends in ecosystem restoration and management”.
1	5	C	51	Suggest rewording as “Number of certified forest areas under sustainable management with verified benefits impacts on <u>ecosystem</u> habitat conservation/ restoration.”
1	5	C	51	Suggest new Indicator “Number of other certified nonforest areas under sustainable management with verified impacts on ecosystem conservation/ restoration.”
1	5	C	56	Suggest new Indicator “Number of other certified nonforest areas under sustainable management with verified impacts on carbon sequestration/storage.”
1	5	C	58	Suggest new Indicator “Number of other certified nonforest areas under sustainable management with verified impacts on water quality.”
2	8	C	6	Suggest new Indicator “Native [or natural] forest area as a proportion of total forest area.”
2	9	B	21, 22	The forest portion of this Monitoring Element is repeated from above, along with the indicator in line 22. We do not see new information here, unless the calculation for the indicator in row 21 also captures the proportion of plantation forests with “at least 10% natural land”. If that is the case, then forests can remain in the Monitoring Element title, but it could be clearer.
2	9	B & C	24	Suggest adding at end of sentence, “... or undergoing restoration” Most ecosystems take very long-time frames to achieve full recovery and many restoration projects are only able to achieve partial recovery (Moreno-Mateos et al. 2017, Gann et al. 2019, Moreno-Mateos et al. 2020). Therefore, an additional indicator is needed to track proportion of land undergoing restoration (i.e., degradation reversing, but not

