

## OECD submission on the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

The OECD submits this document with comments on the draft monitoring framework. The comments build on the OECD report *The Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework: Targets, indicators and measurability implications at global and national level*.<sup>1</sup> A concept that was put forward in the OECD report was to identify, from the suite of all proposed indicators, which would meet the criteria of headline indicators – that means, indicators whereby data is available at national level, using the same metric, so that it is consistent and comparable across countries. This would enable to aggregate data across countries at the national level, to determine whether they cumulatively add up to the proposed post-2020 global goal and targets. If they do not add up to the global goals and targets, this would mean there is a need to ratchet up national level goals and targets.

The comments provided below in section III would help to identify which of the proposed indicators would meet the headline indicator criteria. Comments on other issues are also provided.

### 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 Group<sup>2</sup> 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:
  - 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> The latest version of the OECD report was submitted to CBD SBSTTA-23 as INF document 3, in November 2019. It followed from a background paper that was prepared for an international expert workshop on this issue that was convened in February 2019. For more information, visit: <https://www.oecd.org/environment/resources/biodiversity/post-2020-biodiversity-framework.htm>. The next iteration of the OECD report is intended to be submitted as an INF document for SBSTTA-24.

<sup>2</sup> [CBD/WG2020/REC/2/1](https://www.cbd.int/doc/2020/WG2020/REC/2/1)

- 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.
  - 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 webpage<sup>3</sup> 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**

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**

<b>Review comments on the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework</b>	
<i>Contact information</i>	
<b>Surname:</b>	Karousakis
<b>Given Name:</b>	Katia
<b>Government (if applicable):</b>	
<b>Organization:</b>	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
<b>Address:</b>	2 rue Andre Pascal
<b>City:</b>	Paris
<b>Country:</b>	France
<b>E-mail:</b>	katia.karousakis@oecd.org
<i>General Comments</i>	
<p>Page 0, line 0.</p> <p>Given the very large number of proposed indicators (more than ~150), and the challenges that have been encountered in the 2011-2020 biodiversity framework, whereby few Parties adopted the 98 indicative indicators listed in Decision XIII/28, which means that it is difficult to aggregate national level indicator data across countries so as to be able to determine whether cumulatively, the national level targets add up to ensure achievement of the global Aichi Biodiversity Targets, the OECD strongly recommends the following additional information/analysis to be provided in the tables. This would help to determine which of the proposed indicators meet the headline indicator criteria (i.e. data is available in a consistent and comparable way across countries).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a column with information on whether the data is available at national level, and the current country coverage of the data. For example, for Target 17, on biodiversity-relevant taxes, fees and charges, and tradable permits, currently 110 countries are reporting to the OECD database on Policy Instruments for the Environment (PINE). The country coverage is thus currently 110. Information on country coverage will indicate for how many countries there is consistent and comparable data (i.e., the criteria to be a headline indicator).</li> <li>• Based on existing analysis in the OECD (2019) report, the below indicators have been identified that meet the headline indicator criteria. The next iteration of the OECD report will examine whether additional indicators exist that meet the headline indicator criteria. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Species habitat index</li> <li>○ Red List Index (and variations)</li> <li>○ Biodiversity Intactness Index</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/post2020>

- Mean Species Abundance
- Percentage natural habitat extent
- Wetland extent trends index
- Vegetation biomass
- Biodiversity habitat index
- Extent of primary habitat
- Proportion of land that is degraded
- Land cover change and conversions
- Area of tree cover loss
- Proportion of fish stock over-exploited (sufficiently meets headline criteria)
- Pesticide sale per hectare
- Nutrient balance
- tCO2e
- PA coverage
- PA connectedness index
- PA representativeness index
- MSC certified catch
- Policies and practices against IUU fishing
- Taxes on pesticides (e.g. for mainstreaming in agriculture)
- Taxes on fertilisers (e.g. for mainstreaming in agriculture)
- Biodiversity-relevant taxes
- Biodiversity-relevant fees and charges
- Biodiversity-relevant tradable permits
- Biodiversity relevant (environmentally-motivated) subsidies
- Payments for ecosystem services (under development by OECD)
- Biodiversity offsets (under development by OECD)
- Potentially environmental harmful support to agriculture
- Area under Sustainable Forest Management (under development by FAO)

It is also suggested to add a column with the source of the data (UNEP-WCMC has done this already) so that the information provided on the proposed indicators can be easily checked and made more user-friendly for the Parties.

In Table 1 on Goals: while most indicators are on the state of biodiversity (such as row 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8), there are several indicators that are response indicators (i.e. actions or “tools and solutions”). One example is the indicator on Protected Area coverage (row 42). Response indicators include row 42, 43, 46, 49, 51 (number of certified forest areas under sustainable management), 56, 58, 77, 78 and 80.

What is the rationale for including these response indicators in Table 1 under Goals, and not any other response indicators (which are listed under Targets in Table 2)? It might be worth considering covering only state indicators under the Goals, and placing all pressure and response indicators under the Targets. This could help to provide a more logical framework - and a clearer distinction - between the Goals and the Targets, whereby Goals focus on the state of biodiversity, and Targets focus on pressures (such as target 6) and the responses (i.e., actions) to address these (such as row 108 on MSC certified catch).

This comment is a suggestion, based on the fact that the tables are split up into Goals and Targets. The OECD Secretariat does not, however, find the distinction between Goals and Targets, as formulated in the draft monitoring framework, very clear. All of the objectives could more simply be formulated as targets, in three categories: Targets on the desired state of biodiversity; targets on the pressures; and targets on the responses (i.e. the actions, including mainstreaming).

Ideally:

A target on the state of biodiversity would be accompanied by an indicator related to the state of biodiversity.

A target on a pressure on biodiversity would be accompanied by an indicator related to the pressure on biodiversity (e.g. pesticide use per hectare).

A target on the responses (actions, or “tools and solutions”) on biodiversity would be accompanied by an indicator related to the action on biodiversity (e.g., protected area coverage, biodiversity-relevant taxes, etc).

See OECD (2019), “The Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework: Targets, indicators and measurability implications at global and national level”, November 2019 version, for more information on state, pressure and response indicators, and on headline indicators.

For all the indicators that are also SDG indicators, it would be very useful to add information on whether these are currently classified as Tier I, Tier II or Tier III. The latest information on SDG Tier classification is available here (17 April, 2020):

[https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/Tier%20Classification%20of%20SDG%20Indicators\\_17%20April%202020\\_web.pdf](https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/Tier%20Classification%20of%20SDG%20Indicators_17%20April%202020_web.pdf)

Please note that an SDG indicator that is classified as Tier I effectively implies that it meets the headline indicator criteria – Tier I means data are regularly produced by countries for at least 50 per cent of the countries and of the population in every region where the indicator is relevant. This means that data is

available in a consistent and comparable way across many countries. The data can therefore be added up, to determine whether countries are on track to meet the post-2020 global biodiversity (goals) and targets.

Additional possible indicators:

- Amount of pesticide sales per hectare. A pressure indicator. Data collected by OECD (Agri-environment indicators). Baseline year could be 2011 (data is more complete).
- Policies and practices against IUU fishing. A response indicator. Data collected by OECD (first year of data will be 2018). The data are being uploaded and will be publicly available in Q3/4, 2020.

**Target 9, Trends in soil quality: FAO has a database on soil organic content:** <http://www.fao.org/soils-portal/soil-survey/soil-maps-and-databases/harmonized-world-soil-database-v12/en/>

And also the JRC produces global data on Soil erosion for 2001 and 2012:

<https://esdac.jrc.ec.europa.eu/content/global-soil-erosion>

### *Specific Comments*

Table	Page	Column letter	Row number	Comment
1	2	C	16	Farmland bird index (% annual change) is an appropriate potential indicator here. Data is currently available for OECD countries (from 1990 onwards). All countries are welcome to report. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264186217-graph59-en">https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264186217-graph59-en</a>
1	5	B/C	59	Change in ambient water quality is determined by many factors, not just changes in biodiversity. This indicator is not really a measure of how biodiversity is contributing to the regulation of freshwater quantity.
1	5	C	62	Many factors influence trends in the number of deaths, missing persons etc. due to disasters. Biodiversity is just one factor and not necessarily the most important one. How can changes in this indicator be attributed to biodiversity protection/loss?
1	6	B	64	Would an upward or downward trend be desirable here? Without any consideration of sustainability, an upward trend could be devastating for biodiversity. The same could be said for other monitoring elements and indicators under Goal B. OECD recommends a greater focus on “sustainable” use, not simply use and benefits from this use.
1	6	B	78	In addition, it would be good to measure overall domestic public expenditure. Data quality and coverage is increasing for this. Sources include CBD FRF, OECD/EUROSTAT EPEA Accounts, BIOFIN BERs, and COFOG. See OECD (2020), <i>A Comprehensive Overview of Global Biodiversity Finance</i> .
2	33	A		Target 17.1 The OECD will be collecting data on Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) and biodiversity offsets (i.e., number of instruments in place, objective, finance mobilised, a.o.), as of late 2020. This will complement data on biodiversity-relevant taxes (row 205), fees and charges (row 206), and tradable permits (row 207). The new data on PES and biodiversity offsets will also be collected in a consistent and comparable way across countries, meaning it will meet the headline indicator criteria. The baseline year will be 1980. The data will be updated every one or two years.
2	33	B		Target 17.1: What is the difference between a public vs private economic incentive? Biodiversity-relevant taxes, for example, are put in place by the public sector (i.e. government) and apply to the private sector (firms and households). This language is confusing and could be simplified by deleting “public and private”. Related to this, column B (public incentives) is attributed to indicators in row 205 and 206 (taxes, and fees and charges), whereas column B (private incentives) is attributed to row 207 (tradable permits). This distinction is incorrect: they are all the same.
2	33	A		Target 17.1: The language refers to economic instruments <i>and</i> regulatory instruments. The OECD tracks and provides indicators on economic instruments (biodiversity-relevant taxes, fees and charges, tradable permits). Regulatory (command-and-control) instruments include, for example, protected areas, environmental impact assessments, standards, and <i>many</i> others. Is this what is intended here? Please note that some of these regulatory instruments are already captured

				in the other targets. It is therefore not clear which regulatory instruments are being referred to here, how they differ from the other ones in other targets, and how it provides value-added and/or avoids duplication. One option would be to delete the language here on regulatory instruments here.
2	33/34	A		Target 17.2. This language is less ambitious than the current language in Aichi Target 3 (which refers to harmful subsidies), as this target 17.2 only refers to “most harmful” subsidies. Is this intentional? If so, why?
2	33/34			Target 17.2 In addition to providing data on trends in potentially environmentally harmful elements of agriculture support (PSE) (row 208), OECD is working to collect and provide data, as of 2021, on <i>Trends in potentially environmentally harmful elements of government support to fisheries</i> . (The OECD collects data on government support to fisheries via the OECD fisheries support estimate [FSE] database). Hence please insert an additional row with this new indicator. The baseline year would be from 2010, and the data would be updated every year. It will build on: <a href="https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?datasetcode=FISH_FSE">https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?datasetcode=FISH_FSE</a>
2	26	C	219	The monitoring element (B) is trends in public domestic resource mobilization. Yet the indicator (C) proposed is # of Parties with a target. This proposed indicator does not make sense. For all other resource mobilization targets, the indicator proposed is quantitative data on the value/magnitude of finance (not whether they have targets). Moreover, this data is already being collected by a number of countries (see e.g. CBD financial reporting framework, OECD/EUROSTAT Environmental Protection Expenditure Accounts, BIOFIN Biodiversity Expenditure Reviews and the COFOG data). OECD (2020) <i>A Comprehensive Overview of Global Biodiversity Finance</i> provide analysis, including country coverage of different datasets. The indicator should be similar to those of other resource mobilization targets, namely: Amount of domestic public finance mobilized for biodiversity.
2	34-35	C	212/216	The distinction between 212 and 216 is not clear. Are these not the same?
2	35	C	218	Data on biodiversity-related funding from philanthropic foundations collected by OECD could be used here. This mentioned in table 1 row 80.
2	13		57	Target 4. For the monitoring element on the implementation of international instruments against IUU fishing (row 57, page 13), the new OECD indicators of best policies and practices against IUU fishing could be useful. The data is now being uploaded on OECD.Stat but will only be publicly accessible in Q3/4 2020.
2	13		58	The text says “Trends in proportion of biological resources harvested within the established harvest limits” – <del>but and then</del> it is related to SDG indicator 14.4.1 “Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels”.  Both approaches are however different. Indeed, stocks could be harvested within established harvest levels but be unsustainable if harvest limits have been set at an unsustainable level. And, conversely, they could be biologically sustainable but not harvested within the established harvest limit, if countries have objectives for economic maximization which mean they adopt harvest limits that are even more restrictive than what biological sustainability would require. What is more, the monitoring element implies that a harvest limit has been set, which is still not the case for large numbers of stocks, while the SDG indicator is related to a biological status that can be met without a harvest limit if pressure on stocks is limited anyway.

				<p>The OECD has developed new “targets &amp; thresholds indicators” (base year will be 2009, to be made public in Q3/4 2020), that include information both on the status and on the policy dimension of stocks, by reporting (i) whether a stock is meeting biological sustainability and (ii) whether it is also meeting “higher management objectives” on the basis of recent stock status evaluations. And we exclude from the biological sustainability count, stocks that meet harvest limits, which do not ensure biological sustainability. The OECD indicator could thus give you all the information you are looking at. But the coverage is not global and, replicating such analysis at a global level would be very data intensive. In doing so, it would be important to make biological sustainability a primer criteria.</p> <p>Given the heaviness of such a process, from a CBD perspective, it might be worth considering whether the harvest limit monitoring element is necessary, as perhaps instead the biological sustainability is the most important criteria. If this is the case, it might be helpful to align the “monitoring element” language with the SDG indicator and focus on biological sustainability. [Please note that when it comes to monitoring element “trends in sustainable fisheries management”, page 18, rows 105 and onwards, the SDG stock sustainability indicator is there again but not the harvest limit dimension, which is more policy focused]</p> <p>One other element that could be of interest, and simpler to monitor, is the number of stocks for which any stock status evaluation is available, regardless of status, as knowledge of the status is already an important step towards sustainability. This data is also available in the OECD targets and thresholds dataset mentioned above.</p>
2	13		59	<p>On “Trends in proportion of biological resources harvested through sustainable harvest practices” : what does sustainable harvest practices refer to here? – it could range from management rules such as harvest limits to the actual fishing gear being used, the fishing grounds, season etc. and as such it seems very difficult to monitor. Again, it may be easier to focus on the outcome – sustainable stocks.</p> <p>The OECD will be reporting new fisheries management indicators with information on how many of countries’ most important stocks are managed with a total allowable catch (TAC) limit; which could be useful in this context. But it is only part of the picture, and already very difficult to monitor. This new dataset will also be made public in Q3/4 2020 with 2018 as a base year.</p>
2 or 3				<p>For Table 2 or 3, it is proposed to add a column to indicate which of the indicators are state indicators, pressure indicators, or response indicators. This will help to determine the relative balance of indicators proposed across the goals and targets of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. It is important to have a good balance of different types of P-S-R indicators (this is related to the theory of change).</p> <p>For example, in Table 2, row 1, 2, and 5 are response indicators. Row 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20 are state indicators. Row 7, 17 and 24 are pressure indicators.</p> <p>This has been undertaken below for Table 3 for most of the indicators (see Annex I below). The preliminary analysis finds:  Number of State indicators: ~ 25  Number of Pressure indicators: ~15  Number of Response indicators: ~ 80</p>

				<p>While it is important to have many response indicators (this is what will lead to change), it is important to note that many of these proposed response indicators are related to protected areas or other area-based conservation measures (about 10). It would be important to try and identify additional response indicators that are representative of other elements, including mainstreaming (across sectors, so as to address the pressures).</p> <p>Moreover, many of the response indicators are process indicators (e.g. integrate biodiversity into national strategies). It would be important to try and identify additional response indicators that reflect outputs (e.g., new legislation for mining) and outcomes (e.g. [trends in, to determine increase or decrease of] pesticides per hectare).</p>

**Annex I: Table 3 with an additional column with information on whether the proposed indicators are state indicators, pressure indicators or responses indicators.**

<b>A. Proposed Global Indicators</b>	<b>B. Relevant Goals and Targets</b>	<b>Row Number</b>	<b>State, pressure or response indicator</b>
(a) Food loss index and (b) food waste index (SDG indicator 12.3.1)	15	1	Pressure
(a) Hazardous waste generated per capita; and (b) proportion of hazardous waste treated, by type of treatment (SDG indicator 12.4.2)	6, 14	2	(a) Pressure  (b) Response
(a) Index of coastal eutrophication; and (b) plastic debris density (SDG indicator 14.1.1)	6	3	Pressure
(a) Number of countries that have established national targets in accordance with or similar to Aichi Biodiversity Target 2 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 in their national biodiversity strategy and action plans and the progress reported towards these targets; and (b) integration of biodiversity into national accounting and reporting systems, defined as implementation of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SDG indicator 15.9.1)	13	4	Response
(a) Official development assistance on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity (SDG indicator 15.a.1)	D, 18	5	Response
15.a.1 (b) revenue generated and finance mobilized from biodiversity-relevant economic instruments (SDG indicator 15.a.1)	D	6	Response
Amount and composition of biodiversity-related finance reported to the OECD Creditor reporting system	18	7	Response
Amount of Biodiversity-related philanthropic funding	D	8	Response
Amount of fossil-fuel subsidies per unit of GDP (production and consumption)(SDG indicator 12.c.1)	17	9	Response
Amount of funding provided through the Global Environment Facility and allocated to biodiversity focal area (decision X/3)	18	10	Response
Area of forest under sustainable management: total FSC and PEFC forest management certification	9, 14	11	Response
Areas of agricultural land under conservation agriculture.	9	12	Response
Average income of small-scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status (SDG indicator 2.3.2)	8	13	
Average marine acidity (pH) measured at agreed suite of representative sampling stations (SDG indicator 14.3.1)	A	14	State

Average share of the built-up area of cities that is open space for public use for all, by sex, age and persons with disabilities (SDG indicator 11.7.1)	11	15	Response
Bioclimatic Ecosystem Resilience Index (BERI)	1	16	State
Biodiversity Barometer	15, 19	17	Response
Biodiversity Engagement Indicator	15	18	Response
Biodiversity Habitat Index	A, B, 1	19	State
Biodiversity Intactness Index	A	20	State
Change in the extent of water-related ecosystems over time (SDG indicator 6.6.1)	A, 10	21	State
Change in water use efficiency over time (SDG indicator 6.4.1).	14	22	Response
Change on the extent of water related ecosystems (SDG Indicator 6.6.1)	A, 1	23	State
CO <sub>2</sub> emission per unit of value added (SDG indicator 9.4.1)	14	24	Pressure
Comprehensiveness of conservation of socioeconomically as well as culturally valuable species.	A	25	Response
Continuous Global Mangrove Forest Cover	A, 1	26	State
Coverage by protected areas of important sites for mountain biodiversity (SDG indicator 15.4.1)	2	27	Response
Coverage of other effective area-based conservation measures	A, 2	28	Response
Coverage of protected areas in relation to marine areas (SDG indicator 14.5.1)	2	29	Response

A. Proposed Global Indicators	B. Relevant Goals and Targets	Row Number	State, pressure or response indicator
Cumulative human impacts on marine ecosystems	A, 1	30	Pressure
Degree of application of a legal/regulatory/ policy/institutional framework which recognizes and protects access rights for small-scale fisheries (SDG indicator 14.B.1)	8	31	Response
Degree of implementation of international instruments aiming to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (SDG indicator 14.6.1)	4, 8	32	Response
Degree of integrated water resources management (SDG indicator 6.5.1)	1	33	Response
Dollar value of all resources made available to strengthen statistical capacity in developing countries (SDG indicator 17.19.1)	18	34	Response
Dollar value of financial and technical assistance (including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation) committed to developing countries (SDG indicator 17.9.1)	18	35	Response
Domestic material consumption, domestic material consumption per capita, and domestic material consumption per GDP (SDG indicators 8.4.2 and 12.2.2)	14, 15	36	Pressure
Ecological Footprint	14, 15	37	Pressure
Ecoregion Intactness Index	1	38	State
Estimated % of monetary and non- monetary benefits directed towards conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity	12	39	Response
Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies; (b) curricula; (c) teacher education; and (d) student assessment (SDG indicators 4.7 and 12.8.1)	19	40	Response
Forest area as a proportion of total land area (SDG indicator 15.1.1)	A, 1	41	State
Global coral reef extent	A	42	State
Global saltmarsh extent	A	43	State
Global seagrass extent	A, 1	44	State
Global Vegetation Health Products	A	45	
Growth in number of records and species in the Living Planet Index database	19	46	Response
Growth in Species Occurrence Records Accessible Through GBIF	19	47	Response
Human Appropriation of Net Primary Production (HANPP)	14	48	Pressure
Level of water stress: freshwater withdrawal as a proportion of available freshwater resources (SDG indicator 6.4.2)	14, 15	49	Pressure
Live coral cover	A, 1	50	State
Living Planet Index and derivatives	A, 8	51	State
Material footprint, material footprint per capita, and material footprint per GDP (SDG indicators 8.4.1 and 12.2.1)	14, 15	52	Pressure
Mountain Green Cover Index (SDG indicator 15.4.2)	1	53	State
MSC Certified Catch	8, 14	54	Response
National recycling rate, tons of material recycled (SDG indicator 12.5.1)	15	55	Response
Nitrogen Balances	6	56	Pressure
Number of assessments on the IUCN Red List of threatened species	19	57	Response
Number of certified forest areas under sustainable management with verified impacts on biodiversity conservation	2, B	58	Response
Number of certified forest areas under sustainable management with verified impacts on carbon sequestration/storage	B	59	Response
Number of certified forest areas under sustainable management with verified impacts on water quality	B	60	Response
Number of checkpoint communiqués published in the ABS Clearing-House	C	61	Response
Number of companies publishing sustainability reports (SDG indicator 12.6.1)	14, 19	62	Response

A. Proposed Global Indicators	B. Relevant Goals and Targets	Row Number	
Number of countries developing, adopting or implementing policy instruments aimed at supporting the shift to sustainable consumption and production (SDG indicator 12.1.1)	14, 15	63	Response
Number of countries that adopt and implement national disaster risk reduction strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030 (SDG indicator 13.1.2)	7	64	Response (process)
Number of countries that have (a) Assessed values of biodiversity, in accordance with the Convention, (b) Identified and reported funding needs, gaps and priorities (c) Developed national financial plans for biodiversity; (d) Been provided with the necessary funding and capacity building to undertake the above activities; (decision X/3)	18	65	Response
Number of countries that have adopted legislative, administrative and policy frameworks to ensure fair and equitable sharing of benefits (SDG Indicator 15.6.1)	12	66	Response
Number of countries that have adopted legislative, administrative and policy frameworks to ensure fair and equitable sharing of benefits (SDG Indicator 15.6.1) (this seems to be a repeat of the one just above)	12	67	Response
Number of countries that require prior informed consent that have published information on ABS procedures in the ABS Clearing-House.	12	68	Response
Number of countries that require prior informed consent that have published legislative, administrative or policy measures on access and benefit-sharing in the ABS Clearing-House.	12	69	Response
Number of countries using ecosystem-based approaches to managing marine areas (SDG indicator 14.2.1)	1	70	Response
Number of countries with biodiversity-relevant charges and fees	17	71	Response
Number of countries with biodiversity-relevant taxes	17	72	Response
Number of countries with biodiversity-relevant tradable permit schemes	17	73	Response
Number of countries with mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development (SDG indicator 17.14)	13	74	Response
Number of deaths, missing persons and directly affected persons attributed to disasters per 100,000 population (SDG indicator 11.5.1)	B, 10	75	State or pressure (?)
Number of extinctions prevented by conservation action	A	76	Response
Number of least developed countries and small island developing States with nationally determined contributions, long-term strategies, national adaptation plans, strategies as reported in adaptation communications and national communications (SDG indicator 13.b.1)	7	77	Response
Number of MSC Chain of Custody Certification holders by distribution country	14	78	Response
Number of Parties with a nationally determined target for increasing the level of domestic resources, reported to the Convention	18	79	Response
Number of plant and animal genetic resources for food and agriculture secured in either medium- or longterm conservation facilities (SDG indicator 2.5.1)	A, 8, 9	80	Response
Number of species extinctions (birds and mammals).	A	81	State
Number of users that have provided information relevant to the utilization of genetic resources to designated checkpoints	C	82	
Ocean Health Index	A, 1	83	State
Percentage of cropped landscapes with at least 10% natural land	1	84	
Percentage of Parties that carry out scientifically sound risk assessments to support biosafety decision-making	16	85	Response
Percentage of Parties that establish and implement risk management measures	16	86	Response
Percentage of Parties that have the necessary biosafety legal and administrative measures in place	16	87	Response
Percentage of Parties that have the necessary measures and means for detection and identification of products of biotechnology.	16	88	Response

A. Proposed Global Indicators	B. Relevant Goals and Targets	Row Number	
Percentage of Parties that implement their biosafety measures	16	89	Response
Percentage of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety implementing the relevant provisions of the Protocol.	16	90	Response
Percentage of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety implementing the relevant provisions of the Protocol.	16	91	Response
Percentage of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety implementing the relevant provisions of the Protocol.	16	92	Response
Percentage of Parties to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol implementing the relevant provisions of the Supplementary Protocol.	16	93	Response
Percentage of Parties with legal and technical measures for restoration and compensation.	16	94	Response
Percentage of Parties with mechanisms to facilitate the sharing of and access to information on biosafety.	16	95	Response
Percentage of threatened species that are improving in status.	3	96	Status
Phosphorus balances	6	97	Pressure
Primary forest deforestation	1	98	Pressure
Progress towards sustainable forest management (SDG indicator 15.2.1)	9	99	Response
Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture (SDG indicator 2.4.1)	9	100	Response
Proportion of bodies of water with good ambient water quality (SDG indicator 6.3.2)	B, 10	101	State
Proportion of countries adopting relevant national legislation and adequately resourcing the prevention or control of invasive alien species (SDG indicator 15.8.1)	5	102	Response
Proportion of countries with systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment (SDG indicator 5.c.1)	20	103	Response
Proportion of fish stocks under sustainable management certification schemes	8	104	Response
Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels (SDG indicator 14.4.1)	4, 8	105	State
Proportion of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity that are covered by protected areas, by ecosystem type	2	106	Response
Proportion of known species assessed through the IUCN Red List.	19	107	Response
Proportion of land that is degraded over total land area (SDG indicator 15.3.1)	A, 1, 9	108	Pressure
Proportion of local administrative units with established and operational policies and procedures for participation of local communities in water and sanitation management (SDG indicator 6.b.1)	10	109	Response
Proportion of local breeds classified as being at risk of extinction	A, 9	110	State
Proportion of local governments that adopt and implement local disaster risk reduction strategies in line with national disaster risk reduction strategies (SDG indicator 13.1.3)	7	111	Response
Proportion of population who believe decision making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group (SDG indicator 16.7.2).	20	112	State
Proportion of seats held by women in (a) national parliaments and (b) local governments (SDG indicator 5.5.1)	20	113	Response
Proportion of terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecological regions which are conserved by PAs or OECMs.	2	114	Response
Proportion of total research budget allocated to research in the field of marine technology (SDG indicator 14.A.1)	19	115	Response
Proportion of traded wildlife that was poached or illicitly trafficked (SDG indicators 15.7.1 and 15.c.1)	4	116	Pressure
Proportion of transboundary basin area with an operational arrangement for water cooperation (SDG indicator 6.5.2)	1	117	Response

A. Proposed Global Indicators	B. Relevant Goals and Targets	Row Number	
Protected Area Connectedness Index (PARC-Connectedness).	2	118	Response
Protected area coverage	A, 2	119	Response
Protected Area Coverage of key biodiversity areas	A, 2	120	Response
Protected Area Representativeness Index (PARC-Representativeness)	A, 2	121	Response
Protected Areas Management Effectiveness	2	122	Response
Protected Connected (Protconn).	1, 2	123	Response
Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate (SDG indicator 11.3.1)	11	124	Pressure
Red List Index and derivatives	A, B, 1, 3, 5, 8, 9	125	State
Red List Index for Ecosystems	A, 1	126	State
Species Habitat Index	A, B	127	State
Species Protection Index	A, 2	128	State
Species Status Information Index	19	129	
Sustainable fisheries as a percentage of GDP in small island developing States, least developed countries and all countries (SDG indicator 14.7.1)	8	130	Pressure
Total amount of approved funding for developing countries to promote the development, transfer, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies (SDG indicator 17.7.1)	18	131	Response
Total number of internationally recognized certificates of compliance published in the ABS Clearing-House	12	132	Response
Total number of permits or their equivalent granted for access to genetic resources	12	133	Response
Total number of transfers of crop material from the Multilateral System of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) received in a country	12	134	Response
Tree cover loss	A	135	Pressure
Trends in degree to which traditional knowledge and practices are respected through: full integration, participation and safeguards in national implementation of the Strategic Plan (decision X/43)	20	136	Response
Trends in invasive alien species vertebrate eradications.	5	137	Response
Trends in land cover change (SDG indicator 15.3.1)	1	138	State or pressure
Trends in land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities (decision X/43)	20	139	Response
Trends in Loss of Reactive Nitrogen to the Environment.	6	140	Pressure
Trends in mangrove extent	A, 1	141	State
Trends in Nitrogen Deposition.	6	142	Pressure
Trends in policy responses, legislation and management plans to control and prevent spread of invasive alien species	5	143	Response

Trends in potentially environmentally harmful elements of government support to agriculture (producer support estimate)	17	144	Response
Trends in Protected area downgrading, downsizing and degazettement (PADDD)	2	145	Pressure
Trends in the number and value of government fossil fuel support measures	17	146	Response
Trends in the numbers of invasive alien species introduction events.	5	147	Pressure
Trends in the practice of traditional occupations (decision X/43)	20	148	
Trends of linguistic diversity and numbers of speakers of indigenous languages (B) (decision VII/30 and VIII/15)	19	149	
Volume of production per labour unit by classes of farming/pastoral/forestry enterprise size (SDG indicator 2.3.1)	8	150	
WAZA bio-literacy survey (Biodiversity literacy in global zoo and aquarium visitors)	15, 19	151	
Wetland Extent Trends Index	A, 1	152	State