

CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY (CBD)

NOTIFICATIONS 2020-45

Peer review of draft documents for the twenty-fourth meeting of the
Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice
(SBSTTA 24)

Submission by Australia



Australian Government

NOTE: Information provided in this response has predominately been drawn from Australian government input

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

CBD Notifications 2020-45

Australia thanks the Secretariat for the opportunity to submit views on the draft documents for the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Science, Technical and Technological advice as communicated in Notification 2020-45 of 25 June 2020 Ref: SCBD/SSSF/AS/KM/VA/88724.

Australia's response pertains to the draft *Monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework*. As requested, Australia's comments have been provided in the associated review template below.

Review comments on the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework	
<i>Contact information</i>	
1. Surname:	Miller
2. Given Name:	Katherine
3. Government (if applicable):	Australian
4. Organization:	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment
5. Address:	John Gorton Building, King Edward Terrace, Parkes, ACT, 2600
6. City:	Canberra
7. Country:	Australia
E-mail:	CBDAustralia@awe.gov.au
<i>General Comments</i>	
<p>Australia acknowledges the challenges that all Parties have faced in monitoring and reporting against the current Strategic Plan and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Our position has always been that the lessons we have learned from the Aichi targets must not be lost. This applies not only to the development and agreement of the goals and targets of the Global Biodiversity Framework, but all elements associated with monitoring and reporting as well.</p> <p>We also acknowledge the challenge of discussing indicators for goals and targets which are still not agreed. The reality is that the upcoming SBSTTA24 discussions may be on indicators which end up out of scope because of goals and targets being refined or changed at future meetings. Despite this, Australia is very supportive of an inclusive discussion in which all potential indicators within scope. However, it would be useful to organise our future discussions into Framework 'themes' or 'groups' which we are confident will be included in the final framework. We envisage these would be at the level of 'species' or 'protected areas'. This approach would reduce the issues associated with the draft status of the targets.</p> <p>Within this broad context, our view is that further work is needed, both in the lead up to and at SBSTTA24, to drive consensus around: how comprehensive the monitoring framework should be; what requires monitoring and how many indicators are needed;</p>	

what tools are available to measure multiple goals, targets and elements; and whether the goals require their own set of indicators.

As it stands, the current monitoring framework is too extensive. It would not be possible for us (and, we believe, for most Parties) to report against all the proposed elements and indicators due to a lack of data, data ownership considerations or data inconsistencies. The approach taken also varies widely in terms of level of granularity of the indicators – from high level to very specific. For many monitoring elements where there are more granular indicators, there are some obvious gaps. Our view is that the monitoring framework either needs to be substantially cut back and grouped into sensible cohorts of indicators, or, clear guidance needs to be developed and provided on which elements/indicators are considered most critical for reporting purposes.

Australia's view is that it would be more appropriate to develop a smaller set of 'headline' indicators to service the core elements of the Global Biodiversity Framework. Headline indicators would be those existing, relevant, global biodiversity indicators that can contribute to monitoring the core elements of all targets – for example, the relevant SDG indicators, the Red List. It may be beneficial for Parties to identify and agree these headline indicators in the first instance, before deciding if further detailed indicators are available and required against specific targets. This process could occur virtually in the lead up to SBSTTA24.

We are also of the view that indicators need to allow for flexible implementation of the post-2020 framework by Parties. We therefore wish to avoid indicators which would unduly limit the extent to which individual Parties can determine their implementation priorities. For example, elements including, but not limited to, '*areas of particular importance*' and '*priority sites*' are most appropriately determined by national governments and should remain within their sovereign responsibilities.

Notwithstanding our overarching concerns and preferred approach, Australia's response to this peer review process provides comments and suggestions for consideration regardless of which approach is taken and to feed into a fulsome discussion at SBSTTA24.

We wish to emphasise that the absence of comments on an element or indicator should not be interpreted as support by Australia. In some cases, comments have not been provided as we have not been able to identify a data holder for those elements. We look forward to providing more detailed commentary as this process evolves. Further, our view is that if no indicators can be easily identified for proposed monitoring elements, then that monitoring element should be deleted or integrated into other elements of the framework.

Some further general observations are as follows:

- The indicators need to be strategically focused on what we want to measure and for what purpose – in our view, this strategic overlay is lacking in the current version of the monitoring framework.
- The link or logic between the goals and targets, and then the indicators, is not currently clear. The levels of specificity of indicators also differs greatly throughout the document, which makes it even harder to establish these clear links.

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

- We acknowledge that many existing indices have a set of assumptions built into them which may mean they are not entirely fit-for-purpose for a given target. While it may be preferable to develop specific, fit-for-purpose indicators using the data these indices are derived from, we know this is not likely to be practical in the time available. Therefore, we agree it is most practical to utilise these existing indices where possible, noting these constraints.
- We are supportive of utilising the SDG indicators to the extent possible and where they are directly relevant, given Parties are already working to develop processes to collect and analyse that data. However, we need to ensure that all indicators proposed, including those SDG indicators, appropriately reflect and are confined to the CBD's remit.
- Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) are in many cases the keepers and traditional custodians of biodiversity. Our view is that this critical role is currently underrepresented in the monitoring framework and needs to be better reflected.
- There are some third party, fee for service indices proposed that we do not consider appropriate. Our strong view is that any data utilised in CBD reporting is either supplied or verified by national governments. Use of legal or regulatory frameworks is a preferred alternative to certification schemes, where appropriate/feasible.
- Many of the nominated indicators are not underpinned by peer reviewed and accepted global methodologies, lack standard definitions, and/or transparent data sources. To address this issue, we suggest that stronger links are made between this framework and existing guidelines and standards. Our strong view is that indicators incorporated to the GBF need to be scientifically robust. For those that are not, we suggest deletion.
 - Use of accounting-based approaches, for example from the System of Environmental-Economic Accounts (SEEA) and Ecosystem Accounts (SEEA-EEA), will help to ensure repeatable, consistent and comparable measurement of indicators among Parties.
 - We understand a separate submission to this process has been made by the United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD) outlining how these accounting frameworks could provide a useful scaffolding for the measurement of these indicators. Australia is supportive of this approach.
- It is unclear how baselines will be established in the current monitoring framework, and in many cases, what tools may be utilised to measure the proposed indicators. All Parties have consistently stated the need for SMART goals, targets and indicators and Australia notes the need for such discipline to be applied as we refine the monitoring framework.

Specific Comments

Table	Page	Column letter	Row number	Comment
1	2	A	1-35	There is an opportunity to more explicitly connect components, and associated indicators, dealing with ecosystems (A1 and A2) and those dealing with species and genetic diversity (A3 and A4) – i.e. through the application, and further development, of indicators expressly designed to estimate expected levels of

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

				<p>species extinctions as an explicit function of change in the area, connectivity and integrity of ecosystems.</p> <p>Where ecosystems are referenced, reference should be made to “all ecosystems” instead of listing them out OR, alternatively, a specific reference to coastal ecosystems should also be included given this is often where a substantial amount of human activities (and associated impacts) are located, and also that coastal ecosystems are particularly vulnerable to climate change and natural disasters. Coastal ecosystems are distinct from both land and sea.</p>
1	2	C	1-14	<p><u>Possible alternative headline indicators to cover the whole ecosystem goal (in which case, more granular indicators could be removed)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition of all ecosystems (or of terrestrial, freshwater, coastal and marine ecosystems) • Extent of all ecosystems (or of terrestrial, freshwater, coastal and marine ecosystems) • Pressures and the associated impacts identified for all ecosystems (or of terrestrial, freshwater, coastal and marine ecosystems).
1	2	C	2	Suggest removal of this indicator as tree cover does not always encompass a clear subset of the ecosystems covered by the goal. Further, not all tree cover loss can be attributed to human activities.
1	2	C	3	The Biodiversity Habitat Index is available for all terrestrial ecosystems, including forests, so could be utilized more broadly in this goal in the context of the proposed headline indicators above.
1	2	C	8	Live coral cover is an appropriate indicator given its importance in national and global policy.
1	2	C	9	Global coral reef extent is a key metric for understanding the area and changing extent of coral reef ecosystems at national, regional, and global levels.
1	2	C	12	Suggest removal as it is unclear how it would be measured and how meaningful it is at the global scale.
1	2	A	15-28	Many of our comments above regarding A1 apply here and throughout the document and suggest we may need to consider a more qualitative dataset to capture the ‘health’ of ecosystems and how degraded or otherwise they are.
1	2	B	15	The definition of quality is different to integrity so being able to measure this and report against different terminology will present challenges. We recommend

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

				using the term integrity throughout the monitoring elements so that there is consistency of definition with the goal – although we note that is currently unclear how ‘integrity’ will be measured. We have proposed in headline indicators that “condition” could be a metric.
1	3	C	23	An indicator on hard coral species composition in addition to live coral cover could also be considered (i.e. a measure of the most dominant growth forms).
1	3	C	26	The RLI is not suited to this element, as it measures the status of species in relation to their risk of extinction, which may be due to factors other than ecosystem resilience. It is better suited to A3.
1	3	C	29	This indicator should not be limited to birds and mammals.
1	3	A	34	<p>Increasing population of all species without consideration of carrying capacity of different ecosystems will be problematic. An alternative approach is to:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Increase the health of populations and their resilience to threats.</p> <p>We also need to ensure that our language in A4 is confined to locally native species (i.e. reflecting that we want to control and manage invasive species, not increase them).</p>
1	4	B	34	<p>Suggested monitoring element:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Trends in healthy populations of species and their resilience to threats.</i></p>
1	4	C	36	<p>An indicator here to address the maintenance of genetic diversity, to replace all the current proposals except for the relevant SDG indicator would be:</p> <p>Policies and procedures have been developed and put in place to maintain genetic diversity.</p>
1	4	C	42-43	<p>We note that these indicators are not consistent with those proposed in the Info Doc prepared by the UNEP-WCMC. Australia suggests that further consideration is given to those proposed indicators as more appropriate alternatives.</p> <p>Links to the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance could also be considered here.</p>
1	4	C	46	Propose expanding this indicator to encompass alternative domestic approaches to areas of particular importance.

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

1	4	C	46-47	Links to the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance could also be considered here.
1	4	B	48	This monitoring element may fit better in Goal B
1	4	C	49	Propose leaving room for Parties to use relevant domestic representativeness indices for this monitoring element.
1	5	A	51	Australia notes the potential for a number of B1 monitoring elements (climate regulation, extreme events) to overlap with the UN Convention on Climate Change and suggests that indicators are considered in the context of data already collected under that Convention.
1	5	C	51	Propose deletion of 'certified' given this term is too variable.
1	5	C	51-53	Suggest indicator: <i>'Area (ha) of natural habitat created'</i>
1	5	C	56	Australia proposes deletion of 'certified' unless defined.
1	5	C	56	Suggested indicator: <i>Area (ha) of oceans and associated carbon sinks with verified impacts on carbon sequestration/storage</i>
1	5	C	58	Propose deletion of 'certified' given this term is too variable.
1	5	B	62	Suggest changing of monitoring element to: <i>Trends in regulation [size and extent] of hazards and extreme events</i>
1	6	B	64	Suggest inclusion of fibre in the monitoring element: <i>'Nature's material contributions including food, fibre, water and others'</i>
1	6	C	71	Suggested indicator: <i>Cultural sites protected by national and sub-national legislation.</i>
2	8	A	1	As per our commentary on Goal A, Australia would prefer to refer to "all ecosystems" or, add in a specific reference to coastal ecosystems given this is often where a substantial amount of human activities (and associated impacts) are located, and coastal ecosystems are particularly vulnerable to climate change and natural disasters.
2	8	C	1-2	Suggest addition of indicators to account for land-based or freshwater ecosystems/areas.
2	8	C	1	We are unsure of the relationship between this proposed indicator and the draft target.

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

				Further consideration could be given to the UNEP-WCMC documentation.
2	8	C	2	This indicator is more relevant to the monitoring element 'Trends in area under marine spatial planning'
2	8	C	2	Some alternative indicator approaches for consideration include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of hectares that are being managed for biodiversity, supported by spatial planning. - Proportion of land/sea areas that are covered by ecosystem-based management arrangements. - Extent/area of ecosystems under IPLC management.
2	8	A	6	Extent can be a useful indicator, however it is not a holistic indicator of fragmentation on its own.
2	8	C	6-7	Alternative broad indicators could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The area of specific ecosystems that are protected by relevant national or international agreements. - The area of specific ecosystems that are under restoration/green engineering arrangements.
2	8	C	6	We are supportive of using relevant SDG 15 indicators (15.1.1 and 15.2.1.)
2	8	C	9	We note that the Biodiversity Habitat Index is available for all terrestrial ecosystems.
2	9	C	14	Live coral cover is an appropriate indicator given its importance in national and global policy. An additional indicator of <i>global coral reef extent</i> would help improve understanding the changing extent of coral reef ecosystems at national, regional and global levels.
2	9	C	17	Measurement of this indicators may prove problematic, particularly if it is intended to include indirect human impacts, such as climate change.
2	9	A	23	'Intact' is preferred to 'Wilderness' as some definitions of wilderness do not include scope for people living harmoniously in these landscapes, as is the case with many Indigenous cultures.
2	9	C	24	Given difficulties with measuring degradation over total land area, we suggest considering the following alternatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Area subject to active remediation</i> - <i>Area that has been remediated</i>
2	9	B	25	Suggest the following alterative approach:

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

				<i>Trends in the area of active restoration of degraded corals.</i>
2	10	B	26	Suggest considering the following alternative approach: - <i>Area of degraded marine and coastal areas under active restoration.</i>
2	10	C	26	Measurement of this indicators may prove problematic, particularly if it is intended to include indirect human impacts, such as climate change.
2	10	C	28	Links to the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance could be considered here.
2	10	B	30	We would recommend changing this to refer to “ecosystem” connectivity instead of habitat. Connectivity in ecosystems is broader and more appropriate, captures habitats and aligns with the draft target.
2	10	C	30	The relationship of this indicator to habitat connectivity is unclear.
2	10	C	31	The relationship of this indicator to habitat connectivity is unclear.
2	10	A	35-38	Where ecosystems are referenced, reference should be made to “all ecosystems” instead of listing them out OR, alternatively, a specific reference to coastal ecosystems should also be included given this is often where a substantial amount of human activities (and associated impacts) are located, and also that coastal ecosystems are particularly vulnerable to climate change and natural disasters. Coastal ecosystems are distinct from both land and sea.
2	10	C	35-38	Suggested indicators for consideration in both elements of T2.1: - <i>Protected areas and OECMs (terrestrial and marine) managed by IPLCs or managed under joint management arrangements with IPLCs.</i>
2	11	C	40	This indicator could be improved by expanding to also cover coastal and marine ecosystem.
2	11	B	43	While representativeness is an important principle to consider, this element could be improved by including consideration of other important factors, such as adequacy and comprehensiveness (all biodiversity types).
2	11	C	46	Australia notes that the UNEP-WCMC provides International guidance on management effectiveness that could be utilised here.

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

				Evaluation and monitoring are also important here. We suggest consideration be given as to whether indicators could be included to this effect.
2	12	A	51	Unsure of the need for this element given the overlap with T2.4.
2	12	B	52	The element could be improved through broadening to encompass complementary activities beyond governance. Suggested changes are: <i>Policies, programmes and governance practices occurring outside of protected areas and OECMs compatible [complementary] with their management objectives</i>
2	12	A	56	Throughout this target and all its related monitoring elements and indicators, Australia proposes replacing “sustainable” with “ecologically sustainable” or defining “sustainable” is to give ecological considerations primacy.
2	12	A	56	Throughout this target and all its related monitoring elements and indicators, Australia proposes replacing “sustainable” with “ecologically sustainable” or defining “sustainable” is to give ecological considerations primacy.
2	13	B	58	The element could be expanded to accommodate a range of sustainable management tools though the changes suggested below: <i>Trends in proportion of biological resources harvested within the established harvest limits sustainable harvest management frameworks or strategies.</i>
2	13	C	58	An additional indicator to support our proposed changes to the monitoring element could be: - <i>Proportion of fish stocks being managed within harvest management frameworks/strategies</i>
2	13	B	59	Could consider removing if changes to previous monitoring element are implemented.
2	13	B	60	Suggest indicators for the element consider both the safety of the target organisms, and the non-target organisms.
2	13	A	61	Suggested change to component: T4.2. <i>Trade is legal, sustainable and safe for human health and biodiversity, taking into account human health.</i>
2	13	B	62	Suggested change to monitoring element: Trends in proportion of biological resources traded within the established limits/quotas sustainable management frameworks or strategies.

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

2	13	A	64	Given the similarities between T4.2 and 4.3, there may be an opportunity to merge these elements to cover both trade and use.
2	13	B	64,65,66	Suggest deletion of these indicators, as per above comment.
2	14	B	67	Given introduction pathways are generally well established, it may be more beneficial to focus on pathway prioritisation and management activities, e.g.: <i>Trends in IAS detection rates along particular introduction pathways over time.</i>
2	14	B	68-69	There is potential to strengthen this element by including an additional indicator on pre-border pathway management, e.g.: <i>Number of countries implementing and adhering to pre-border measures to reduce occurrence of IAS in trade movements.</i>
2	14	C	69	Given growing e-commerce and cargo will likely lead to increased introductions of IAS, we suggest 'establishments' as a more appropriate indicator. Noting that measuring 'trends' requires reliable baseline data, 'number' may be a more attainable alternative. Further, we note that this indicator needs to be contextualised with surveillance effort when reported. <i>Trends in the numbers of invasive alien species introduction establishment events.</i>
2	14	B & C	70-72	As increased detection of IAS could be viewed as both positive and negative, therefore a more reliable indicator could be: <i>Trends in the number of countries that are implementing efficient detection systems for IAS.</i>
2	14	B	71	This monitoring element could be improved through the inclusion of a 'scientific cooperation' measure on 'improvements in, and sharing resources for, the identification/diagnostics of IAS globally'.
2	14	C	73	This indicator could be improved through removing 'vertebrates' so it applies to all IAS eradications.
2	14	C	74-75	There may be an opportunity to merge the two indicators for this element into a single indicator on 'control and management measures'. An additional indicator could be considered in relation to the development of new tools and management techniques.

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

2	15	B	78-80	As IAS elimination/eradication is not always technically feasible or cost effective, an approach which focuses on management of established pests and the uptake of effective decision-making tools is suggested.
2	16	C	91	Suggestion consideration of coastal water quality as an indicator.
2	16	C	92	Suggestion consideration of coastal water quality as an indicator.
2	16	C	95	Suggestion consideration of coastal water quality as an indicator.
2	16	B	96	Another useful metric for consideration would be the proportion of hazardous wastes safely recovered/recycled
2	16	C	97	As to ensure the respective mandates of the UNFCCC and CBD are respected, it's suggested this element focuses on the use of biodiversity in national climate planning and the area/extent of biodiverse ecosystems providing climate benefits. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggested indicators: <i>Change in area [number of hectares or percentage of national extent] of ecosystems critical to the sequestration and storage of carbon.</i> - <i>% of countries with nature-based solutions included in their national climate change strategies, targets or plans.</i>
2	17	C	101	Suggest considering the following and/or a possible additional indicator: <i>Number of countries integrating climate mitigation and adaptation considerations within their conservation and protection policies [and/or NBSAPS].</i>
2	18	C	104	Suggest considering this as an indicator for target 4
2	18	C	107	Suggest considering the following as an alternative indicator: <i>Parties applying frameworks that align fisheries management practices with relevant international agreements and arrangements relating to responsible fisheries.</i>
2	19	B	110	The intent of this element and its focus on bycatch species is unclear to us. We suggest it be considered for removal.
2	19	B	113	This element appears duplicative of other element under this target component, as well as the sustainable harvesting element of target 4. We suggest it be considered for removal.

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

2	19	B	114	It is unclear how this element and its indicators deliver against the target element, and suggest it be considered for removal.
2	19	C	114-116	We suggest the indicators under this element are considered for inclusion in target 4, and notes that SDG indicators 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 are relevant to fisheries as well.
2	20	C	125	The target could be improved through creating stronger linkages between T9.3 and T1.2 and bringing the relevant indicators under one target.
2	21	A-C	128	Directly attributing regulation of hazards and extreme events to nature-based solutions could prove difficult. A more appropriate lens for this target could be the uptake of nature-based solutions for this purpose (e.g. trends in the number of nature-based solution projects to remediate hazards and extreme events).
2	21	C	130	The indicator could be improved with the following additional text: Proportion of local administrative units with established and operational policies and procedures for participation of local and Indigenous communities in water and sanitation management.
2	21	C	132	Consideration should be given to: <i>Area of canopy cover in urban areas</i> as an additional indicator.
2	22	C	141	We propose that a more appropriate focus for this target would be the appropriateness or robustness of permitting processes, rather than the volume of permits.
2	27	A	162	We suggest considering the following as other relevant indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Changes in key threatening processes,</i> - <i>The efficacy of water efficiency programs.</i>
2	29	C	177	Measures of sustainability (such as long-term forest management plans) could be useful in this space.
2	31	B & C	188-189	The FAO's <i>State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture</i> (SOFIA) report could be a useful trending indicator on fish stocks.
2	32	A	194	T16.1. Measures to prevent potential adverse impacts of biotechnology on biodiversity, taking also into account human health If human health is to be included in addition to biodiversity, Article 8(g) provides language that is readily applicable to the target and all the way through any indicators "... impacts of biotechnology on

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

				biodiversity, taking also into account human health, ...”.
2	32	A	194	<p>T16.1, .2 and .3 could be combined into a single target component along the lines of: “Measures to prevent, manage or control potential adverse impacts...”. The current monitoring elements and indicators could then be combined to fall within the one target component.</p> <p>If the term biotechnology is agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to “biotechnology” should be consistent with Article 8(g) – “...impacts on biodiversity from the use and release of living modified organisms resulting from biotechnology”; and • Language in the target and indicators should (once agreed) be consistent. <p>The potential positive impacts on biodiversity from the use and release of living modified organisms resulting from biotechnology could be reflected through a new indicator such as:</p> <p>Measures to identify, understand and share information on the positive impacts on biodiversity from the use and release of living modified organisms resulting from biotechnology.</p>
2	32	C	196	<p>Clarification of the intent of the phrase “products of biotechnology” is needed. It would be more appropriate to simply state “LMOs”.</p> <p>An alternate approach could be “LMOs and processed products of LMO origin with detectable combinations of replicable genetic material”</p> <p>These comments apply across this whole target.</p>
2	33	C	203	<p>Noting measures may be broader than “legal and technical” an alternative approach would be:</p> <p>Parties with domestic policies or measures in place regarding the restoration and compensation for damage to biodiversity caused by LMOs.</p>
2	33	C	205-206	<p>Suggest consideration of the following two metrics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The OECD PINE database recognises policy instruments for environmental management, but would benefit from an updated methodology.

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

				<p>- The System of Environmental Economic Accounts (SEEA) which could be used as a framework for measuring environmentally harmful subsidies.</p>
2	34	A	212	We propose the language be updated to ' <u>all</u> international sources' to match language of target.
2	36	A,C	226-229	<p>We would welcome further clarification about how indicators 226-229 will demonstrate achievement of the desired outcomes. If they do not clearly make that link, we would suggest deletion.</p> <p>We note the importance of linking improving our knowledge base to improved decision-making and more cost-effective management.</p>
2	37	C	230	<p>An alternative to this indicator could be:</p> <p>Proportion of total research budget allocated to research addressing the most critical biodiversity knowledge gaps for policy and programme development.</p>
2	37	C	231	<p>Two additional or alternative indicators that could be considered are:</p> <p>Improvements in the availability of data that is comprehensive, comparable, and reliable to support biodiversity policy and programme development.</p> <p>Instances of inter-cultural dialogues occurring and inputting into biodiversity related decision making.</p>
2	38	A	236	<p>[Component one] Availability of research and knowledge</p> <p>[Component two] The appropriate access to and use of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of Indigenous peoples and local communities with their prior and informed consent, free, prior and informed consent or approval and involvement</p> <p>FPIC should be specifically mentioned when talking about access and use. When FPIC is referred to, it should align with the agreed Article 8(j) definition.</p> <p>It is important to note that awareness and use of some traditional knowledge is confined to particular custodians based on considerations such as family groups and gender. Noting this, research and traditional</p>

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

				knowledge could be separated, like our proposed edits, for this purpose.
2	38	C	236	<p>If research and traditional knowledge stay interlinked, noting care needs to be taken with framing, the following could be considered as indicators:</p> <p>The number of IPLCs working with governments to improve land management and improved biodiversity outcomes.</p> <p>Proportion of science publications that acknowledge, engage or are co-authored by IPLCs.</p>
2	38	C	237	<p>Extensive and appropriate consideration needs to be given regarding the sensitivities of all traditional knowledge held by IPLCs, including sacred men and women's business and knowledge.</p> <p>Suggested indicator: Domestic policies and procedures are in place to appropriately seek IPLCs consent to access traditional knowledge.</p>
2	38	C	238	<p>Possible additional indicators could include:</p> <p>Domestic policies and procedures are in place to appropriately seek IPLCs consent to use traditional knowledge</p> <p>IPLCs are assisted to compile and record traditional information and knowledge.</p> <p>IPLCs are engaged in consultation and project development in relation to the access and use of traditional knowledge, customs and practices.</p> <p>Number of NBSAPs that address the promotion of cultural and biodiversity values.</p>
2	38	A,B,C	238	<p>Suggest a new line item for target 19 as follows:</p> <p>T19.5 A Adoption of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of IPLCs in management plans for protected areas (and other effective area-based conservation measures) as appropriate and with their prior and informed consent, free, prior and informed consent, or approval and involvement.</p> <p>B Trends in the adoption of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of IPLCs in management</p>

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

				<p>plans for protected areas (and other effective area-based conservation measures) as appropriate and with their prior and informed consent, free, prior and informed consent, or approval and involvement.</p> <p>C Extent to which traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of IPLCs are included in management plans for protected areas (and other effective area-based conservation measures) identified through appropriate consultation with IPLCs</p>
2	38	A	239-248	<p>“Equal” is more appropriate language than “equitable”. The comment applies to all aspects of this target.</p> <p>We would also appreciate the IIFBs views on whether their preference is for “equal” language, or for language to speak to the “full and effective participation” of IPLCs.</p>
2	38	B	239-248	<p>Trends in the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in decision making related to biodiversity</p> <p>Addition of ‘related to biodiversity’ at the end of this monitoring element makes this consistent with the remit of the CBD. This comment applies to all aspects of this target.</p>
2	38	C	239	<p>Additional indicators for consideration include:</p> <p>Extent to which Parties include IPLCs and traditional knowledge, customs and practices in NBSAP planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting.</p> <p>Domestic processes and measures in place that enable the full and effective, participation of IPLCs in decision making relating to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.</p> <p>Proportion of IPLCs in senior roles (board members and chairs) in relation to biodiversity management.</p> <p>Additional IPLC data sources are appropriately identified and utilized, where appropriate, in relation to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.</p>
2	39	C	245	<p>This SDG indicator could be a headline indicator for this target, in addition to indicators directly relevant to IPLCs.</p>

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

				<p>Australia also proposes consideration of inclusion of SDG 1.4.2 - Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognised documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure</p> <p>Australia also proposes the following indicators for consideration:</p> <p>The area covered by agreements relating to traditional ownership or management.</p> <p>The area of land/sea under traditional ownership or management.</p> <p>The number and extent of on-country businesses or enterprises run by IPLCs and/or increased biodiversity related employment opportunities for IPLCs</p>
2	39	B	244	<p>Trends in the participation of all genders, in particularly, women and girls, in decision making regarding biodiversity</p> <p>Support the explicit reference to women and girls but this may inadvertently exclude other genders, hence the proposed addition to encompass all genders.</p>
2	39	C	245	<p>The following indicators could also be considered.</p> <p>Data collected in relation to biodiversity policies, programs and interventions is dis-aggregated by [gender][sex].</p> <p>National biodiversity policies, plans, strategies or actions are gender-responsive and inclusive.</p> <p>Number of Parties that have increased the quality, comparability and regularity of gender statistics related to biodiversity to address data gaps and meet reporting commitments.</p> <p>(additional to SDG 5.5.1) Proportion of women in senior roles, on boards and as chairs.</p> <p>(additional to SDG 5.5.1) Progress towards achieving equal (50%) representation of women and girls on decision making bodies.</p>

Australia's Submission to CBD Notifications 2020-45

				<p>Barriers to participation are identified and removed where possible to facilitate enhanced equal (50%) board membership and participation.</p> <p>Number of CBD parties with gender equal delegations.</p> <p>Gender of CBD party heads of delegation.</p> <p>Further consideration could also be given to the findings of the UN Women flagship program Making Every Woman and Girl Count and the UN Women's Evidence and Data for Gender Equality (EDGE) program, as appropriate.</p>
2	40	C	247	<p>Indicators for consideration could include:</p> <p>Proportion of youth participation in decision making processes relating to biodiversity.</p> <p>Proportion of youth participation in the CBD decision making processes and negotiations.</p>