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

## Background

1. The second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group[[1]](#footnote-1) 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:
	1. Please provide all comments in writing and in an MS Word or similar document format using the table provided below.
	2. Please provide full contact information for the individual/Government/organization submitting the comments.
	3. Please avoid commenting on issues related to grammar, spelling, or punctuation, unless it affects the overall meaning of the text, as the document will be edited as the final draft is prepared.
	4. To facilitate the revision process please be as specific as possible in your comments. In areas where you feel additional or alternative text or information is required, please suggest, if possible, what this text may look like or what should be included.
	5. If you refer to additional sources of information, please include these with your comments when possible or provide a complete reference or hyperlink.
	6. Please focus your comments on columns A (monitoring elements), B (indicators) and C (Indicator baseline year and frequency of updates) of the tables 1 and 2.
	7. If you are suggestion the inclusion of additional indicators please provide information on if the indicator is currently operational, the organization supporting its development, its baseline (i.e. the year data is first available) and how frequently the indicator is updated (i.e. monthly, yearly, every two years etc.).
	8. All review comments will be posted on the webpage[[2]](#footnote-2) 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***

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

**TEMPLATE FOR COMMENTS**

|  |
| --- |
| **Review comments on the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework** |
| *Contact information* |
| **Surname:** |  |
| **Given Name:** |  |
| **Government** (if applicable)**:**  |  |
| **Organization:** |  |
| **Address:**  |  |
| **City:** |  |
| **Country:** |  |
| **E-mail:** |  |
|  |  | ***Comments*** |
| **Table** | **Page** | **Column letter** | **Row number** | **Comment** |
| 2 | 12 | C | 48 | We request removing the following indicator from action target 2. We are supportive of forest certification programs, and we believe that they should be regarded and utilized as an indicator of sustainable use of natural resources. We are pleased to see a similar indicator used for Action Target 9 (page 21, row 126) and believe that is the appropriate place for it. Given the implicit focus on production, including commercial use, forest certification should not also be used as a measure of effective management of a protected or conserved area. Accordingly, we recommend striking the following in this particular instance:“Number of certified forest areas under sustainable management with verified impacts on biodiversity conservation” |
| 2 | 12 | B | 51 | We believe that for Action Target 2 to be fully successful, we need to ensure that protected areas and OECMs are effectively managed and in fact delivering long-term biodiversity conservation outcomes. As an example, the IUCN Green List framework is the golden standard of describing and determining what constitutes effective management of protected areas and we believe that it would be helpful, besides the national reporting systems to include a specific reference to the IUCN Green list in order to be clear about what is expected in the implementation of this target. We suggest an addition to the monitoring element so that it reads as follows: “Trend in conservation effectiveness of protected areas and other area-based conservation measures, based on compliance with the four elements of the IUCN Green List framework: 1) good governance, 2) sound design and planning, 3) effective management, and 4) successful conservation outcomes” |
| 2 | 12 | C | 51 | We believe that it is critical to add more indicators to ensure that there is a more complete and detailed understanding of where the global system of protected and conserved areas is succeeding in effective management. We suggest including the following two indicators, which were both listed as available indicators where UNEP-WCMC and IUCN through PAME/WDPA would be the responsible institution:“% of PAs/OECMs by area with documented ecological objectives in their planning and managing official toolsAnd:“% of PAs/OECMs by area meeting their ecological objectives”These indicators alone, however, would not provide the full picture of whether protected, conserved areas, and OECMs are delivering conservation outcomes, given that it would only pertain to those areas that documented ecological objectives in their planning. As a result, we believe that it is very important to develop a more comprehensive system for measuring the effectiveness of every protected, conserved area and OECM through some combination of new monitoring tools and national reporting. We have refrained from suggesting specific percentages, but believe that it is critical to include a new indicator along these lines:“By 2030, X% of PAs/CAs/OECMs demonstrate that the majority of biodiversity values are in good condition, and X% of the remainder demonstrate that biodiversity values are improving” |
| 2 | 12 | B | 51 | Ultimately, much of the success of implementing Action Target 2 will depend on financing. A recent [independent economic report](https://www.conservation.cam.ac.uk/files/waldron_report_30_by_30_publish.pdf) from over 100 experts found that protecting 30% of the planet would cost roughly $140 billion, compared to the roughly $24 billion (only 17%) that the world currently spends on protected areas. We believe that it is important to ensure that this monitoring framework provides the tools to track the degree to which the world is able to close that funding gap. Accordingly, we propose adding the following monitoring element:“Effective Funding for PAs and OECMs” |
| 2 | 12 | C | 51 | To correspond with the above monitoring element, we propose adding new indicators that could draw data from parties’ reporting, including through NBSAPs, national financial plans, and reporting on those financial plans, which we recommend are completed and sent to the secretariat every two years. We recommend adding the following indicators to better determine the amount of resource mobilization that is strictly directed to protected and conserved areas and to better gauge how many protected and conserved areas are receiving sufficient funding:“Effective Funding for PAs and OECMs from all sources, including public domestic and international sources” |

*Comments should be sent by e-mail to* *secretariat@cbd.int****no later than 25 July 2020****.*
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