1. **What are the key priorities for marine indicators?**

Marine and coastal biodiversity conservation and sustainable use require specific indicators and approaches for monitoring implementation that do not always coincide with terrestrial indicators and governance structures. Qualitative indicators are also important and should be prioritised.

In general terms, several instruments and mechanisms have been developed under the Convention (as well as under other relevant treaties and bodies) that directly contribute to the implementation of the GBF. Examples include:

1. the ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSA) criteria and process for description of areas that meet the criteria. EBSAs can contribute as indicators for several GBF targets, including Targets 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 14;
2. CBD voluntary guidelines on several issues, including on biodiversity-inclusive environmental impact assessments (EIAs) and strategic environmental assessments(SEAs) (Decision XI/18 (2012); UNEP/CBD/COP/11/23) (relevant for Target 14 on mainstreaming biodiversity within and across economic sectors; as well as Target 5 with respect to sustainable fishing);
3. Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) (Target 1): CBD decision XIII/9 (2016) makes recommendations on marine spatial planning (MSP). The decision also references the report of the Expert Workshop to Provide Consolidated Practical Guidance and a Toolkit for Marine Spatial Planning (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/6) that could guide implementation of Targe 1. Furthermore, the role of the ecosystem approach in MSP and in implementing Target 1 is of utmost importance in accordance with the COP decision XIII/9, which encouraged Parties and others to strengthen the application of the ecosystem approach in MSP. Guidance on the ecosystem approach is provided by CBD decisions V/6 (2000) and VII/11 (2004).
4. Coral Reefs: The Priority actions to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Target 10 for coral reefs and closely associated ecosystems contained in the Annex to decision XII/23 (2014) continues to be relevant for the achievement of GBF Targets 2, 3, 4, 5 and others.
5. Ecologically Representative and well-connected MPAs: Implementation of the scientific guidance for selecting areas to establish a representative network of MPAs, including in open ocean waters and deep sea habitats (Annex II), and Four initial steps to be considered in the development of representative networks of MPAs (Annex III) should be a priority on the implementation of Target 3.
6. Fisheries (Targets 5, 9, 10, 14): Decision XIII/3 (2016) adopted recommendations on actions to mainstream biodiversity into the fisheries sector, including through: the implementation of existing fisheries legal and policy instruments; making use of EBSA and vulnerable marine ecosystem (VME) information in fisheries management; the use of existing FAO guidance on ecosystem approach to fisheries; the implementation of the Priority actions to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Target 10 for coral reefs and closely associated ecosystems; the strengthening of existing fisheries governance mechanisms in particular the precautionary approach to conserve and recover endangered species.
7. Climate change and ocean acidification nexus (Target 8, but also applicable to targets 5, 14, among others): Decision XIII/11 (2016) adopted the Voluntary specific workplan on biodiversity in cold-water areas within the jurisdictional scope of the Convention contains relevant recommendations, including on: the avoidance, minimisation and mitigation of impacts of global and local stressors in these areas; and identification and protection of refugia sites; prediction of species and habitats vulnerable to stressors. Decision XI/18 (2012) deliberates on progress made in the implementation of the specific workplan on coral bleaching, and inter alia, recognises the need for coral ecosystems’ managers to apply ecosystem-based adaptation measures. The same decision XI/18 took note of the elements in Annex III to document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/6 as guidance for practical responses to the impacts of ocean acidification on marine and coastal biodiversity, and encourages Parties, other Governments and relevant organisations to use this guidance (para 24). Furthermore, the Priority actions to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Target 10 for coral reefs and closely associated ecosystems (contained in the annex of the decision XII/23) continues to be relevant in the implementation of this Target 8.
8. Marine pollution (Target 7) on underwater noise: Decision XII/23 (2014) encouraged Parties and other Governments to avoid, minimise and mitigate the potential significant adverse impacts of anthropogenic underwater noise by, *inter alia*: defining and differentiating types or intensities of underwater noise by source; combining acoustic mapping with habitat mapping of sound-sensitive species in spatial risk assessments; using spatio-temporal management based on knowledge of species distribution patterns in relation to noise; conducting impact assessments (para 3). Decision XIII/10 (2016) takes note of the updated report ‘Scientific synthesis of the impacts of underwater noise on marine and coastal biodiversity and habitats’ and invites Parties, other Governments and relevant organisations to use this information (para 1).
9. Marine pollution (Target 7) on marine debris: Decision XIII/10 took note of the Voluntary practical guidance on preventing and mitigating the impacts of marine debris on marine and coastal biodiversity and habitats present in the annex of the decision (para 5). It urges Parties and encourages other Governments, relevant organisations and other actors to prevent and mitigate the potential adverse impacts of marine debris on marine and coastal biodiversity and habitats, taking into account the Voluntary practical guidance (para 6).

Implementation at the national, regional and global levels (where appropriate) of these instruments would constitute an important way to monitor progress towards several GBF targets with respect to the marine environment.

**2. Should the headline indicators capture marine elements for each target, or only some targets?**

Headline indicators should capture marine elements for at least most of the targets. Some targets are cross-cutting (especially those under Goal D), but it will still be important to measure progress towards those with respect to the marine environment.

**3. Are there binary indicators that could be used for marine elements of the framework?**

Yes, all binary indicators should be applicable to the marine environment.

**4. Are there opportunities to coordinate monitoring activities across regions, and should this be considered in the monitoring framework development (e.g. through Regional Seas groups)?**

The Sustainable Ocean Initiative (SOI), especially the SOI Global Dialogue process provides a sound platform for regional and cross-regional cooperation. However, it is an informal process – which adds valuable outputs to the current landscape of formalised processes (e.g. UNEP RSOs meetings, FAO RFBs meetings, OSPAR-NEAFC + Collective Arrangement meetings, among others. For the purposes of measuring progress, however, a more formalised avenue for sharing of information from (and across) regions would be advisable. This could be adopted by a COP decision at COP 16. The current framework already recognises the role of regions in implementing the GBF. A formalised process for collecting and assessing such contributions would be beneficial to the monitoring framework as a whole and equally, it would serve as a platform to share best practices across regions and global processes.

It would therefore be advisable that COP 16 invites regional and other global competent bodies to share information on how they are planning to implement the GBF targets, and on the actions they have been already undertaking that could contribute to such implementation.

**Other considerations:**

With respect to Target 3, it would be advisable to procedurally ensure that submissions of OECMs to the WCMC’s OECM database be based on a template/pro-forma based on the criteria and sub-criteria contained in Annex III of decision 14/8 (2018). The completed pro-formas contained in the [report of the ICES WKTOPS](https://ices-library.figshare.com/articles/report/ICES_IUCN-CEM_FEG_Workshop_on_Testing_OECM_Practices_and_Strategies_WKTOPS_/18621746) could provide some insights on minimum standards for inclusion of such information in the WCMC database.