

Co-chairs' text on item 3

Annex

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ADVICE ON UPDATED GOALS AND TARGETS, AND RELATED INDICATORS AND BASELINES, OF THE UPDATED ZERO DRAFT OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

A. Background

1. The present document is a synthesis of the views expressed during the plenary session of the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice on 3 and 4 May 2021, the informal session of the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on 17 and 18 February 2021 and the contact group sessions under agenda item 3 of the Subsidiary Body's agenda (5-7 May 2021). It has been prepared by the co-chairs of the contact group on item 3, Anne Teller (European Union) and Jorge Murillo (Colombia), to support the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework in the preparation of the first draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The overall mandate of the contact group was to provide a scientific and technical review of the proposed goals and targets in the updated zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (CBD/POST2020/PREP/2/1) and to work on issues and recommendations related to the monitoring framework. The contact group also had before it a note by the Executive Secretary containing scientific and technical information related to the proposed goals and targets in the updated zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (CBD/SBSTTA/24/3/Add.2/Rev.1). In addition to the present note, a conference room paper related to agenda item 3 has been prepared by the contact group.

2. The content of this note has not been negotiated by Parties and does not imply that agreement or consensus has been reached on any of the issues identified. This document is not intended to replace the interventions of Parties and observers during the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice. Further, given the mandate of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the contact group, this document does not include information related to the wording of goals and targets. The Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework also participated in all sessions of the Subsidiary Body and contact group meetings under this agenda item in order to further ensure that the views of Parties are considered in preparing the first draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

3. This document has six main parts: (a) background; (b) scientific and technical advice on the overall approach and relationships between vision, mission, milestones, goals and targets; (c) scientific and technical advice on the scope of draft goals in the updated zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework; (d) scientific and technical advice on the scope of draft targets in the updated zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework; (e) criteria and approach to the monitoring framework and headline indicators; and (f) results from the online survey on headline indicators. It also contains one annex. It must be noted that, to improve readability, the issues raised during the deliberations have been included where they are most relevant. However, some issues may be relevant to more than one goal and/or target. Thus, the issues raised in this note should be considered in an integrated way.

B. Scientific and technical advice on the overall approach and relationships between vision, mission, milestones, goals and targets

4. The contact group considered the relationships between the 2050 Vision, and the proposed mission, milestones, goals and targets in the updated zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and specifically sought to identify additional scientific and technical advice on the scope of and interlinkages between these elements. In the discussions, the participants expressed views on the structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, its level of ambition and its scope. Each of these issues is addressed in turn below; however, it should be noted that the issues are interrelated.

1. Structure

5. Some Parties noted the need for a better logical flow between the Vision, and the proposed mission, goals, milestones, targets and indicators in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. In this light, some suggested that the structure of the framework should be simplified and that overlaps between the goals, milestones and targets should be avoided or minimized. In this respect:

(a) Some suggested that the goals in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be simple and aspirational in nature, milestones should focus on outcomes, and targets should focus on actions. However, some felt that the goals do not necessarily need to be related to outcomes and targets do not necessarily need to be related to actions. It was suggested that the goals should be tangible;

(b) Some stated that the proposed targets should be more closely linked to the goals and/or nested within them in order to streamline the framework and to reduce number of required headline indicators;

(c) Some Parties felt that the target components, as illustrated in document CBD/SBSTTA/24/3/Add.1 could be included as part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to further define the scope of the goals and targets;

(d) Some opined that the milestones should be removed from the framework and the issues addressed in them could be incorporated into the goals and targets, while others felt that the concept of milestones should be retained;

(e) Some Parties suggested the structure of the framework could be aligned with the key transitions in the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*.

6. Some noted that the structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should also take into account the development of a follow-up to the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation 2011-2020.

2. Ambition

7. Some expressed concern that the ambition of “no net loss” was not well defined, was not supported by sufficient scientific and technical information and/or that it might lead to unintended perverse outcomes. However, others noted that “no net loss” would be ambitious, had a sufficient scientific basis, and was simple and easy to communicate.

8. Some noted the importance of selecting appropriate baselines for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. In this respect, some suggested using a pre-industrial baseline and others suggested using a 2020 baseline or a 2010/2020 baseline. It was also noted that the selection of a baseline should not place a large burden on developing country Parties. The issue of baselines was further discussed by a friends of the chair group, established by the co-chairs of the contact group, where issues related to baselines were further discussed.¹ The result of this friends of the chair group is reflected in the conference room paper on this agenda item.

9. Some noted that some of the proposed goals and targets in the current draft framework were less ambitious than related elements in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. In this respect, some noted the importance of taking a “no regression” approach.

¹ Concepts related to baselines were discussed during the friends of the chair. During the discussions, scientific experts suggested that a differentiation between (a) reference reporting period; (b) baseline condition, and (c) baseline period might be helpful in addressing this issue. It was suggested that a reference reporting period could be understood as a common starting point for measuring progress towards most if not all targets and indicators. Baseline condition could be understood as conditions that might be desirable to attain. The baseline condition often depends on many factors and may refer to historical conditions. Baseline period could be understood as a historical period that is used as a point of reference to evaluate levels of ambition.

10. Some suggested that ambition of the goals and targets should be based on the aggregate of national commitments while others expressed that the ambition of the goals and targets should be based on the available scientific information and planetary boundaries.

3. *Scope*

11. Some noted the framework should address all three level of biodiversity (genetic diversity, species and ecosystems) in a balanced manner. Additionally, some noted that objectives 2 (sustainable use) and 3 (access and benefit-sharing) of the Convention needed to be better reflected across the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Specifically, on access and benefit-sharing, some noted that that issue should be reflected throughout the framework and address all access and benefit-sharing mechanisms, not only the Nagoya Protocol. Some also noted that the benefits provided through access and benefit-sharing should not be mixed with the means of implementation for the framework.

12. Some noted that issues related to indigenous peoples and local communities and Article 8(j), human rights, gender, youth, intergenerational equity, rights-based approaches, and linkages with poverty alleviation should be better reflected throughout the framework.

13. Some noted that the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss, for example those identified by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), needed to be better reflected. In this respect, some noted that climate change as a driver of biodiversity loss needed to be better addressed. However, others also noted that many of the drivers were considered under other processes or multilateral agreements and that the level of coverage in the global biodiversity framework updated zero draft was appropriate.

14. Some noted that sustainable development and the link with the sustainable development goals should be further reflected in the framework. Similarly, some expressed the need for coherence between the global biodiversity framework and other multilateral process, such as the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and other multilateral environment agreements. However, others noted the need to ensure that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework did not infringe on the mandates of other conventions or agreements or address issues outside the mandate of the Convention.

15. It was noted that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to be rooted in science. In that light, some suggested terms or concepts used in the updated zero draft that needed further clarity, agreed definitions or scientific information. These include the following terms: healthy populations, ecological connectivity, integrity, no net loss, spatial planning, productivity gaps, other effective area-based conservation measures, safe, nature-based solutions and biocide versus pesticide (these issues are further discussed below in the sections on goals and targets).

16. Some suggested that current draft of the framework implies a separation between nature and people and is too anthropocentric.

17. Some noted the need to better capture means of implementation, including capacity needs and gaps, mainstreaming issues, mobilizing new financing types and improved information systems, in the global biodiversity framework and its monitoring framework. In that respect, some noted the need to improve biodiversity information and monitoring and noted that many aspects of the current global biodiversity framework would be difficult to measure at the current time.

18. Some identified additional issues that could be better reflected across the goals and targets in the framework and/or identified issues that should be addressed through additional targets. Those issues included:

- (a) Food systems, including the link with agriculture, aquaculture, harvest practices and nutrition;
- (b) Marine and coastal ecosystems, including fisheries;
- (c) Other important ecosystem types, such as forests;
- (d) The One Health Approach;
- (e) Customary sustainable use;
- (f) Genetic diversity;
- (g) Freshwater;
- (h) Cities and infrastructure;
- (i) Soil biodiversity;
- (j) Restoration;
- (k) Productive sectors;
- (l) Non-material ecosystems services or nature's contributions to people;
- (m) Synergies between relevant international processes.

C. Scientific and technical advice on the scope of draft goals in the zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

19. The contact group considered the goals proposed in the updated zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and sought to provide scientific and technical advice on their scope, identify major gaps, provide advice on their numeric aspects and identify other considerations which should be taken into account when developing quantitative elements. Each of the four goals is addressed below.

1. Goal A

20. It was noted that it would be challenging and/or unrealistic to determine a single specific quantitative value related to the area, connectivity and integrity of ecosystems. In that light, some suggested that separate values should be identified for each of these elements or only some of them.

21. It was noted that the goal should address the extent, integrity, quality, connectivity and maintenance of all natural and semi-natural ecosystems as well as the sustainable management/use of these. In this context, some noted that the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) methodologies for ecosystem types could be used to help frame the goal, its milestones, its components and/or its indicators.

22. While some suggested that the goal should be made more general, others suggested that there could be either separate goals, or greater focus within the goal on species and extinctions, ecosystems, and genetic diversity.

23. Some note that the wording in the goal on reducing the number of threatened species by X% could be problematic as it could be achieved by reducing total the number of threatened species through extinction.

24. On genetic diversity some suggested that the focus should be on maintaining and enhancing genetic diversity. Others noted that the focus should be maintaining a threshold percentage of genetic diversity of distinct populations or on variation within and between species.

25. Further, some suggested that the goal should have a greater emphasis, references and/or address issues related to:

- (a) Marine, coastal and freshwater biodiversity;
- (b) Endangered species;
- (c) Climate change;

- (d) Desertification;
- (e) Restoration;
- (f) Issues related to the private sector.

26. Some suggested that some terms or concepts used in goal needed further clarity, agreed definitions or scientific information, including healthy populations, ecological connectivity, integrity, and no net loss.

27. On the issue of milestones for goal A, if they are retained, some suggested that:

- (a) The scope of milestone A.1 should reflect all ecosystems and not just natural ones. It was also suggested that the milestone could focus on vulnerable ecosystems;
- (b) The scientific basis for the 5% figure in milestone A.1 is not clear;
- (c) Milestone A.2 would not be realistic to measure for all species, and, in that light, some suggested that the focus should be on known threatened species, a subset of species, an average or abundance;
- (d) Milestone A.2 is not clearly linked to Goal A;
- (e) A milestone on related to genetic diversity should be included.

2. Goal B

28. Some suggested that the goal should better address sustainable use of biodiversity and the second objective of the Convention generally. It was also suggested that the goal should be made more operational and some suggested that the goal should be more closely linked to the issue of mainstreaming.

29. Some suggested that the term “nature’s contributions to people” was not appropriate or was too limiting, and might be outside the scope of the Convention. Some suggested that contributions to biodiversity should be also be addressed. Relatedly, some suggested that the term “ecosystem services” should be used instead. Some suggested the goal should focus on all types of “nature’s contributions to people” or ecosystem services and not be limited to just those listed in the current formulation of the goal.

30. Some suggested that the goal should address climate change resilience and links to health more explicitly. However, others noted that the goal should not address issues outside the mandate of the Convention and/or which overlap the mandate of other international processes and agreements.

31. Some suggested that the scope of the goal should more closely reflect the scope of Aichi Biodiversity Target 4.

32. Some suggested that the goal should focus on the elements of biodiversity that need to be conserved, sustainably used and restored in order to ensure that ecosystem services are provided to people.

33. Some suggested that the goal should provide more clarity on what types of action need to be undertaken to reach the goal.

34. Some suggested that the goal should have a greater emphasis, references and/or address issues related to agro-ecology, productive sectors, telecoupling and supply chains.

35. On the issue of milestones for goal B, if they were to be retained, some suggested that:

- (a) Milestones B.1 would be challenging to measures and some felt that the milestone should be focused on all people benefiting. Others suggested that the quantitative aspect of the milestone should be phrased as a percentage of people benefiting. However, others suggested that the focus on people was inappropriate and outside the scope and mandate of the Convention;
- (b) Some noted that the milestones should consider the sectors responsible for biodiversity loss and that the list of issues and sectors identified should be broader and more complete;

(c) Some noted that the milestones for the goal should address the full range of ecosystem services identified by IPBES.

3. *Goal C*

36. Some noted that the current formulation of the goal was not ambitious enough, especially when compared to the other goals and that the goal should include language related to an “X% increase” in benefits shared. However, some noted that placing a specific value on benefits would be challenging, given the currently available information and the different forms that benefits could take. Relatedly, some noted challenges in identifying relevant baselines on that issue.

37. Some stressed that the goal should address both the monetary and non-monetary benefits related to access and benefit-sharing.

38. Some noted that the current phrasing of the goal was unclear and difficult to measure. Similarly, some noted that the phrasing of the goal needs to better reflect the Nagoya Protocol and relevant provisions under the Convention on access and benefit sharing, while others noted the need to go beyond the Nagoya Protocol and capture other access and benefit-sharing mechanisms.

39. Some noted that the goal overlapped with the proposed target 12 addressing access and benefit sharing and that that should be avoided. Relatedly, some noted that the links between that goal and the other goals and targets in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be made clearer. Similarly, some suggested that the links between that goal and sustainable use should be identified.

40. Some noted that the formulation of the goal should consider that there was currently limited or no information globally on the amount of benefits shared. In that light, some suggested that the focus of the goal should be on putting in place effective mechanisms for access and benefit-sharing.

41. Some suggested that the goal should include, have a greater emphasis on, references and/or address issues related to:

- (a) Indigenous peoples and local communities;
- (b) Traditional knowledge;
- (c) Capacity-building;
- (d) Non-monetary benefits.

42. On the issue of milestones for goal C, if they were to be retained, some suggested that:

- (a) Milestone C.1 was a necessary first step but on its own was not sufficient to ensure that benefits are shared;
- (b) Milestones C.2. could not be measured as there was no available data set or baseline and therefore was not realistic.

4. *Goal D*

43. Some suggested that the scope and ambition of the goal needed to be more transformational in order to address biodiversity loss. In that respect, some suggested that the goal should be phrased as a global pledge or commitment to mobilize resources, taking into account the existing funding gap, and the anticipated impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic.

44. Some suggested that the goal needed to address the use and mobilization of resources and not just the availability of resources. Similarly, it was suggested that the goal should address the efficient use of resources.

45. Some suggested that the goal should contain a specific value for the mobilization of resources and that specific means of implementation should be identified or highlighted in the phrasing. Relatedly, some suggested that the specific circumstances and priorities of developing countries, in particular the least

developed countries, small island developing States, and countries with economies in transition, should be taken into account in the phrasing of the goal and that specific values for the mobilization of resources for the countries in those groups should be identified. In addition, some suggested that the framework should emphasize the need for sustained support to developing countries from developed countries.

46. Some suggested that the goal should emphasize that resources should come from all sources and that all relevant financial flows should be aligned to the framework.

47. Some suggested the goal should be linked to national biodiversity strategies and action plans, which, in turn, should identify necessary means of implementation.

48. Some noted that the goal should cover a broad range of issues, including capacity development and technology transfer, and improvement to scientific information and that the identification of indicators for those issues was needed. However, some noted challenges in identifying appropriate baselines for those issues.

49. Some suggested that the goal should have a greater focus on cross-cutting issues, such as gender.

50. On the issue of milestones, some noted that the proposed milestones were too narrow.

D. Scientific and technical advice on the scope of draft targets in the zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

51. The contact group considered the targets proposed in the updated zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and sought to provide scientific and technical advice on their scope, identify major gaps, provide advice on their numeric aspects and identify other considerations which should be taken into account when developing quantitative elements. Each of the proposed targets is addressed below.

Target 1

52. Some noted that the term “spatial planning” required a clearer definition, and that the link to biodiversity should be made clearer. In that respect, some suggested that the target should qualify that the purpose of spatial planning is to support the conservation, sustainable use and restoration of biodiversity. Others suggested that the focus should be on the areas under active management rather than the area under spatial planning. Further, others suggested that the focus should be on landscape and seascape-level approaches and some noted that other relevant tools, in addition to spatial planning, existed.

53. It was also noted that spatial planning should apply to all ecosystem types and not only intact and wilderness areas, natural areas or areas with high value. Others suggested that the target should focus on areas important for ecosystem services. Still others suggested that the focus of the target should be on retaining natural, intact, wilderness areas and/or high value areas. However, others noted that the issues related to natural ecosystems should be addressed through proposed target 2 and, in that light, some noted potential overlaps or duplication between targets 1 and 2.

54. Some noted that there was insufficient information to set a quantitative value and/or that the 50% value in the proposed target was not supported by scientific information. However, others noted that the target should call for all areas, (i.e. 100%), to be under spatial planning. Conversely some noted that 50% was overly ambitious.

55. Some suggested that restoration needed to be more visible in the target or should be a separate target and that it should apply to all areas, not just natural ones. Some also suggested that elements on restoration should be based on a pre-industrial baseline. However, others noted that identifying a specific value for the area to be restored would be challenging owing to different definitions, especially in the marine environment.

56. Some noted that the terms sea use change and intact and wilderness areas were unclear.
57. Some suggested that the target should be moved under the section of the framework addressing tools and solutions for implementation and mainstreaming.
58. Some noted that the phrasing of the target should also refer to, address, cover or take into account Key Biodiversity Areas, Ecological and Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs), all sectors and land use, fragmentation, local and subnational governments, marine spatial planning and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Target 2

59. Some suggested that the target should set ambitious quantitative values for marine, terrestrial and freshwater areas separately. Some suggested that the target should call for 30% of marine, 30% of terrestrial and 30% freshwater areas to be protected and noted that there was scientific evidence to support that level of ambition. However, others suggested that there was insufficient information to support those quantitative values and some suggested that the focus should be ensuring biodiversity outcomes from such areas.
60. Some suggested the need to further emphasize other effective area-based conservation measures in the formulation of the target, while others suggest that the definition of other effective area-based conservation measures needed more clarity.
61. Some suggested that the target should focus on areas particularly important for biodiversity, such as Key Biodiversity Areas or EBSAs. However, others noted that using EBSAs for that purpose would be inappropriate. Others noted that important areas should be identified nationally and that the target should only apply to areas within national jurisdictions.
62. It was identified that the qualitative elements of protected areas, as described in Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, should be better reflected in the target. Those include effective and equitable management, connectivity, and integration. With regard to those aspects, it was noted that the proposed target is currently less ambitious than Aichi Target 11. With regard to connectivity, it was also noted that that issue had links to other international agreements and processes and that emphasizing connectivity in the target could help with synergies.
63. It was noted that the role of indigenous peoples and local communities in relation to protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures should be further emphasized and taken into account in the formulation of the target.

Target 3

64. It was identified that human-wildlife conflict, while important, is problematic given the lack of information to establish a baseline and to monitor progress. Because of these some suggested removing this issue from the proposed target while others suggested removing the quantitative element. Some suggested that the target could instead address:
- (a) Maintaining species;
 - (b) Species recovery and restoration;
 - (c) Extinction rates;
 - (d) Abundance;
 - (e) Conservation status of threatened species;
 - (f) Effective management of species.
65. It was also suggested that the target should focus on all species, not only flora and fauna, while others noted the focus should be species of national importance.

66. Some suggested that the target should have a greater focus on genetic diversity while others suggested that there should be a stand-alone target addressing issues related to genetic diversity.

Target 4

67. Some noted that the target should address sustainable use generally and not be limited to wild species. It was also suggested that reference to ecological limits, as in Aichi Biodiversity Target 4, could be reflected in the target.

68. It was identified that the term safe was unclear, and that further work would be needed to clarify its meaning. In that respect, one possible definition for safe which was supported by some but not extensively discussed, was “posing no risk of pathogen spillover to humans, wildlife, or domesticated species and posing no risk of becoming an alien invasive species”.

69. It was also noted that the meaning of the term “legal” in the context of the target was unclear and that legal use might not necessarily be sustainable. Relatedly, some noted that the issue could infringe on the mandate or processes of existing mechanisms regulating international trade.

70. Some noted that the phrasing of the target should also refer to, address, cover or take into account: customary sustainable use, impacts on non-targeted species (such as through by-catch), all wild species and the link with poverty alleviation and social development needs.

Target 5

71. It was identified that the term “priority sites” was unclear and that it would require further work to identify such areas. Some suggested that such sites could include islands, nature reserves and vulnerable ecosystems. Others also noted that priority sites should be identified nationally and be determined by Parties.

72. Some suggested that rates of introduction would require further work to effectively monitor and some questioned the scientific basis for the 50% figure in the target and noted that determining an appropriate baseline would be challenging. Some suggested that instead the target should focus on rates of establishment as they were more realistic to measure. Others suggested that the focus should be on reducing the impacts of invasive alien species on ecosystems and species generally. Some noted that specific attention to endemic species might be warranted.

73. Some suggested that the target should focus on putting in place necessary measures to appropriately address and manage invasive alien species and their pathways.

74. Some noted that the elements from Aichi Biodiversity Target 9 should be better reflected in the target.

75. Some noted that the phrasing of the target should also refer to, address, cover or take into account:

- (a) The effects of climate change on invasive alien species;
- (b) The sectors responsible for the introduction of invasive alien species;
- (c) The impacts of invasive alien species on ecosystem services, including the provision of food and water, as well as their impacts on agricultural systems;
- (d) The impacts of invasive alien species in the marine environment;
- (e) Links and synergies with other international processes.

Target 6

76. It was identified that the term biocide was problematic as it lacked a clear definition and, in that respect, many suggested using the term “pesticide” instead. Others noted that the research on reducing the

use of pesticides was dominated by examples from the global north, and values might therefore not be realistic globally.

77. Some noted that it would be challenging to determine a specific quantitative value for the different pollutant types identified. In that respect, some suggested that the target should address pollution generally.

78. Some suggested that the proposed target was currently less ambitious than Aichi Biodiversity Target 8. In that light, some suggested that the target should be on reducing to pollution to levels which were not detrimental to biodiversity. However, others noted that it was not clear what such levels would be. Others suggested that the target should focus on reducing the percentage of biodiversity affected by pollution. Others noted that that approach would be difficult as pollution impacts were context-specific.

79. Some suggested that “excess nutrients” should be replaced by “total nitrogen waste” or “nutrient use efficiency”. Other raised questions as to whether the target should address new pollution and/or the historic accumulation of pollution as well.

80. While some supported the target addressing plastic, others noted that determining appropriate baselines and monitoring would be challenging.

81. Some suggested that the target should be phrased so that it applies to all types of pollutants while others suggested that the focus should be on those pollutants which are particularly detrimental.

82. Some suggested that the target should focus on putting in place the necessary measures and processes, such as watershed management plans, to address pollution.

83. Some noted that it was not clear how this target related to the goals.

84. Some noted that the phrasing of the target should also refer to, address, cover or take into account:

- (a) Underwater noise;
- (b) Light pollution;
- (c) Effluent and wastewater;
- (d) Circular economy;

(e) The mandates and activities of other relevant agreements and processes, including the United Nations Environment Assembly and the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management.

Target 7

85. Some expressed concern on the use of the term “nature-based solutions”, including that the term was not clearly defined, was not supported by sufficient scientific information, was a new concept, did not take into account common but differentiated responsibilities and/or had possible unintentional negative impacts. In that light, some suggested that the term “ecosystem-based approaches” should be used instead. However, others suggested that the term was supported scientifically and that concerns regarding possible unintentional impacts could be addressed through the use of safeguards. Others also pointed to the definition developed by IUCN on nature-based solutions as a possible definition.

86. Some suggested that the target should have a greater focus on climate change as a driver of biodiversity loss, including by addressing issues related to adaptation, and mitigation, and possible synergies with UNFCCC. However, others noted that the target should not overlap with or infringe on the mandate of UNFCCC.

87. Some noted that target 7 is closely related to or overlaps with Target 10 and the relationship between the two targets should be clarified and overlaps avoided.

88. Some noted that this target was below the level of ambition in Aichi Biodiversity Target 10.

89. Some noted that the phrasing of the target should also refer to, address, cover or take into account:

- (a) Community-based adaptation approaches and conservation measures;
- (b) Avoiding emissions from habitat loss;
- (c) The Ocean-climate nexus;
- (d) Ocean acidification.

Target 8

90. Some suggested that the target should focus on sustainable use generally, including articles 10(c) and 10(d), and the long-term and continued provision of ecosystem services. In that respect, some noted that the target should address those issues covered in Aichi Biodiversity Target 4.

91. Some noted that the target should be focused on ensuring that services would be available to all people. However, some supported keeping a reference to particularly vulnerable groups. However, others noted that the links to human livelihoods, health and well-being were beyond the scope of the Convention.

92. Some noted that the target should not be limited to flora and fauna but, rather, should apply to all species, as well as crop varieties.

93. Some noted that the target overlaps with proposed target 4 and that those two targets could be merged.

94. Some noted that the terms “ensuring benefits” was unclear, could be confused with issues related to access and benefit-sharing and was therefore problematic.

95. Some noted that the phrasing of the target should also refer to, address, cover or take into account:

- (a) Customary sustainable use;
- (b) Population growth;
- (c) Alternative production methods;
- (d) Fishing and bycatch.

Target 9

96. It was identified that measuring productivity gaps and determining a specific value for them would be problematic owing to different definitions, regional and national variations, and the absence of baselines. In that light, some suggested that productivity gaps should not be used in target and/or should not have an associated quantitative value. Some also noted that the term “managed ecosystem” was unclear.

97. Some noted that the target should focus on the sustainable management of ecosystems generally. Other suggested that the target should address the sustainable management of certain types of managed ecosystems, including forestry, agriculture. However, others suggested that the target should also address natural ecosystems. Others noted that the focus should be on restoring those types of ecosystems.

98. Some noted that the phrasing of the target should also refer to, address, cover or take into account:

- (a) Marine ecosystems;
- (b) Biotechnology;
- (c) Forestry;
- (d) Agriculture;
- (e) Agroecological processes;
- (f) Agroforestry;
- (g) Deep sea and seabed mining;

- (h) Food scarcity;

Target 10

99. The views expressed on the term “nature-based solutions” noted above under target 7 also apply to this target.

100. Some noted that this target was closely related to proposed target 7 and had overlaps which needed to be clarified and/or avoided. In that light, some suggested that nature-based solutions should be included under one target. However, others noted that nature-based solutions should not be used in target formulations and that ecosystem-based approaches should be used instead.

101. Some noted that the proposed target was too limited and should focus all ecosystem services rather than on specific services.

102. Some suggested that the focus of the target was outside the mandate of the Convention.

103. Some noted that the target should focus on ensuring that ecosystem services were available for all people and not just a percentage. Others noted that the target should not refer to people. Relatedly, some suggested that the target could focus on the area of the planet covered by ecosystem-based approaches or nature-based solutions.

Target 11

104. Some suggested that the target should focus on urban biodiversity generally. Others noted that rather than addressing access to green and blue spaces the target should focus on biodiversity outcomes, including the restoration of biodiversity in those environments, and improving connectivity, extent, and distribution. Others suggested that the target should be more closely linked to conservations and sustainable use.

105. Some suggested that the target should focus on the area of urban environments with biodiversity-friendly practices, while others suggested that the focus should be on infrastructure. In that respect, some suggested that a target of infrastructure should be added.

106. Some noted that the target should be for all people to be able to benefit from blue and green areas. However, others noted that the focus on the number of people with access was inappropriate given the mandate of the Convention and/or would be difficult to measure. Others noted that, given the limited information available, a numeric target on the issue would be difficult to determine. Others noted that access to those areas should not be limited to issues related to human health.

Target 12

107. The issues raised in relation to Goal C above also apply to this target.

108. Some suggested that the target should be more clearly linked to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Other suggested that the target should be made more outcome oriented. Further some noted that the target should not be overly prescriptive.

109. Some suggested that the target should focus on increasing monetary and non-monetary benefits and some suggested that there should be a specific quantitative value for monetary benefits. However, others noted that it would be challenging to identify appropriate baselines and/or indicators for this given that benefits were monetary and non-monetary and therefore were not in favour of including such a value. However, others noted that the absence of information on benefits provided a further rationale for addressing the issue in a target.

110. Some suggested that the target should focus on putting in place necessary access and benefit-sharing measures and ensuring their effectiveness. However, others noted that, while that was an important element or first step, it would not be ambitious enough on its own.

111. Some noted the links between the target and ongoing discussions on digital sequence information under the Convention.

112. Some suggested that the target should have a more explicit reference to traditional knowledge and/or indigenous peoples and local communities.

113. Some noted that the target should be more closely aligned with the objectives of the Convention and the Nagoya Protocol. Others noted that the phrasing of the target should also consider and/or address other relevant processes and instruments related to access and benefit-sharing.

Target 13

114. Some suggested that the target should focus on mainstreaming and noted links to the long-term action plan on mainstreaming. Others noted that the actions implied by the target have costs, particularly for developing countries and that need to be born in mind.

115. Some noted that the target should address all levels of government and the multiple values of biodiversity, for instance through improved environmental impact assessment. However, others suggested that the target was overly prescriptive. Others suggested that the target was too vague and should address specific sectors.

116. Some noted links to Article 14 of the Convention on impact assessment and minimizing adverse impacts and suggested that that could be used as basis for developing a quantitative element in the target.

117. Some noted the relevance of environmental accounting processes and standards, such as the System of Environmental Economic Accounting and suggested that they could help inform the phrasing of the target.

118. Some suggested that the target should reference the One Health approach or that the One Health approach should be addressed as a separate target.

Target 14

119. Some noted that the basis for the percentage value in the target was unclear and that it was not clear how it could be measured or what the baseline would be.

120. Some expressed concerns that the target as phrased could constitute a non-tariff trade barrier and was outside the scope of the Convention.

121. Some noted that the target should also address the financial sector and investment more generally. Others noted that the target should not be limited to supply chains.

122. Some noted that the target overlaps with proposed target 15 on consumption patterns and suggested merging the two targets. However, others favoured keeping the targets separate. Some also noted that the target overlap with proposed target 9.

123. Some suggested that the target should have a similar scope and focus as Aichi Biodiversity Target 4 and/or be made more general.

124. Some suggested that the target should focus on those sectors having particularly negative impacts on biodiversity. However, others suggested that the target should focus on all sectors and noted the importance of involving the private sector in addressing the target.

125. Some noted that the phrasing of the target should also refer to, address, cover or take into account:

- (a) Telecouplings;
- (b) Net positive impacts;

- (c) Product life cycles;
- (d) Circular economy.

Target 15

126. Some noted that the target was less ambitious than Aichi Biodiversity Target 4, suggested that the target should be more inline with Sustainable Development Goal 12 and/or focus on sustainable development generally.

127. Some noted that the terms “consumption patterns” and “responsible choices” needed more clarity. Others noted that, as currently phrased, the target was outside the scope and mandate of the Convention, places too heavy a burden on individual consumers, and/or was overly ambitious. In that respect, some suggested that the target should instead focus on the role of governments in promoting sustainable consumption.

128. Some suggested that the target should address consumption and production in an integrated way and in this respect noted links and overlaps with proposed target 14.

129. Some noted that the phrasing of the target should also refer to, address, cover or take into account food waste, illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing, consumer awareness and education.

Target 16

130. It was identified that there was an insufficient basis for the inclusion of a quantitative element related to potential negative impacts of biotechnology. Some also noted that no such impacts had been identified. Other suggested that the current formulation of the proposed target was outside the scope of the Convention and the Cartagena Protocol. Similarly, some suggested that the target wording should address the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.

131. Some noted that the target should address the potential positive impacts from biotechnology and that the target should not approach the issue from a risk perspective.

132. Some suggested that the phrasing of the target should be in line with Article 8(g) of the Convention. Others suggested that the focus should be on living modified organisms. Further, others suggested that the focus of the target should be on putting in place appropriate measures to address biotechnology.

Target 17

133. Some noted that the target was less ambitious than Aichi Biodiversity Target 3 and, in that respect, suggested that the target should focus on the complete removal, elimination or reform of harmful subsidies. Others suggested that a value related to the percentage of harmful subsidies removed, calculated in relation to gross domestic product (GDP), could be included.

134. Some noted that the target should be consistent with processes under the World Trade Organization and noted the relevance of the standards from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

135. Some noted that the target should also address putting in place positive incentives.

136. Some noted that the target should include a specific reference to the identification of harmful incentives.

Target 18

137. Some suggested that the target should have specific quantitative values and that estimates of the current biodiversity funding gap could be used to inform them. Other suggested that those values could be informed by what is identified in national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs). Others noted that the quantitative aspects should take into account the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and the potential benefits from a green recovery and/or the benefits from the conservation and sustainable use

biodiversity. However, others suggested that a specific quantitative value should not be included and that the target should, rather, focus on ensuring that adequate resources were available.

138. Some noted that the target should include a specific value for the resources required by developing countries to be able to implement the framework and/or the amount of resources to be provided by developed countries to developing countries. However, some stated that they were not in favour of that approach.

139. Some suggested that the target should include a reference to Article 20 of the Convention and specific circumstances of developing countries.

140. Some noted that that target should cover resources for all sources. However, some suggested that the different sources should be addressed separately.

141. Some suggested that the target should address capacity development.

142. Some suggested that the target should address innovative financial mechanisms, the phasing out of harmful incentives, improving resource use efficiency, and the role of the private sector.

143. Some noted the possible needed for the development of dedicated fund to support developing country Parties.

Target 19

144. Some noted that the target needed to have a greater emphasis on traditional knowledge, better reflect Article 8(j) and ensuring that access to traditional knowledge was appropriate and with free and prior informed consent. In that respect, some noted that the target, as currently proposed, was lower than Aichi Biodiversity Target 18.

145. Some noted that the phrasing of the target should also refer to, address, cover or take into account:

- (a) Marine species;
- (b) Behaviour change;
- (c) Support for systematic observation and monitoring systems;
- (d) Support for education and research;
- (e) The uptake and use of information.

Target 20

146. Some noted that the target should have a greater emphasis on human rights, the rights of environmental defenders, gender, and/or intergenerational equity.

147. Some noted that the target should ensure effective participation and inclusion, including with free and prior informed consent. In that respect, some noted that indigenous peoples and local communities should be further reflected in the target.

148. With regard to rights, it was noted that, as phrased, the target was not clear on what groups should have what rights and that that could create unintended consequences. In that respect, some noted the importance of taking into account other relevant international agreements and processes addressing rights.

149. Some noted that the target should also address participation by the private sector, education and other groups.

E. Criteria and approach to the monitoring framework and the headline indicators

150. The contact group considered the proposed criteria and approach to the headline indicators in the proposed monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and sought to identify any major gaps in the proposed criteria for headline indicators as well as any major coverage gaps.

151. It was identified that the monitoring framework should be simplified as the current three groups and lists of indicators is complex.

152. Some noted that there were currently too many proposed headline indicators and that they should be significantly reduced. While others suggested the importance of the monitoring framework covering the scope of the goals and targets and suggested that one or two indicators per goal and target would be reasonable. Others noted that all goals and targets should have only one indicator with the exception of perhaps Goal A.

153. The importance of developing the goals and targets of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in parallel to the identification of indicators was noted. In particular, some Parties noted that the indicators and the goals and targets should be developed together to ensure that they were measurable. Others noted the importance of capturing all important issues in the goals and targets and suggested that indicators could be further developed to ensure holistic measurement of biodiversity-related issues.

154. It was noted that the headline indicators should represent a core set of indicators which could be used to track progress nationally and globally. Some noted the need for using the indicators for high-level communication.

155. Some noted their support for the indicator criteria identified in document CBD/SBSTTA/24/3/Add.1. Others suggested additional criteria related to relevance and repeatability. Some suggested that the most important criteria for headline indicators should be relevance to the target, while others suggested that the most important criteria should be availability and the ability to scale or aggregate them from national to global levels. In that respect, some suggested that comprehensive information on each indicators should be presented in the draft monitoring framework.

156. Some suggested that the indicators should be based on national data and/or have national level ownership.

157. Some noted that the use of headline indicators should not prevent Parties from using other indicators and that the headline indicators should have flexibility to allow them to account for national circumstances. Others noted that the complementary and component indicators would also be relevant for national level monitoring in many cases.

158. Some noted that the use of headline indicators, particularly for developing country Parties, would require capacity development, technology transfer and financial resources and, in that respect, noted the relevance of Article 20 of the Convention.

159. Some noted that indicators already being used through other processes, such as the Sustainable Development Goals or multilateral environment agreements, should be favoured. Relatedly, some noted that the reporting burden on countries should be minimized, for instance by using such tools as the Data Reporting Tool (DART).

160. Some suggested that the indicators should be clustered around the proposed goals. However, some expressed reservations on this approach.

161. Some noted that indicators should be both scientifically and politically valid. In that respect, some suggested that Parties needed to be able to provide additional views on the headline indicators, including through the in-session survey, the results of which are presented below.

162. Some noted that indicators should address the three objectives of the Convention, should be balanced in terms of the ecosystems they addressed and should be in line with Article 1 of the Convention.

163. It was suggested that the future iteration of the monitoring framework should be more bottom-up and streamlined and should present all the relevant information for the indicators, including how they relate to the identified criteria, baselines, responsible organizations and other processes using the indicator, in one location.

F. Results of the in-session survey on the proposed headline indicators

164. The Chairs conducted an in-session online survey² to capture views on each of the proposed headline indicators in the draft of the monitoring framework as presented in document CBD/SBSTTA/24/3/Add.1. The list of indicators is shown in the table below. For each indicator, respondents were asked:

(a) Do you think this indicator is relevant to measure overall progress of the goal or target?

(b) Do you think this indicator is relevant for global reporting and for enhancing standardization and comparability in national reporting?

165. The survey was available from 10 to 19 May 2021 for SBSTTA focal points or CBD national focal points (where SBSTTA focal points had not been designated) and representatives of observer organizations who were registered to attend the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice. Responses were received from 60 Parties (12% from Africa, 18% from Asia and the Pacific, 12% from Central and Eastern Europe, 23% from the Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries, and 35% from the Western European and Others Group) and 76 observers. An overview of the survey results is shown in table 1. The aggregated results of the survey are presented in the annex to the present note, and the written responses have been compiled in document CBD/SBSTTA/24/INF/29.

166. As shown in table 1, more than half of the headline indicators (26 indicators) have strong support from Parties (at least 70% support for the indicator) and roughly three quarters (36 indicators) have high-to-moderate support (60% support the indicator). However, many of these indicators require further work in order to enhance standardization and comparability.

167. For Parties, the survey response was limited to one response per Party; however, for observers, there was one response accepted per registered observer.

Explanation of the annex

The graphs in the annex present the results of the survey for each indicator. The reference at the top of each figure identifies each indicator by reference to table 1. The reference to the questions below each bar chart in each figure refers to the two questions identified in paragraph 164 above:

“*Question (a)*”: Do you think this indicator is relevant to measure overall progress of the goal or target?

“*Question (b)*”: Do you think this indicator is relevant for global reporting and for enhancing standardization and comparability in national reporting?

Please note that the annex is issued as a separate document and is common to all language versions.

² Note that some Parties and observers experienced technical difficulties with the online survey and the Secretariat took their responses offline.

Table. Proposed headline indicators to monitor implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the percentage of respondents answering “Yes” or “Yes with work” [3]

2050 Goals, milestones and Targets [2]	Headline indicators [3]	Do you think this indicator is relevant to measure overall progress of the goal?		Do you think this indicator is relevant for global reporting and for enhancing standardization and comparability in national reporting?	
		<i>Party</i>	<i>Observer</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Observer</i>
<p>Goal A:</p> <p>The area, connectivity and integrity of natural ecosystems increased by at least [X%] supporting healthy and resilient populations of all species while reducing the number of species that are threatened by [X%] and maintaining genetic diversity;</p>	A.0.1 Extent of selected natural ecosystems (forest, savannahs and grasslands, wetlands, mangroves, saltmarshes, coral reef, seagrass, macroalgae and intertidal habitats)	92%	70%	88%	62%
	A.0.2 Living Planet Index	81%	57%	69%	56%
	A.0.3 Red list index	90%	68%	85%	65%
	A.0.4 Species habitat index	75%	48%	68%	45%
	A.0.5 The proportion of populations maintained within species*	73%	47%	63%	39%
<p>Goal B:</p> <p>Nature's contributions to people have been valued, maintained or enhanced through conservation and sustainable use supporting global development agenda for the benefit of all people;</p>	B.0.1 Population benefiting from ecosystem services*	49%	39%	51%	35%
	B.0.2 Value of all final ecosystem services (Gross Ecosystem Product)*	64%	39%	59%	34%

2050 Goals, milestones and Targets [2]	Headline indicators [3]	Do you think this indicator is relevant to measure overall progress of the goal?		Do you think this indicator is relevant for global reporting and for enhancing standardization and comparability in national reporting?	
<p>Goal C:</p> <p>The benefits, from the utilization of genetic resources are shared fairly and equitably;</p>	<p>C.0.1 Amount of monetary benefits (in United States dollars) received by countries from utilization of genetic resources as a result of an ABS agreement, including traditional knowledge</p> <p>C.0.2 Number of research and development results or publications shared as a result of an ABS agreement</p>	58%	35%	47%	32%
<p>Goal D:</p> <p>Means of implementation are available to achieve all goals and targets in the framework.</p>	<p>D.0.1. Index of coverage of national biodiversity strategies and action plans with formal processes for ensuring that women, indigenous peoples and local communities and youth are engaged and which capture means of implementation*</p> <p>D.0.2. National funding for implementation of the global biodiversity framework*</p>	66%	47%	61%	42%
<p>Target 1. By 2030, [50%] of land and sea areas globally are under spatial planning addressing land/sea use change, retaining most of the existing intact and wilderness areas, and allow to restore [X%] of degraded freshwater, marine and terrestrial natural ecosystems and connectivity among them.</p>	<p>1.0.1 Percentage of land covered by landscape scale land-use plans for terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecosystems*</p>	73%	66%	76%	55%
<p>Target 2. By 2030, protect and conserve through well connected and effective system of protected areas and other</p>	<p>2.0.1 Protected area coverage of important biodiversity areas</p>	83%	77%	78%	64%

2050 Goals, milestones and Targets [2]	Headline indicators [3]	Do you think this indicator is relevant to measure overall progress of the goal?		Do you think this indicator is relevant for global reporting and for enhancing standardization and comparability in national reporting?	
effective area-based conservation measures at least 30 per cent of the planet with the focus on areas particularly important for biodiversity.	2.0.2 Species Protection Index	59%	44%	54%	43%
Target 3. By 2030, ensure active management actions to enable wild species of fauna and flora recovery and conservation, and reduce human-wildlife conflict by [X%].	3.0.1 Protected areas management effectiveness	63%	52%	59%	44%
	3.0.2 Species recovery programmes*	75%	53%	64%	48%
Target 4. By 2030, ensure that the harvesting, trade and use of wild species of fauna and flora is legal, at sustainable levels and safe.	4.0.1 Proportion of traded wildlife that is legal and safe (not poached, illicitly trafficked or unsustainable)	75%	58%	58%	51%
	4.0.2 Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable level	85%	47%	75%	44%
Target 5. By 2030, manage, and where possible control, pathways for the introduction of invasive alien species, achieving [50%] reduction in the rate of new introductions, and control or eradicate invasive alien species to eliminate or reduce their impacts, including in at least [50%] of priority sites	5.0.1 Rate of invasive alien species spread	75%	51%	64%	44%
	5.0.2 Rate of invasive alien species impact	66%	44%	58%	38%
Target 6. By 2030, reduce pollution from all sources, including reducing excess nutrients [by x%], biocides [by x%], plastic waste [by x%] to levels that are not	6.0.1 Proportion of water with good ambient water quality (freshwater and marine)	75%	51%	63%	44%

2050 Goals, milestones and Targets [2]	Headline indicators [3]	Do you think this indicator is relevant to measure overall progress of the goal?		Do you think this indicator is relevant for global reporting and for enhancing standardization and comparability in national reporting?	
harmful to biodiversity and ecosystem functions and human health	6.0.2 Plastic debris density 6.0.3 Pesticide use per area of cropland 6.0.4 Proportion of municipal solid waste collected and managed in controlled facilities out of total municipal solid waste generated by cities	64%	49%	53%	43%
		76%	47%	68%	40%
		73%	43%	58%	38%
Target 7. By 2030, increase contributions to climate change mitigation adaption and disaster risk reduction from nature-based solutions and ecosystems-based approaches, ensuring resilience and minimizing any negative impacts on biodiversity	7.0.1 Total climate regulation services provided by ecosystems*	51%	40%	53%	31%
Target 8. By 2030, ensure benefits, including nutrition, food security, livelihoods, health and well-being, for people, especially for the most vulnerable through sustainable management of wild species of fauna and flora	8.0.1 Number of people using wild resources for energy, food or culture (including firewood collection, hunting and fishing, gathering, medicinal use, craft making, etc.)*	54%	39%	42%	32%
	8.0.2 Percentage of the population in traditional employment	44%	29%	41%	23%
Target 9. By 2030, support the productivity, sustainability and resilience of biodiversity in agricultural and other managed ecosystems through conservation and sustainable use of such ecosystems, reducing productivity gaps by at least [50%].	9.0.1 Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture	76%	58%	66%	48%

2050 Goals, milestones and Targets [2]	Headline indicators [3]	Do you think this indicator is relevant to measure overall progress of the goal?		Do you think this indicator is relevant for global reporting and for enhancing standardization and comparability in national reporting?	
Target 10. By 2030, ensure that nature-based solutions and ecosystem approach contribute to regulation of air quality, hazards and extreme events and quality and quantity of water for at least [XXX million] people	10.0.1 Population living in areas with clean air and clean and accessible water*	58%	35%	51%	32%
	10.0.2 Ecosystems providing reduced coastal erosion, flood protection and other services)*	69%	48%	56%	40%
Target 11. By 2030, increase benefits from biodiversity and green/blue spaces for human health and wellbeing, including the proportion of people with access to such spaces by at least [100%], especially for urban dwellers.	11.0.1 Average share of the built-up area of cities that is green/blue space for public use for all	66%	42%	58%	39%
Target 12. By 2030, increase by [X] benefits shared for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity through ensuring access to and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits from the utilization of genetic resources	12.0.1 Numbers of users that have shared benefits from the utilization of genetic resources and/or traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources with the providers of the resources and/or knowledge	54%	42%	47%	36%
	12.0.2 Number of access and benefit-sharing permits or their equivalent granted for genetic resources (including those related to traditional knowledge)	73%	42%	63%	36%
	12.0.3 Extent to which legislative, administrative or policy frameworks to ensure fair and equitable sharing of benefits have been adopted*	76%	43%	63%	42%
Target 13. By 2030, integrate biodiversity values into policies, regulations, planning, development processes, poverty reduction	13.0.1 Extent to which national targets have been adopted for integrating biodiversity values into policies,	78%	53%	61%	40%

2050 Goals, milestones and Targets [2]	Headline indicators [3]	Do you think this indicator is relevant to measure overall progress of the goal?		Do you think this indicator is relevant for global reporting and for enhancing standardization and comparability in national reporting?	
strategies and accounts at all levels, ensuring that biodiversity values are mainstreamed across all sectors and integrated into assessments of environmental impacts.	regulations, planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts at all levels, ensuring that biodiversity values are mainstreamed across all sectors and integrated into assessments of environmental impacts* 13.0.2 Integration of biodiversity into national accounting and reporting systems, defined as implementation of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting	78%	51%	69%	43%
Target 14. By 2030, achieve reduction of at least [50%] in negative impacts on biodiversity by ensuring production practices and supply chains are sustainable.	14.0.1 Potential population and species loss from terrestrial and marine human modification* 14.0.2 Corporate sustainability reporting includes impacts on biodiversity*	44%	43%	36%	39%
Target 15. By 2030, eliminate unsustainable consumption patterns, ensuring people everywhere understand and appreciate the value of biodiversity, and thus make responsible choices commensurate with 2050 biodiversity vision, taking into account individual and national cultural and socioeconomic conditions.	15.0.1 Biomass material footprint per capita	51%	40%	46%	32%
Target 16. By 2030, establish and implement measures to prevent, manage or control potential adverse impacts of biotechnology on biodiversity and human health reducing these impacts by [X].	16.0.1 Extent to which necessary legal, administrative, technical and other biosafety measures are in place to prevent, manage and control potential adverse impacts of biotechnology on biodiversity*	78%	44%	66%	40%

2050 Goals, milestones and Targets [2]	Headline indicators [3]	Do you think this indicator is relevant to measure overall progress of the goal?		Do you think this indicator is relevant for global reporting and for enhancing standardization and comparability in national reporting?	
<p>Target 17. By 2030, redirect, repurpose, reform or eliminate incentives harmful for biodiversity, including [X] reduction in the most harmful subsidies, ensuring that incentives, including public and private economic and regulatory incentives, are either positive or neutral for biodiversity.</p>	<p>17.0.1 Biodiversity relevant taxes, charges and fees on payments for ecosystem services and on biodiversity relevant tradable permit schemes as a percentage of GDP</p>	73%	49%	66%	39%
	<p>17.0.2 Potentially harmful elements of government support to agriculture, fisheries and other sectors (environmentally harmful subsidies) as a percentage of GDP</p>	75%	51%	59%	44%
<p>Target 18. By 2030, increase by [X%] financial resources from all international and domestic sources, through new, additional and effective financial resources commensurate with the ambition of the goals and targets of the framework and implement the strategy for capacity-building and technology transfer and scientific cooperation to meet the needs for implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.</p>	<p>18.0.1 Official development assistance, public expenditure and private expenditure on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems*</p>	80%	56%	71%	48%
<p>Target 19. By 2030, ensure that quality information, including traditional knowledge, is available to decision makers and public for the effective management of biodiversity through promoting awareness, education and research.</p>	<p>19.0.1 Biodiversity information index*</p>	56%	48%	49%	40%
	<p>19.0.2 Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education</p>	69%	45%	53%	40%

2050 Goals, milestones and Targets [2]	Headline indicators [3]	Do you think this indicator is relevant to measure overall progress of the goal?		Do you think this indicator is relevant for global reporting and for enhancing standardization and comparability in national reporting?	
	for sustainable development, including gender equality and human rights, are mainstreamed at all levels in: (a) national education policies, (b) curricula, (c) teacher education and (d) student assessments				
Target 20. By 2030, ensure equitable participation in decision-making related to biodiversity and ensure rights over relevant resources of indigenous peoples and local communities, women and girls as well as youth, in accordance with national circumstances.	20.0.1 Land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous peoples and local communities 20.0.2 Population with secure tenure rights to land 20.0.3 Extent to which indigenous peoples and local communities, women and girls as well as youth participate in decision-making related to biodiversity*	71%	51%	53%	43%
		54%	48%	42%	35%
		81%	52%	63%	47%
TOTAL NUMBER OF INDICATORS ABOVE 70%		26		7	
TOTAL NUMBER OF INDICATORS ABOVE 60%		36		23	

[1] Percentages are calculated out of the number of Parties or Observers responding to the specific question. Percentages greater than 70% are shown in green and percentages less than 40% are shown in red.

[2] The 2050 goals and 2030 milestones and targets are as proposed in document CBD/POST2020/PREP/2/1.

[3] The headline indicators are the same as in document CBD/SBSTTA/24/3.