REVIEW COMMENTS AND RESPONSES RELATED TO THE PROPOSED LIST OF INDICATORS FOR THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020 FOLLOWING THE TWENTIETH MEETING OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

1. The Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice in recommendation XX/13, requested the Executive Secretary, in consultation with the members of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and partners of the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, to update the list of indicators contained in the note by the Executive Secretary on the fifth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook, national reporting and indicators for assessing progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in the light of the comments made during the twentieth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice applying the criteria contained in recommendation XIX/4, and to make the updated list of indicators available through the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention on Biological Diversity prior to the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

2. In line with the request above, the Executive Secretary updated the list of indicators for assessing progress in the attainment of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets based on the comments made at SBSTTA 20 and made it available to the participants in the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and partners of the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership from 30 May to 30 June. In addition to the comment made during SBSTTA 20, by 22 July comments were received from Ethiopia, the European Commission, Mexico, Birdlife International, GEO-BON, the Global Forest Coalition, the Marine Stewardship Council and Terralingua.

3. The review comments received are presented in the table below. Also included are responses indicating how the comment was taken into account in the update of the list of indicators. The updated list of indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 is contained in the annex to recommendation XX/13 in document UNEP/CBD/COP/13/5 prepared for the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Comments from members of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020		
Reviewer	**Comment**	**Action Taken**
Ethiopia	Target 6 – Change of wording: Policies with adequate provisions to minimize impacts of fisheries on threatened species in place Trends in regular monitoring and reporting of impacts on threatened species of fisheries Trends in global effort in bottom trawling Progress by countries in the degree of implementation of international instruments aimed at combating illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (indicator for SDG	In light of this and other comments (see below) the wording for the indicators has been modified to ensure clarity. The wording for the indicator related to Sustainable Development Goal 14.6 has not been changed as it matches what is used in the Sustainable Development Goal process.

	target 14.6)	
	Target 8 – Change of wording Trends in loss of reactive nitrogen to the environment Proportion of bodies of water with good water quality (indicator for SDG target 6.3)	"Trends in" has been added to ensure consistency with the other indicators and clarity. The suggested change relates to an indicator for to the Sustainable Development Goal target 6.3. The indicator wording matches that used in the SDG process. For this reason the suggested change has not been made.
	Target 9: Change of wording Trends in invasive alien species eradications	The indicator only covers vertebrates as global information for other species groups is not currently available. No change has been made in response to this comment.
	Target 12, Generic indicator, change in wording: Trends in extinction risk of populations and species	The specific indicator associated with this generic indicator refers to both extinction risk and to the status of populations. This is reflected in the wording of the generic indicator. No change has been made in response to this comment.
	Target 13 – change in wording Proportion of local breeds, whose status and trends are classified as increasing, stable, declining (identified risk level of extinction) (indicator for SDG target 2.5)	The indicator is associated with Sustainable Development Goal target 2.5 and the wording reflects that used in the SDG process. No change has been made in response to this comment.
	Target 17 – Generic Indicator - Change in wording Trends in revision, adoption and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, as policy instruments by parties	The term revision has not been included in the generic indicator as it is included in the specific indicator. Also revision is not in the wording of Aichi Target 17. The term developed has been included in the wording of the generic indicator to reflect the idea of the proposed change and to remain in line with the wording of the Aichi Target. The terms "as policy instruments" has been maintained to reflect the wording of the Aichi Target. "By Parties" has not been included as it is implied.
	Target 18 – Additional Generic Indicator Trends in documenting community knowledge, innovations and practices Trends in integrating community knowledge, innovations and practices into local and national development strategies	The first proposed additional generic indicator has not been included as it is not clear how it directly relates to theme of the Aichi Target. The second proposed additional generic indicator has not been included as it addresses issues covered by the generic indicator "Trends in which traditional knowledge and practices are respected through their full integration, safeguards and the full and effective participation of indigenous and local

		communities in the national implementation of the Strategic Plan". No change has been made in response to this comment.
European Commission	Target 11, Protected area coverage of terrestrial, marine and freshwater ecoregions Factual correction: The Joint Research Centre (JRC) of the European Commission (EC) has been calculating this indicator for UNEP-WCMC in 2014 and 2016.	Change made
Mexico	Target 5 - Generic indicator "Trends in extent of natural habitats other than forest". Our experts´ suggestion is to complement one of the specific indicators and add another: • Natural habitat extent (land area minus urban and agriculture). The suggestion is to disaggregate it based on the ecosystem type (scrub, grasslands, meadows, permanent snow and glaciers, areas with scarce vegetation, etc.) • Natural habitat extent (disaggregated by ecosystem type) - expressed as percentage of the total terrestrial surface. Concerning both of the above, the source is FAO: particularly the Global Land Cover Network and Land Cover Classification System.	The natural habitat extent indicator has been developed by the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL). Disagregations of the indicators have not been included in the table in order to keep the table to a manageable size. Also the suggested disaggregations do not appear to be possible to undertake with the currently available information. While the Global Land Cover Classification is a potential useful source of information there is currently no time course data available. The data that is available therefore does not currently allow for the development of an indicator. No changes have been made to the list of indicators in response to this comment.
	Generic indicator "Trends in fragmentation of forest and other natural habitat". Our experts propose to use the ecological integrity index that is obtained through the tool GLOBIO.	No reference to the ecological integrity index could be found in the 2016 March version of the technical description of the GLOBIO Model. The Local Biodiversity Intactness Index, developed by Predicts, is included in the list of indicators related to Target 12, and could provide relevant information on fragmentation. No change has been made to the list of indicators in response to this comment
	Target 14: There is not a global indicator available. The suggestion is to use the indicators "Change in the ecosystem condition index" and "Change on the ecosystem services flux" of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounts (SEEA) of the UNSD.	From the documentation available on the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting website the availability of the indicators is not clear. While guidance related to this issues is available it is not clear that data is currently available and what SEEA's role will be in developing and

		maintaining data associated with the proposed indicators. No change has been made to the list of indicators in response to this comment
BirdLife International	Delete protected areas overlays as per the comment from Japan and as "Protected Area Overlays with Biodiversity" is basically three different indicators produced by WCMC/IUCN/BirdLife – two are in the list already (PA coverage of KBAs and ecoregions), the third (PA coverage of species) is not very feasible to update, and adds little to the others (it makes various problematic assumptions), so my suggestion was to drop it.	Change made
	I'd suggest that some of the new FAO indicators could do with some editing: Existence of monitoring… Presence of legislation… Presence of regulation… Presumably all these should become Proportion of countries with… or Proportion of fish stocks or something like this? What is the scale at which 'presence' will be assessed? Then there are two which are worded as targets not indicators: Policies make adequate provisions…. Policies to secure… are in place. I'd suggest rewording as indicators as above: Proportion of countries/stocks/whatever with policies making adequate provisions etc.	The wording of the indicators has been modified to ensure it is clear what is being monitored and that the indicators are worded as such.
GEO-BON	The existing indicators from GEO BON partner organizations that are found on the updated list were, in some cases, referenced and supported by Party statements at SBSTTA20 indicating their value. While they are not considered 'operational' or 'available today' yet and thus, have not been scored for some criteria in the table (e.g. disaggregable, easy to communicate, etc.), we would suggest that they are provided with a preliminary assessment for these attributes since the majority of them are already being applied at the national and regional level. As a compromise, these indicator assessments could be tagged or footnoted as preliminary in nature (requiring future updates). It might also be worth	Modification to introductory paragraph to make it clear categorization will be added once indicators are available at the global level. As the Local Biodiversity Intactness Index has now been published, criteria have been included. However as the other indicators are not currently available at the global level the criteria of been left blank for the time being.

	providing a specific definition regarding 'available today';	
	Terminology: there is some inconsistency in the table with regard to how indicators, presented and led by GEO BON partner organizations are attributed. In total, there are three indicators included in the table that have been developed by CSIRO, in collaboration with various partners, under the auspices of GEO BON, but these are currently attributed to three different sources – "CSIRO" for the "Biodiversity Habitat Index", "GEO BON" for the "Protected Area Representativeness Index", and "UNEP" for the "Protected Area Connectedness Index". These should all be consistently attributed to the same source. What we suggest is that the new indicators presented by GEO BON partner organizations that are found in the list be tagged as 'GEO BON-CSIRO, GEO BON-Predicts, GEO BON-Map of Life, etc. to ensure consistent attribution	Change made
	Regarding Japan's intervention "This indicator seems to be close or the same as the indicators of Protected Area Connectedness Index (row number 99), so it should be deleted" and the proposed response "The indicator has been removed from the proposed list" – it is not clear what issue is being referred to here, nor what changed is being proposed. The table of indicators lists a single specific indicator "Protected Area Connectedness Index" against "Trends in connectivity and integration of conserved area", so it is not clear what duplication is being referred to. However, the source of this indicator is incorrectly specified as "UNEP" when it should be listed as GEO BON-CSIRO (as suggested in the above point). The "Protected Area Connectedness Index" is one of two components of the "Protected Area Representativeness and Connectedness (PARC) Indices" developed by CSIRO, in collaboration with various partners, under the auspices of GEO BON, the other component being the "Protected Area Representativeness Index" listed against "Trends in ecological representativeness of areas conserved" in the table.	During SBSTTA 20 Japan resubmitted the comments they made during the peer review of the indicators that took place between SBSTTA 19 and 20 and asked that they be reconsidered. What Japan suggested (and what was done for the list of indicators consider at SBSTTA 20) was that the indicator "Land-/Seascape Connectivity Index" was similar to the "Protected Area Connectedness Index" and therefore should be removed. For this reason the Land-/Seascape Connectivity Index was removed from the list that went to SBSTTA 20. There is no suggestion that the "Protected Area Connectedness Index" would be removed from the list at this point. No change required

Comments from the partners of the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership		
Reviewer	**Comment**	**Action Taken**
Global Forest Coalition	Our main concern is that the draft indicators for Aichi Target 11 considered at SBSTTA-20 in April 2016 (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/13, Annex) were overwhelmingly focused on protected areas. They failed to include adequate indicators for 'other effective area-based conservation measures' (in short, conserved areas), which are a key component of Target 11 intended to serve alongside but distinct from protected areas. This illustrates a conceptual and perhaps ideological bias towards conventional protected areas in the Target 11 indicators. If these indicators fail to consider conserved areas, Parties to the CBD will exclude a potentially very significant percentage of effectively conserved lands and waters. Similar points could be made for indicators of other Targets. As stated in UNEP/SBSTTA/20/INF/40, IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas is currently developing guidance on conserved areas. The Target 11 indicators should acknowledge that this process is underway, as it will form an important basis for reporting on progress towards Target 11. 4. We strongly encourage BIP to ensure that each Target 11 indicator that refers to protected areas also explicitly refers to conserved areas. Conserved areas are distinct from protected areas (for example, the definition of a protected area does not require actual effectiveness, whereas conserved areas are actually effectively conserved). Furthermore, custodians of conserved areas may not wish to be included in government protected area systems for various reasons. Thus there is a need to explicitly recognise conserved areas as well.	All of the generic indicators refer to "conserved" and therefore would cover both "other effective area-based conservation measures" as well as "protected areas". The global datasets and indicators which currently exist relate specifically to protected areas. For this reason the specific indicators refer to protected areas and not to conserved areas. However as the current recommendation from SBSTTA to COP is that the list of indicators be kept under review the specific indicators could be modified to include conserved areas once the information becomes available at the global level. The comments provide do not relate to the changes introduced as a result of the discussions at SBSTTA 20. No change to the list of indicators has been made in response to this submission.
	In addition, we encourage BIP to add the following Generic Indicator and Specific Indicators specifically on conserved areas, noting that they are under active development by IUCN, UNEP-WCMC and the ICCA Consortium, among others, and/or	The level of development of the proposed indicators is not clear. The submission notes that the indicators are under development but it is not clear when they will become available. Technical Series 64 dates from 2012 and does not appear to explicitly refer

	can already be sourced from CBD Technical Series No. 64: Generic Indicator: "Trends in recognition of other effective area-based conservation measures (conserved areas)." Specific Indicators: • "Progress by countries in the degree of application of a legal/regulatory/policy/institutional framework to appropriate recognise and support other effective area-based conservation measures (conserved areas)." • "Trends in recognition of ICCAs and other community conservation practices that effectively contribute to conservation regardless of primary objectives." • "[Percentage] [Proportion] of terrestrial and inland water and coastal and marine areas under self-designated effective area-based conservation measures." • "[Percentage] [Proportion] of terrestrial and inland water and coastal and marine areas under government-recognised effective area-based conservation measures."	to the proposed indicators. The comments provide do not relate to the changes introduced as a result of the discussions at SBSTTA 20. No change to the list of indicators has been made in response to this submission.
	The list of indicators considered at SBSTTA-20 included a Generic Indicator on trends in "effectiveness and/or equitability of management of conserved areas". Although the specific reference to conserved areas is welcome, it is well known that there is much work to be done on effectiveness of protected areas. The definition of a protected area does not even require effectiveness in their conservation aims, whereas the very name 'other effective area-based conservation measures' refers to effectiveness of conserved areas. The Generic Indicator should thus be revised to the following, namely, to refer to both effectiveness and equitability in protected areas as well as conserved areas: "Trends in effectiveness and equitability of management of protected areas and conserved areas."	The generic indicator has made a distinction between management effectiveness and equity as these are two distinct issues. In some cases one element may apply more than others. In other cases both elements may apply. The use of "and/or" is to allow for flexibility and does not imply that one element is more important than the other. The comments provided do not relate to the changes introduced as a result of the discussions at SBSTTA 20. No change to the list of indicators has been made in response to this submission
	In addition, governance is a fundamental	The level of development of the proposed

	aspect of management effectiveness and equity, as underscored by Element 2 of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas and by IUCN Best Practice Guidelines on Protected Area Governance. We encourage BIP to add the following Specific Indicator under this Generic Indicator: "Participatory assessments of governance diversity, quality and vitality of protected and conserved areas." Such assessments will be developed by a number of countries as part of the Global Support Initiative for ICCAs, which is funded by the German BMUB and administered by UNDP, with the ICCA Consortium, IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme and UNEP-WCMC as implementing partners. The global ICCA Registry hosted by UNEP-WCMC provides an important source of data on the number, location, extent and diversity of indigenous peoples' and community conserved territories and areas (ICCAs) around the world. The Registry also protects certain information that the peoples and communities concerned wish to remain confidential. CBD Parties should support indigenous peoples and local communities in their countries to provide information on their ICCAs to the global ICCA Registry. Parties should also make a concerted effort to gather more data on ICCAs and report on such information – subject to the concerned peoples' and communities' free, prior and informed consent – in national reports to the CBD and the Global Biodiversity Outlook, among other things.	indicators is not clear. The submission notes that the indicators are under development but it is not clear when they will become available. The comments provided do not relate to the changes introduced as a result of the discussions at SBSTTA 20. No change to the list of indicators has been made in response to this submission.
Terralingua	Terralingua is involved in re. to the Index of Linguistic Diversity, relevant to Target 18. There seems to be no intervention required for that Indicator. However, two corrections needed in the indicators table and anywhere else the ILD is mentioned: - The indicator is called "Index of Linguistic Diversity", not "Global Index of Linguistic Diversity" - The spelling of "Terralingua" is with two	Change made

	"r", not one	
Marine Stewardship Council	Thank you for the update on the BIP indicators. My only comment is that the MSC indicator is not number of fisheries, but certified catch. The indicator name should therefore be “Catch certified by the Marine Stewardship Council” rather than “Trends in fisheries certified by the Marine Stewardship Council.” If you can make that change I would be grateful.	Change made
Comments made during the Twentieth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice		
Reviewer	**Comment**	**Action Taken**
Argentina	Por otro lado, la Argentina ve con preocupación la inclusión de Fuentes no oficiales y de conceptos no consensuados ni legitimados a nivel multilateral. En este sentido, en relación a la propuesta de indicador genérico en la Meta 2 de "flujo de capital natural", sugerimos reemplazar tal expresión por "recursos naturales".	The wording for the generic indicator has been modified to "Trends in incorporation of measures of stock and flow of natural capital resources into national accounting"
	Asimismo, respecto de las inclusiones en varias Metas del "Indice de la Lista Roja" respecto de las especies amenazadas, sugerimos sea reemplazada por los Apéndices CITES de Especies amenzadas, por ser el foro multilateral competente en la materia, y para acomodar el listado de especies amenazadas/en peligro de extinción a los acuerdos multilaterales, evitando interpretaciones extensivas que podrían ser la base de eventuales medidas unilaterales a la comercialización de ciertas especies, por ejemplo pesqueras.	The Red List Index has been published in numerous peer reviewed journals. It has been used in previous editions of the GBO and several countries use national Red List Indices. The Red List Index has been recognized in previous COP decisions including Decision VIII/15. Further there is an indicator based on CITES data included under Target 4. No change to the list of indicators has been made as a result of the comment

	En la Meta 3, respecto de la propuesta de "indicador específico de tendencias en los elementos de apoyo gubernamental a la agricultura posiblemente perjudiciales (estimaciones de apoyo a productores)", debería referirse a tendencias de eliminación, reforma o eliminación, atento el mandato de la OMC en tal sentido respecto de los subsidios agrícolas distorsivos. En la misma línea, debería proponerse lo mismo para los subsidios a las pesquerías, atento el mandato de Doha y Hong Kong para generar disciplinas para la prohibición general de esos subsidios, con excepciones limitadas en número y alcance. En adición, en la Meta 3, queda poco claro el alcance del indicador del número de países con instrumentos nacionales sobre planes de permisos pertinentes atinentes a la diversidad biológica que se comercializan, el que debería ser reformulado en relación a "instrumentos nacionales de conservación y uso sostenible de la diversidad biológica".	The wording of the indicators is that used by the OECD or as proposed for the Sustainable Development Goals. No change has been made as a result of the comment.
	Respecto del indicador en la Meta 4 de "huella ecológica", solicitamos su eliminación ya que dicho concepto no tiene acuerdo multilateral. Del mismo modo, el indicador de "huella del agua" en la Meta 4 va más allá de los acuerdos multilaterales, siendo que en la Agenda 2030 las referencias incluyen el tema de la eficiencia del uso del agua, pero no tal concepto. Acercaremos por escrito estas y otras sugerencias para su consideración. Muchas gracias.	Both the ecological footprint and the water footprint are published indicators. Both indicators have been used in previous editions of the Global Biodiversity Outlook. Further the Ecological Foot print has been recognized in previous COP decisions including Decision VIII/15. No change has been made as a result of the comment.
France	• pour l'objectif d'Aichi 3 : l'indicateur « estimation du soutien aux producteurs » (proposé pour l'objectif 2b des ODD) n'est pas pertinent dans le contexte de la CDB, puisqu'il vise, dans le contexte des ODD, à suivre les subventions entravant le fonctionnement des marchés agricoles, et pas spécifiquement les subventions néfastes pour la biodiversité ; nous demandons donc sa suppression ; Delete - Producer Support Estimate (proposed indicator for SDG target 2.b)	Given that the SDG focuses on trade distortion, the proposed indicators have been removed from the list.
	• pour l'objectif d'Aichi 4 : pour la cible	As the indicator is an SDG indicator, and is

	14.2.1 des ODD, il a été proposé l'indicateur « Proportion de zones économiques exclusives nationales gérées en utilisant des approches écosystémiques ». Cet indicateur a un rapport direct avec la biodiversité, et il serait logique qu'il soit repris dans le contexte de la CDB, par exemple pour le suivi de l'objectif d'Aichi 4 ; Add to Target 4 - Proportion of exclusive national economic zones managed using the ecosystem approach (proposed indicator for SDG target 14.2.1)	relevant to biodiversity, it has been added to the list of indicators.
	• pour l'objectif d'Aichi 7 : s'agissant des « Tendances en matière de risques d'extinction et de population d'espèces spécialistes des forêts dans les forêts de production », pour lesquelles aucun indicateur n'est proposé, nous proposons de retenir un indicateur sur les ressources génétiques forestières déjà validé dans le cadre de la Commission des ressources génétiques pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture (http://www.fao.org/3/a-mm130e.pdf). Add to Target 7 - Trend in number and proportion of species for which distribution is known, forest genetic resources are monitored and characterized and for which information are available in the REFORGEN database.	According to the document referred to the proposed indicator is still at the early stages of development. Further the information does not currently appear to be available from the REFORGEN website. No change to the list of indicators has been made in response to this comment.
	• pour l'objectif d'Aichi 13 : s'agissant des « Tendances en matière de diversité génétique des plantes cultivées », les indicateurs ODD retenus ne sont pas entièrement satisfaisants, car ils ne couvrent pas tous les aspects ; là aussi nous proposons d'ajouter un indicateur (triple) déjà validé dans le cadre de la Commission des ressources génétiques pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture et disponible (http://www.fao.org/3/a-mm294e.pdf/) Add - Number of plant genetic resource for food and agriculture surveyed/inventoried Percentage of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture threatened out of those surveyed/inventoried	The document referred to contains a reporting framework for national use for monitoring the implementation of the Second Global Plan Of Action for Plant and Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. The website for the Global Plan of Action indicates that data provided by countries will be used to generate data for the indicators and to produce a global assessment of the implementation of the Second GPA which will be reviewed by the Commission's Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on PGR at its Eighth Session in June 2016. According to the report prepared for that meeting, by March 2016, 35 countries had completed the reporting framework and that given this the assessment is not

	Number of Standard Material Transfer Agreements, as communicated to the Governing Body of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture	representative of the global state of implementation of the Second GPA Given this, the proposed indicators have been added to the table and categorized as under active development. The monitoring of the second GPA would be relevant to assessment of Aichi Biodiversity Target 13.
	• pour l'objectif d'Aichi 16 : dans la mesure où cet objectif concerne spécifiquement le Protocole de Nagoya et non la problématique plus large de l'accès et du partage des avantages (APA), il paraît pertinent de scinder l'indicateur proposé « Nombre de permis ou leur équivalent mis à disposition du CHM APA, et nombre d'accords standards de transfert de matière communiqué à l'organe directeur du traité international », sa première partie relevant de l'objectif 16, et sa seconde de l'objectif 13; en outre « material » doit ici être traduit par « matériel [génétique] » et non par « matière ». Add to Target 13 - Number of in situ (including on farm) surveys/inventories of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture carried out	The reference to the international treaty has been removed.
	Par ailleurs, nous demandons que, lorsqu'un indicateur ODD est repris comme indicateur CDB, sa formulation soit traduite en français de manière identique dans les deux cadres.	This issue relates to the translation of the SDG indicators. A note will be made to use the appropriate translations in the other language versions.
Japan	Regarding the proposed list of indicators shown in the Annex, we submitted a number of comments to the secretariat at the end of last December. Some of our comments are then seemingly reflected on the current list, whereas other comments are not. For instance, IUCN Protected Areas Categories System may enable more precise assessment of achievement of Target 11. We therefore suggested, if percentage of areas covered with protected areas of Category I (of IUCN's system) can be calculated globally, we could know our progress for the target in terms of substantial regulations (i.e., preservation) simultaneously.	The comments submitted were reviewed as part of the review process for the list of indicators following SBSTTA 19. Responses to the review comments are available from the meeting page of the AHTEG. For ease of reference the comments from Japan as part of the peer review and the Secretariat's response to them are included in the table below. The comments were also reviewed in light of the comments made during SBSTTA 20.

Mexico	Por otro lado, celebramos la sincronización de los indicadores para el Plan Estratégico con los de los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible, a fin de promover sinergias a nivel internacional y nacional. De manera general, estamos de acuerdo con la lista de indicadores propuestos como un marco flexible, conscientes de que ésta se mantendrá en revisión y evolucionará con el tiempo. En este sentido, tenemos una recomendación específica respecto a los indicadores propuestos para las Metas 5 y 14, que tienen un enfoque predominante hacia bosques y humedales, y consideramos conveniente la inclusión de indicadores específicos para otros ecosistemas como matorrales, pastizales y praderas, entre otros.	It is not clear what additional indicators are being suggested. It is not clear that indicators for scrub, grassland and meadows currently exists. If such indicators become available in the future they should be considered for inclusion in the list. No change to the list of indictors has been made.
Norway	Add to target 6 - Number and coverage of stocks with adaptive management systems / plans	Following consultation with the FAO, the indicator has been added to the list as it is currently available and is based on national data which are aggregated.
	Add to target 6 -% of stocks within safe limits	Following consultation with the FAO, the indicator has not been included. It duplicates - Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels which is an SDG indicator.
	Add to target 6 -Progress by countries in the degree of implementation of international instruments aiming to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (proposed indicator for SDG target 14.6)	The indicator was already in the list so no change has been made.
	Add to target 6 -Presence of regulations requiring recovery of depleted species	Following consultation with the FAO, the indicator has been added to the list as it is currently available and is based on national data which are aggregated.
	Add to target 6 -Number and coverage of depleted stocks with rebuilding plan in place	Following consultations with FAO, the indicator has been included as it is under active development
	Add to target 6 -Policies make adequate provisions to minimize impacts of fisheries on threatened species.	Following consultation with the FAO, the indicator has been added to the list as it is currently available and is based on national data which are aggregated.
	Add to target 6 -Coverage of fisheries with regular monitoring and reporting of impacts on threatened species	Following consultations with FAO, the indicator has been included as it is under active development
	Add to target 6 -Coverage (or range of coverage) of threatened species for which mortality rate due to fisheries is decreasing	Following consultations with FAO, the indicator has been included as it is under active development

	Add to target 6 -Policies to secure that mortalities and significant indirect adverse impacts on other species are accounted for are in place	Following consultation with the FAO, the indicator has been added to the list as it is currently available and is based on national data which are aggregated. The wording of the indicator has been modified to reflect comments from FAO (i.e. "other species" has been replaced with "non-target species"
	Add to target 6 -Coverage of fisheries with management measures to reduce bycatch and discards	Following consultation with the FAO, the indicator has been added to the list as it is currently available and is based on national data which are aggregated.
	Add to target 6 -Trends in population of other species affected by fisheries	Following consultations with FAO, the indicator has been included as it is under active development. The wording of the indicator has been modified to reflect the wording used by FAO (i.e. "other species" has been replaced by "non-target species")
	Add to target 6 - Presence of legislation allowing actions protection of vulnerable habitats (including VMEs), and addressing threats to ecosystem structure and function	Following consultations with FAO, the indicator has been included as it is under active development
	Add to target 6 -Existence of ecosystem impact monitoring and/or assessment programmes	Following consultation with the FAO, the indicator has been added to the list as it is currently available and is based on national data which are aggregated.
	Add to target 6 -Amount (spatial extent, gear type, intensity) of fishing effort within vulnerable habitats (desired)	Following consultations with FAO, the indicator has been included as it is under active development
FAO (supported by Norway and EU)	Our comments refer mainly to the indicators in the annex in order to align best existing reporting processes. We seek clarification on SDG 15.4, for which FAO has proposed the Mountain Green Cover Index, whereas the indicator proposed in the annex has a different wording. For completeness, the indicator on 'average dietary energy supply adequacy' should refer to SDG 2.1.2. The various elements of Target 6 have been addressed in different ways through the work of FAO since its establishment, including work to implement the Code of Conduct on Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) adopted to foster implementation of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF), adopted to follow-up on the adoption of the	The indicators related to SDG 15.4 which have been included in the list of indicators match what is included in the document resulting from the 47th session of the United Nations Statistical Commission. The indicator related to average dietary energy supply has been updated to reflect the wording from the 47th session of the United Nations Statistical Commission. The additional proposed indicators for Target 6 have been addressed above in relation to the comments from Norway.

	Ecosystem Approach by the CBD.	
IIFB (supported by EU)	After its February 2016 meeting, a new indicator for land tenure under Goal 1, Target 1.4.2 has been adopted, which needs to replace the indicator listed in the Annex. The new indicator reads as follows Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure."	The indicator has been added to the proposed list as it is an SDG indicator

Comments from Japan made as part of the peer review of the proposed list of indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and resubmitted during SBSTTA 20. For all the comments made during the peer review of the indicators see - https://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/ind/id-ahteg-2015-01/other/id-ahteg-2015-01-reer-review-en.pdf		
Japan	Japan acknowledges that this peer review is to update and revise the proposed list of global indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020; however, we would like to note that Japan will not be able to apply all the indicators into monitoring of national implementation for the SP even when this list is fixed and adopted by the COP. Japan will consider flexible application of the indicators depending on our current situation and circumstances, as appropriate. According to our view mentioned above, we reviewed the proposed list from a technically neutral position. Japan considers that the IUCN Red List is not appropriate to monitor progress of Japan's outcomes for the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets because there is a	SBSTTA recommendation XIX/4 notes that the indicators should be adapt to national priorities and circumstances. No change made to the proposed list of indicators.

	significant difference of designated species between the IUCN Red List and the Japanese Red List. When reporting the progress such as in the sixth national report, we will use the Japanese Red List. There are some indicators that are close to or same as other indicators. Thus, such duplication should be avoided. Details of this point are mentioned in the following cells.	
	The data of Google trends can be obtained for each country as well, and therefore the global data can be disaggregated to create national data. In this regard, the cell of "global indicator can be disaggregated to create national indicator" could be filled with "X".	Change made
	As alternative suggestions, "percentage of schools that have mandatory courses about environmental issues" and/or "percentage of university students who major in environmental sciences or related subjects" could be considered. Such data might be easier to acquire than the suggested indicator (proposed indicator for SDG target 4.7), considering that this proposed indicator is categorized as grey.	The list of indicators has been updated to reflect the documentation for the 47th sessions of the United Nations Statistical Commission The additional proposed indicator has not been included as it is not clear if the indicator exists, who is developing it and/or who is maintaining or developing the data set.
	The suggested indicator is not an indicator, and the words of "number of countries…" may be added at the beginning.	Change made
	The definition of "Trends in the number and value" is unclear. It is not possible to count the number of harmful incentive measures while the parameter is unknown. Also, there could be other harmful incentives that are newly implemented. How the "value" is expressed needs to be clarified.	Change made. Indicator removed and modified to reflect wording of OECD indicator.
	The proposed specific indicator, "Trends in potentially harmful elements of government support to agriculture", should be deleted. It is not clear what "harmful elements" means and how to identify "harmful elements" to biodiversity among government supports to agriculture.	Indicator is one developed by the OECD. The wording of the indicator reflects that used by the OECD.
	The proposed specific indicator, "Percent change in import and export tariffs on agricultural products", should be deleted. We do not see any particular linkage between tariffs and biodiversity.	Wording modified to match that used by the OECD.
	Many cities might be just unaware of Cities Biodiversity Index yet, but that does not mean	It is not clear if this indicator currently exists or who is developing it. It is also not clear if data

	that these cities are environmentally unfriendly. Thus, we would like to suggest adding another indicator, "the proportions of green space in urban areas and/or biodiversity-related budgets" which may be better to monitor the progress for achieving Target 4.	exists. No change made.
	To avoid duplication of the two specific indicators, Japan suggests integrating these into an indicator from the resource of FAO (such as FRA: Global Forest Resources Assessments).	While the indicators have similar names, they rely on different data sets and measure different things. No change made.
	Trend in MSC certified fisheries, tonnage and improvements is an inappropriate indicator. As for the fishery products certification system, it is true that many fishermen get the MSC certification, but there are a lot of certification systems other than MSC in the world. In addition, many fishermen do not try getting fisheries production certification due to the high cost with small benefit, even if their fishing operations are conducted in a sustainable manner.	The indicator, like many of those proposed, has limitations. These limitations need to be acknowledged when the indicators are used. This was the approach used in GBO-3 and GBO-4 which made use of this indicator. The indicator has been retained.
	The fishing activities by bottom trawling do not necessarily induce the destruction of marine ecosystem. Not only bottom trawling but also all fisheries may affect the marine ecosystem including all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants, if they are not managed appropriately. Trawl fisheries are relatively well managed fisheries, setting of total allowable catch based on stock assessment and establishing marine preserve. Also, some trawl fishermen have got MSC and other types of certifications.	The generic indicator associated with this specific indicator has been modified. The word destructive has been removed to not imply that all bottom trawling is destructive.
	Although "fisheries subsidies" has been discussed in the WTO, a consensus has not yet been formed about its definition and rules. Therefore, row number 46 "Dollar value of negative fishery subsidies against 2015 baseline" should be deleted.	The list of indicators has been updated to reflect the documentation for the 47th sessions of the United Nations Statistical Commission
	The estimated fisheries catch is affected by socioeconomic factors such as a taste of consumers and price as well as a stock status. Therefore, a stock trend is a better indicator than "estimated fisheries catch and fishing effort".	Trends in fish stocks is included in the list. Fisheries catch and efforts is an existing indicator. It has been published and was used in GBO-4. Like all indicators, it has limitations and these limitations should be acknowledged when it is used. No change made to the proposed list.
	A catch documentation scheme or similar traceability system is used as a purpose to certify that the fish were caught legally or to carry out	The list of indicators has been updated to reflect the documentation for the 47th sessions of the United Nations Statistical Commission

	distribution management. It is difficult to grasp catch per unit effort by using percentage of catches that are subject to a catch documentation scheme or similar traceability system. Therefore, it is inappropriate to use a catch documentation scheme as an indicator.	
	There are many fishery production certification programs. However, many fishermen do not try getting fisheries production certification due to the high cost with small benefit, even if their fishing operations are conducted in a sustainable manner. Therefore, it is inappropriate to use it as an indicator.	The indicator, like many of those proposed, has limitations. These limitations need to be acknowledged when the indicators are used. This was the approach used in GBO-3 and GBO-4 which made use of this indicator. The indicator has been retained.
	We suggest two databases as sources. "NIES IAS Database" covers IAS information of Japan. At the same time, because many countries/regions have their original databases, we think integration of these databases is necessary. source: IUCN Global Invasive Species Database, NIES IAS Database (http://www.nies.go.jp/biodiversity/invasive/index_en.html)	While the database exists, it is not clear if there is an available indicator or one under development. For this reason no change has been made to the proposed list.
	For instance, “the number of countries that have identified and prioritized IAS “nationally” could be a proposed indicator here. As well, if possible, the number of countries that have early detection systems about IASs may be useful, because most countries may have just listed IASs without early detection and removal systems. Development of systems for reporting new invasions of IASs was requested even in COP6 (guiding principle in Decision VI/23). We suggest two databases as sources. "NIES IAS Database" covers IAS information for Japan. At the same time, because many countries/regions have their original databases, we think that the integration of these databases is necessary. IUCN Global Invasive Species Database, NIES IAS Database (http://www.nies.go.jp/biodiversity/invasive/index_en.html) It seems difficult to use a specific indicator of Row No. 72, because the way of identifying IASs for reporting trends in the distribution and populations may be different among parties.	While the database exists, it is not clear if there is an available indicator or one under development. For this reason no change has been made to the proposed list.

	However, some global organizations/programs could calculate the percentage of IAS that expands their distributions among all IASs identified by global programs such as IUCN Database. If so, by averaging such percentage, we could detect roughly the global trend of IAS's expansions. Thus, we suggest such a percentage as a specific indicator here.	
	Why does this specific indicator focus on vertebrates alone? For instance, global organizations/programs could calculate the percentage of IAS that decline in distributions and/or the number due to eradication/removal among all IASs that are listed by global programs such as IUCN Database. If so, by averaging such percentage, we could detect the global trend of IAS's declines thanks to eradication/removals roughly. Thus, we suggest such a percentage as a specific indicator here. The assessment should be considered for inclusion of national eradication and related efforts about the designated IASs by international efforts such as IUCN Database.	The indicator focuses on vertebrates as that is the information that is currently available. While it would be ideal for the indicator to reflect other types of eradications, this information is not currently available. No change has been made to the proposed list of indicators.
	Not only legislations but development, establishment, and application of practical eradication measures would be an important indicator.	While the additional information would be valuable, it does not currently exists and it is not clear who is working on an indicator related to this issue. No change to the proposed list has been made.
	This generic indicator (extinction risk by IAS) is included in the generic indicator of row no. 76 (impacts of IAS on ecosystems). Thus, we suggest integrating these two indicators.	It is not clear what change is being suggested. No change has been made to the proposed list of indicators.
	We consider that the assessment of impacts on ecosystems is not solely dependent on the impacts of IAS but also other factors such as land change, overexploitation and pollution. The proposed generic indicators such as "Trends in extinction risk and populations driven by IAS impacts" (row No. 75) could also be derived from multiple factors. In other words, it would be difficult to collect and compile simple and schematic data such as a datum that expresses "an increase in the IAS results in a decrease in the potentially-impacted native species", and there is no information on how to assess this proposed generic indicator, "Trends in impacts of IAS on ecosystems". Thus, we would like to suggest deleting this generic indicator.	It is clear that IAS are not the only pressure on ecosystems. However IAS do affect ecosystems and in some cases can be a major determinant of ecosystem health. Therefore, even though no specific indicator currently exists, it would be valuable to have an indicator measuring the impacts of IAS on ecosystem health and integrity. The generic indicator has been retained in order to highlight that this is an issue that is in need of monitoring.
	Specifying numerical targets of this indicator	It is clear that IAS are not the only pressure on

	may be difficult. Increase in the number of detected introductions of IASs does not necessarily mean increase of the introductions of IASs, because developments of detecting IASs' introduction could also lead to the increase in the number of detected introductions of IASs.	ecosystems. However IAS do affect ecosystems and in some cases can be a major determinant of ecosystem health. Therefore, even though no specific indicator currently exists, it would be valuable to have an indicator measuring the impacts of IAS on ecosystem health and integrity. The generic indicator has been retained in order to highlight that this is an issue that is in need of monitoring.
	This indicator seems to be close to or the same as the indicator of "Adoption of national legislation relevant to the prevention or control of invasive alien species" (row number 74), so this specific indicator and its corresponding generic indicator could be deleted.	The list of indicators has been updated to reflect the documentation for the 47th sessions of the United Nations Statistical Commission
	We suggest adding indicators other than ocean acidification, such as water temperature, terrestrial input, and exploitation (e.g., fishery, harvesting). Data for water temperature for coral bleaching is available as "Degree Heating Week" at NOAA, and for terrestrial input at "Reefs at risk". Source: Reefs at Risk (http://www.wri.org/publication/reefs-risk-revisited). Degree Heating Weeks (NOAA Coral Reef Watch) (http://coralreefwatch.noaa.gov/satellite/index.php)	The marine acidity indicator has been retained as it is a proposed SDG indicator. The additional proposed indicators have not been included as they do not directly relate to the target which is about reducing other anthropogenic pressures on vulnerable ecosystems.
	We suggest adding "the number of legislations or action plans adopted for reduction of pressures on coral reefs" as a specific indicator. (E.g., Okinawa Prefecture Red Soil Erosion Prevention Ordinance, The Action Plan to Conserve Coral Reef Ecosystem in Japan.)	The indicator has not been added as it is not clear who is gathering the information/preparing the indicator.
	We suggest adding "trends in the area of mangroves, tidal wetlands, and alpine vegetation". There is "World Atlas of Mangroves", and "Tropical Coastal Ecosystems Portal"(database) for mangroves. Source: World Atlas of Mangroves,Tropical Coastal Ecosystems Portal (http://www.nies.go.jp/TroCEP/index.html)	While there have been studies on these ecosystems. It is not clear if an indicator has been developed or who is developing one. It is also not clear how frequently the data set is updated. The reports referred to appears to be a one-time study. For these reasons no changes have been made to the proposed list.
	Same as row number 81. We suggest adding some quantifiable indicators on ocean acidification, water temperature, terrestrial input, and exploitation.	It is not clear if the proposed indicator exists and/or if they are being developed. No changes have been made to the proposed list of indicators.
	Same as comments for row number 82.	The indicator has not been added as it is not clear who is gathering the information/preparing the indicator.
	IUCN Protected Areas Categories System may	It is not clear if the proposed indicator exists. No

	enable more precise assessment of achievement of the target. Specifically, there are many protected areas that have no substantial regulations, and some scholars call them “paper parks”. Thus, if percentage of areas covered with protected areas of Category I (of IUCN’s system) can be calculated globally, we could know our progress for the target in terms of substantial regulations (i.e., preservation) simultaneously.	change to the proposed indicator list has been made.
	IUCN Protected Areas Categories System may enable more precise assessment of achievement of the target. Specifically, there are many protected areas that have no substantial regulations, and some scholars call them “paper parks”. Thus, if percentage of areas covered with protected areas of Category I (of IUCN system) can be calculated globally, we could know our progress for the target in terms of substantial regulations (i.e., preservation) simultaneously.	It is not clear if the proposed indicator exists. No change to the proposed indicator list has been made.
	This indicator lacks data of coastal area, and similar indicator which includes coastal data is already listed in row number 89 (“Percentage of marine and coastal areas covered by protected areas”), so it should be deleted.	The indicator is a proposed SDG indicator. No changes have been made to the proposed indicator list.
	This indicator seems to be close to or the same as the indicator of “Protected area coverage of Key Biodiversity Areas” (row number 91), so it should be deleted.	While similar, the indicators are different. The KBA indicator shows protected area coverage of important *sites* for biodiversity (locations that have been identified as significant for the global persistence of biodiversity), while the protected area coverage of ecoregions looks at ecological coverage at a much broader scale –that of entire ecosystems.
	Same as the comments in the row 89. Such assessments may indirectly evaluate management effectiveness of protected areas.	It is not clear if the proposed indicator exists. No change to the proposed list has been made.
	Budgets of PAs could be significantly varied depending on whether or not each PA entails land ownership. For instance, in Japan, most national parks do not entail land owning, and hence their budgets are limited in comparison with those of North America, where most areas of national parks are owned by park agencies. In this regard, chronological changes in funding/budgets of each country rather than the funding/budgets *per se* should be relevant and used as an indicator here.	The indicator has been removed from the proposed list.
	This indicator seems to be close to or the same as the indicators of “Protected Area Connectedness Index” (row number 99), so it should be deleted.	The indicator has been removed from the proposed list.

	"Trends in amount of carbon sequestration, as Blue Carbon, in coastal ecosystems" could be an additional indicator which provides information about condition level of coastal ecosystem on climate change. Now there are a few methods to calculate an amount of Blue Carbon. UNEP's Rapid Response Assessment "blue carbon" is useful.	It is not clear if an indicator exists or if one is being developed. The document referred to appears to be a onetime study based on other published literature.
	For instance, percentage of protected areas that implement adaptation and/or mitigation measures against climate change could be considered as an alternative indicator. Such data could be easily understood (more easily than global ecosystem restoration index), and they could be produced at the national level, too.	It is not clear if the indicator proposed currently exists or is under development. It is not clear if data for the proposed indicator exists. No changes to the proposed list of indicators have been made.
	The Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 identified the draft indicators for SDGs as a useful reference for considering indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Since a draft indicator for SDGs 15.6, "Number of countries that have adopted legislative, administrative and policy frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol", is an appropriate indicator for measuring progress on the Aichi Target 16 especially by indicating "the Protocol is in operational, consistent with national legislation", we consider this indicator should be added to the proposed list of indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.	The list of indicators has been updated to reflect the documentation for the 47th sessions of the United Nations Statistical Commission. No change made.
	It seems that this indicator is not satisfactory as its SDG target is "create sound policy frameworks at the national, regional and international levels, based on pro-poor and gender sensitive development strategies, to support accelerated investment in poverty eradication action". Japan would propose to move this proposed indicator for SDG target 1.b into Target 14 section as this indicator is related to gender and poverty issues.	The SDG indicator has been removed. It no longer features in the list proposed for the 47th sessions of the United Nations Statistical Commission
	Japan would like to propose a new specific indicator, "Number of local community-based monitoring on traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity". Knowing the number of Local community-based monitoring such as the Indicators of Resilience in socio-	The indicator has been added.

	ecological production landscapes and seascapes (SEPLS) developed jointly by UNU-IAS, Biodiversity International, IGES and UNDP under the Satoyama Initiative would enable to understand the trends of active participation and involvement of local communities in the monitoring and integration of their traditional knowledge and practices in the implementation of the Strategic Plan. As of the Indicators of Resilience, these are already in use such as in community development project COMDEKS implemented by UNDP, their data are at local community level, and their toolkit is open access (UNEP/CBD/ID/AHTEG/2015/1/INF/10). Available today (X) or under active development (Y): X. Easy to communicate: X Source: Satoyama Initiative	
	There is no rationale for why this indicator of the Aichi Target 19 is specifically focusing on the field of marine technology. Although the SDG target 14 is about marine issues, the indicator of the Aichi Target 19 could take into account terrestrial field as well.	The indicator has been removed.
	We suggest adding a new specific indicator, "Number of local biodiversity strategies and/or action plans formulated by subnational governments, cities and other local authorities", based on Decision X/22.	It is not clear if the indicator exists and/or who is preparing it or collecting the necessary information. The indicator has not been added.