

**TEMPLATE FOR COMMENTS AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS ON DRAFT DOCUMENTATION
FOR SBSTTA-19**

Contact information		
Surname:	Brooks	
Given Name:	Thomas	
Government (if applicable):		
Organization:	IUCN	
E-mail:	t.brooks@iucn.org	
Title of document reviewed:	IUCN peer review comments on UNEP/CBD/ID/AHTEG/2015/1/2	
Comments on the draft documentation for SBSTTA-19		
Page	Paragraph	Comment
0	0	IUCN considers the use of indicators to track progress towards intergovernmental commitments, goals, and targets as essential, and in this light welcomes the SCBD's efforts to convene an Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on Indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and appreciates the opportunity to provide peer review comments into UNEP/CBD/ID/AHTEG/2015/1/2 on "Global Indicators and Sub-Global Approaches to Monitor Progress in the Implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020".
0	0	IUCN also considers it essential that the development of indicators towards the biodiversity-related components of the Sustainable Development Goals draw from the existing indicators mobilised towards the Aichi Targets through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP).

0	0	<p>For more than five decades, the Members, Commissions, Secretariat, and partners of IUCN have mobilised biodiversity information to support decision-making to aid sustainable development. Particularly noteworthy among these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (mobilised through the IUCN Species Survival Commission, the IUCN Red List Partnership, and the IUCN Global Species Programme); - Protected Planet (jointly mobilised through the United Nations Environment Programme's World Conservation Monitoring Centre, the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, and the IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme); - Key Biodiversity Areas (for which a new global standard is very close to completion, drawing from decades of work by IUCN Members in identification of important sites such as BirdLife International's Important Bird Areas and the Alliance for Zero Extinction); - the new IUCN Red List of Ecosystems (under development by the IUCN Commission on Ecosystem Management and IUCN Ecosystem Management Programme, with a targeted first assessment by 2025). <p>Different combinations of these knowledge products were used to generate nearly a third of the 55 indicators harnessed to report on progress towards the Aichi Targets in the Fourth Global Biodiversity Outlook, and contributed through into the BIP. A summary of this effort is in press in "Biodiversity" (Brooks et al. 2015) titled "Harnessing biodiversity and conservation knowledge products to track the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals".</p>
0	0	<p>Importantly, all of these indicators can be disaggregated spatially to provide national (and regional) level indicators; moreover, both the Protected Planet and Key Biodiversity Areas knowledge products are generated through national level processes, while the red lists are generated through contributions from national, regional, and global processes. In addition to being important in supporting global indicators to track progress towards the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, these knowledge products are also therefore valuable in assisting CBD parties in the development of national indicators.</p>
0	0	<p>Over the last couple of years, IUCN has been leading an analysis of the costs to date, annual costs, and projected costs to reach and maintain comprehensive baselines for these knowledge products. This reveals that investment to date has summed \$160m, plus 293 years of volunteer time. An additional \$93 m will be necessary to reach comprehensive baselines for all four knowledge products, and, once these are reached, the ongoing annual cost of maintaining the four knowledge products will be \$13m. Annual costs of equivalent information systems in other domains are much higher, e.g., US Census (\$13bn), Global Observing System for Climate (\$5-7bn), US West Coast Earthquake Early Warning system (\$16m).</p>
0	0	<p>Given this, IUCN maintains that the top priority action regarding indicators to monitor progress in implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity by 2020 is to strengthen investment in the maintenance of existing indicators and the knowledge products which underpin them. This maintenance is continually challenging; it cannot be assumed.</p>
0	0	<p>In strengthening the current BIP indicators set, IUCN sees the disaggregation of "multipurpose" indicators to serve as indicators towards multiple targets as a particularly promising approach. Thus, for example, disaggregations of the Red List Index are currently documented in the BIP as serving as indicators towards Aichi Targets 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, and 14. Opportunities exist for additional subdivisions of the Red List Index as indicators towards Aichi Targets 8, 11, and 13. This is also consistent with the approach to indicator mobilisation towards the Sustainable Development Goals.</p>

0	0	Beyond the existing indicators set, IUCN cautiously endorses the proposals from the BIP to fill gaps where Aichi Targets are currently without indicators. This is in particular the case for Aichi Targets 2, 3, and 15, and to a lesser extent for Aichi targets 7, 10, 14, and 18. IUCN urges that development of indicators towards these targets should first and foremost seek collaboration with institutions beyond biodiversity and conservation who maintain relevant knowledge products, to minimise costs and avoid any danger of duplication of effort.
0	0	By contrast, IUCN is not supportive of the development of additional new indicators for those Aichi Targets for which BIP indicators already exist, with the exception of additional disaggregations of existing indicators. This is a distraction from the maintenance of existing indicators, duplicates effort, and imposes an opportunity cost on the BIP in maintenance of additional indicators, without delivering substantive additional benefit. IUCN therefore recommends against spending time in discussing “Additional potential indicators”.
8	29	Delete, further to comments above.
10-21	Annex	Delete italicised indicators in Annex, with the exception of a) those that are disaggregations of existing, multipurpose BIP indicators (RLI, LPI), and b) those for Aichi Targets 2, 3, 7, 10, 14, 15, and 18.

Please submit your comments to secretariat@cbd.int or by fax at +1 514 288 6588.