

BirdLife International Priorities for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework **Global Monitoring Framework** (April 2021)

Overarching messages

BirdLife calls for the adoption of a SMART monitoring framework that serves the three following purposes: (a) to assess global progress toward meeting the Goals and Targets of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF), (b) for countries to assess their own national progress, (c) to allow national progress to be compared between countries.

We support a limited set of Headline indicators, which all Parties should be required to report against, that are able to generate national-level data that can be readily aggregated to assess global progress. These Headline indicators must be supported by a larger set of Component indicators that translate across each identified component of the Goals and Targets and a set of Complementary indicators which are available for in-depth or thematic analyses. While flexibility should be allowed for Parties to use the most nationally appropriate Component indicators, these indicators should be standardised and comparable wherever possible.

BirdLife has identified gaps in the current draft monitoring framework, especially with regard to reducing threats to biodiversity. We make recommendations for the inclusion of additional indicators and several amendments in the naming of some indicators to better track progress at the national, regional, and global scales.

Principles for the draft monitoring framework

The need for a SMART framework: The global monitoring framework needs to support SMART (Specific, Measurable, Ambitious, Realistic and Timebound) targets¹ – and needs the target wording to clearly read across to the indicators. A SMART target will make it easier to define appropriate indicators.

Purpose of the monitoring framework: We note that indicators in the monitoring framework serve three purposes: (a) **to assess global progress**, (b) **for countries to assess their own national progress**, (c) **to allow national progress to be compared between countries**. In some cases, the same indicator will serve all three purposes (e.g. an indicator mobilised nationally using

¹ Specific, Measurable, Ambitious, Realistic & Time-bound, to which we add Unambiguous & Scalable: Green et al. 2019
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13322>

BirdLife International is the world's largest nature conservation partnership, with 115 partners. Through our unique local-to-global approach, we deliver high impact and long term conservation for the benefit of nature and people.

For more information, see www.birdlife.org/post2020 or contact:

- **Dr Amy McDougall**, Global Biodiversity Policy Coordinator (amy.mcdougall@birdlife.org)
- **Dr Noëlle Kümpel**, Head of Policy (noelle.kumpel@birdlife.org)

standardised methods that allow comparison between countries and that allow aggregation to form a global indicator). In other cases, countries may use the best version of an indicator available locally to assess their own national progress, but this may not allow comparison between countries as easily. For this purpose, national disaggregation of a global version of the indicator could be used if they are available and valid at the national scale (which is not yet the case for some of the current global headline indicators in CBD/SBSTTA/24/INF/16 Annex 1). **It is key that the indicator set reflects the diversity of methods and scales for data collection.**

Availability of indicators: The global monitoring framework should include priority indicators that have been tried, reviewed, and published in the peer-reviewed literature as well as other appropriate indicators that are already used to report on progress toward other global processes to enhance synergies (e.g. SDGs, other conventions, IPBES etc.). Following the recommendations in INF document 16, the global monitoring framework should also allow an **element of flexibility** to accommodate new and more suitable indicators as they are developed.

The need for guidance: Further guidance will be needed to assist Parties in using the indicators in monitoring on the ground, especially in terms of the Headline and Component indicators to allow for robust comparability and aggregation (where relevant). For example, guidance will be required for each indicator to set out and explain the methodologies to be used at national scales to construct meaningful versions or equivalents of the indicators.

The three-tiered approach to indicators

There is room for much improvement to the structure of the monitoring framework, and the definitions of each indicator tier and their inter-relationships. While we briefly discuss our recommendations for each indicator tier below, we will give more in-depth recommendations for our priority indicators.

1) Headline indicators

A primary aim of developing Headline indicators is to generate comparable national-level reporting data that are readily aggregated to assess global progress. It is key that the data used for Headline indicators are standardised to allow for consistent monitoring which enables comparison between and across countries. We need this in order to appropriately implement the 'ratcheting' of global commitments through the implementation mechanism.

All Parties should be required to report against the full list of Headline indicators in a section of their National Reports, using standardised methods for data sources. In some cases this will require development of expanded monitoring, assessment and data compilation at the national scale (e.g. implementation of population abundance monitoring to allow national indices to be developed, such as the Wild Bird Indices recently developed for Botswana and Uganda).

We agree with the call from many Parties to have a limited list of Headline indicators. The number per goal, milestone and target will vary and depend on the complexity of each of these, and the availability/feasibility of appropriate indicators. **We don't agree with the proposal to group the targets under the goals with just a few Headline indicators for each grouped cluster** – as this would make the monitoring framework confusing (SMART targets would not

clearly translate across to indicators), and would risk some targets not being clearly reported against.

The process for choosing Headline indicators must be clear and transparent, and we see the following criteria as key:

- **Easily understood:** it is conceptually clear how the indicator relates to the goal or target and the data is easy to interpret and present
- **Quantitative:** the indicator enables accurate measurement of the feature of interest with low bias and assessment of error. It shows trends over time, measures a rate of change and changes in the rate, and has good spatial coverage.
- **Amenable to analysis at different scales:** the indicator is nationally relevant, including the ability of the indicator to be disaggregated and/or aggregated from global to national and national to global scales without creating bias. This is to help understand the underlying patterns and shed light on the potential drivers of change and remedial policy actions.
- **Scientifically robust:** the methodology for the indicator and the underlying data are published in a peer reviewed location that can be accessed, and the methodology can be repeated by other scientists or agencies with the same overall result obtained.
- **Regular data collection:** data for the indicator can be updated regularly throughout the duration of the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.
- **Good availability and support:** the indicator currently exists or is likely to be agreed through a scientific or intergovernmental process where there is an existing body that will continue to review and revise the methodology as needed, such as the indicators identified for monitoring implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

2) Component indicators

These indicators must **clearly translate across to the monitoring of each identified component of each of the Goals and Targets** (the components are shown in the draft monitoring framework in CBD/SBSTTA/24/3/Add.1).

All Parties should be encouraged to report against these as far as possible.

While there should be flexibility for Parties to use the most nationally appropriate component indicators, these indicators should be standardised and comparable wherever possible, such as through using a methodology that is derived in a standardised way. This is especially important if there is a limited number of Headline indicators, meaning that many elements of the targets are not explicitly addressed in the Headlines. Therefore, it must be made clear to all Parties that Headline and Component indicators are equally needed to adequately assess progress at all scales.

3) Complementary indicators

These indicators should be **available for thematic or in-depth analysis** for each Goal and Target but should not be required for all parties to report against.

Recommendations on specific indicators

Below are BirdLife's recommendations for specific indicators. Based on the annex presented in CBD/SBSTTA/24/3/Add.1, we make recommendations for where indicators should be retained, changed (either in terms of wording or indicator level) and added.

Goal A on conservation of ecosystems, species and genetic diversity

- **Retain** as is:
 - Headline indicator A.0.2. Living Planet Index
 - Headline indicator A.0.3. Red list Index
 - Component indicator A.1.4. Red list Index by species group
 - Complementary indicator A.1.1.55. Red List Index (wild relatives of domesticated animals)
 - Complementary indicator A.1.1.33 Biodiversity Intactness Index
- **Change:**
 - Move A.1.1.43. Wild bird Index to become a Component indicator.
 - Move A.1.1.40. to become a Component indicator and re-word as "Percentage of threatened species that have improved in status since 2020"
 - We note that Complementary indicator A.1.1.41. "Number of threatened species by species group" is rendered superfluous by Component Indicator A.1.4 Red List Index by species group" because the latter factors out changes in knowledge and taxonomy that render trends in the number of threatened species per species group problematic to interpret.
- **Add:**
 - A Component indicator: "Number of extinctions prevented owing to conservation actions"

Goal B on nature's contributions to people

- **Retain** as is:
 - Complementary indicator B.1.1.2. Red List Index (pollinating species)
 - Complementary indicator B.1.1.7. Climatic Impact Index
- **Change:**
 - The baseline of the B.1.1.2 Red List Index (pollinating species) to the correct baseline year of 1998

Target 1 on ecosystems and spatial planning and land/sea use change

- **Retain** as is:
 - Complementary indicator 1.1.1.2 'Percentage of spatial plans utilising information on key biodiversity areas
- **Change:**
 - Reword Headline indicator 1.0.1. as "Percentage of land covered by biodiversity-inclusive landscape scale land-use plans for terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecosystems"
 - Move 1.1.1.1. to become a Component indicator

Target 2 on area-based conservation measures

- **Change:**

- Re-word Headline indicator 2.0.1. as “Protected area and OECM coverage of Key Biodiversity Areas” which is an existing SDG indicator, and delete Complementary indicator 2.1.1.3
- Re-word Complementary indicator 2.1.1.2. as “Proportion of Key Biodiversity Areas in favourable condition” and upgrade to Component indicator
- **Add:**
 - Current Headline indicator 3.0.1 ‘Protected areas management effectiveness’
 - A Complementary indicator: “Number of countries in which KBA inventories have been updated nationally using the Global KBA Standard”

Target 3 on species conservation actions

- **Change:**
 - Reword Headline indicator 3.0.2. as “Proportion of species requiring intensive recovery actions to avoid extinction that are under active recovery management”
 - Remove Headline indicator 3.0.1 (this is covered under Target 2). Not all protected areas are managed for conservation of species (as opposed to ecosystems)
 - Reword Component indicator 3.1.2. as “Number of species for which recovery has been documented using ‘green status of species’ assessments on the IUCN Red List”
 - Re-word Complementary indicator 3.1.1.4. as “Percentage of threatened species that have improved in status since 2020”
- **Add:**
 - A Component indicator: “Mean % of each Key Biodiversity Area identified for globally threatened species that is covered by protected areas or other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs)”
 - A Component indicator: “Proportion of Key Biodiversity Areas identified for globally threatened species in ‘favourable condition’”
 - A Component indicator for component 3.3 “Number of countries with a national species recovery plan” as follow “Number of threatened species for which global or national action/recovery plans are i) up to date, and ii) being implemented

Target 4 on sustainable harvesting, trade and use of wild species

- **Add:**
 - A Complementary indicator: “Red List Index (Impacts of utilisation)”
 - A Complementary indicator: “Red List Index (Impact of fisheries)”

Target 5 on invasive alien species

- **Retain** as is:
 - Component indicator 5.1.4. Red List Index (impacts of invasive alien species)
 - Component indicator 5.1.5. Proportion of key biodiversity areas threatened by invasive alien species

Target 6 on addressing pollution

- **Add**
 - A Component to the target reading “Avoidance of harm from pollution to biodiversity and ecosystem functions and human health”
 - Against this new Component, add a Component indicator: “Red List Index (impacts of pollution)”

Target 7 on climate change mitigation and adaptation

- **Add:**
 - A Complementary indicator: "Climatic Impact Index"
 - Through development, indicators that measure the:
 - Number of countries that include nature-based solutions as part of national commitments to mitigate climate change impacts through biogenic carbon sequestration and storage
 - Number of countries that include nature-based solutions as part of adaptation approaches in national coastal, water, fire, agricultural, health and disaster risk reduction strategies
 - Contribution of biodiversity-inclusive nature-based solutions measured as an amount of greenhouse gas/carbon dioxide equivalent in emissions reductions and enhanced sinks [at global level or evidenced in individual countries' NDCs]
 - Extent of high carbon areas being managed as nature-based solutions for mitigation
 - Extent of high carbon areas being managed as nature-based solutions for adaptation

Target 8 on sustainable management of wild species of fauna and flora

- **Retain** as is:
 - Complementary indicator 8.1.1.4. Red List Index (species used for food and medicine)
- **Add:**
 - A Complementary indicator: "Red List Index (impacts of fisheries)"
 - A Complementary indicator: "Red List Index (impact of utilisation)"

Target 9 on productive ecosystems managed for sustainable use

- **Retain** as is:
 - Complementary indicator 9.1.1.2. Red List Index (wild relatives of domesticated animals)
 - Complementary indicator 9.1.1.3. Red List Index (pollinating species)
- **Add:**
 - A Component indicator: "Wild Bird Index"

Target 13 on mainstreaming and economic reform

- **Add:**
 - A Component indicator: "The proportion of national biodiversity policies and plans that incorporate national spatial assessments of KBAs and other areas of importance for biodiversity"
 - Component indicator: SDG indicator 12.1.1: 'Number of countries with sustainable consumption and production (SCP) national action developing, adopting or implementing policy instruments aimed at supporting the shift to sustainable consumption and production (SCP)' specifying that this should be limited to plans explicitly incorporating biodiversity considerations or with SCP mainstreamed as a priority or a target into national policies including NBSAPs.'
 - Other suggested indicators (based on no net loss/net gain but could alternatively reference sustainable production and consumption or sustainable practices):
 - Proportion of national territory covered by current biodiversity-inclusive strategic environmental assessment (or equivalent comprehensive spatial planning)
 - Number of governments/subnational governments (a) with public procurement policies and action plans for achieving at least no net loss or net gain of

biodiversity and (b) achieving at least no net loss or net gain of biodiversity through these policies and plans

- Number of sector-wide policies in place for achieving no net loss or net gain of biodiversity

Target 14 on supply chains

- **Change:**
 - Headline indicator 14.0.2 to reference SDG 12.6.1: 'Number of companies publishing sustainability reports', retaining the requirement to publish impacts on biodiversity
- **Add** suggested indicators (based on no net loss/net gain but could alternatively reference sustainable production and consumption or sustainable practices):
 - Number of countries having policies requiring no net loss or net gain of biodiversity and reporting for companies listed or operating in their territories
 - Number of financial institutions using biodiversity metrics to guide investment and risk management around a goal of no net loss or net gain of biodiversity
 - Number of companies that have set and implemented targets for achieving no net loss or net gain of biodiversity, taking into consideration biodiversity impacts across their value chains
 - Number of sectoral policies in place for achieving no net loss or net gain of biodiversity
 - Number of governments/subnational governments (a) with public procurement policies and action plans for achieving at least no net loss or net gain of biodiversity and (b) achieving at least no net loss or net gain of biodiversity through these policies and plans

Target 18 on resource mobilisation

- **Add:**
 - An indicator tracking the number of countries with National Biodiversity Finance Plans
 - A cross-reference to the Target 17 Headline indicators on reduction and redirection of harmful subsidies and incentives

Target 19 on information sharing

- **Retain** as is:
 - Complementary indicator 19.1.1.3. Proportion of known species assessed through the IUCN Red List
 - Complementary indicator 19.1.1.5. Number of assessments on the IUCN Red List of threatened species
- **Add:**
 - Complementary indicator on 'number of countries in which comprehensive national Key Biodiversity Areas assessments have been updated using the KBA global standard' and as well as this trend in awareness of biodiversity information we believe it is important to have an indicator to monitor trends in use of that information to guide policy