ONU
programa para el medio ambiente

Convención sobre la conservación de las especies migratorias de animales silvestres

CMS

NOTIFICACIÓN A LAS PARTES

ANÁLISIS ACTUALIZADO DE LA SECRETARIA DE LA CMS DEL PRIMER PROYECTO DEL MARCO MUNDIAL DE LA DIVERSIDAD BIOLÓGICA POSTERIOR A 2020 Y SUS INDICADORES PRINCIPALES PROPUESTOS

La Secretaría de la CMS se complace en compartir un análisis actualizado del primer borrador del Marco Mundial de la diversidad biológica posterior a 2020 (GBF), y sus indicadores generales propuestos, con respecto a cómo a cómo se relacionan con las prioridades de la CMS acordadas en la COP13 de la Convención a través de la Declaración de Gandhinagar (Resolución 13.1).

Estos documentos se presentan para la reanudación de la tercera reunión del Grupo de Trabajo de composición abierta sobre el GBF (WG2020/3, 13-29 de marzo, Ginebra, Suiza) y tienen en cuenta los debates celebrados durante la primera sesión del WG2020/3, así como las reflexiones posteriores de los copresidentes.

Se alienta a los Puntos Focales de la CMS a considerar estas recomendaciones y a establecer enlaces con sus homólogos del CDB o con aquellos que asistirán al WG2020/3 para garantizar que las prioridades de la CMS se reflejen en el GBF y su marco de seguimiento.

http://www.cms.int/es/news/notifications

Updated CMS Secretariat analysis of the
draft post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

Provided for the resumed session of the third meeting of the Working Group
(13 - 29 March 2022 - Geneva, Switzerland)

14 February 2022

Introduction

This document provides an analysis of the draft post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) with respect to how it delivers on the CMS priorities for the GBF agreed at the Convention's COP13 through the Gandhinagar Declaration (Resolution 13.1) It takes into account discussions during the first session of the third meeting of the Working Group which was held virtually from 23 August to 3 September 2021 (CBD/WG2020/3/5), and the subsequent Reflections by the Co-Chairs (CBD/WG2020/3/6).

While the current draft GBF includes important aspects relevant to CMS priorities, there are a number of areas which would benefit from further improvement.

CMS priorities for goals & targets

Five key priorities for the post-2020 GBF were agreed by CMS COP13:

 1. Ecological connectivity to be reflected effectively in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

- Ecological connectivity is a fundamental requirement for functioning ecosystems and for migratory species. To be effective, spatial planning should include connectivity as a key criterion for determining   which areas to establish as protected areas, and/or as areas of priority for restoration. But ecological connectivity goes beyond the bounds of single-site protection, and spatial planning   should consider measures to ensure functional connectivity involving networks of sites that have some level of protection. Sites relevant for migratory species may include multiple use areas along migratory routes within built or transformed landscapes.

- The IPBES Global Assessment found that connectivity had not been adequately addressed by governments under the framework of the Aichi Targets. Thus, the GBF needs to ensure that connectivity is accurately and effectively addressed.

 2. Effectively address the conservation needs of endangered species and species with an unfavourable conservation status, including goals and targets to halt species declines.

- Extinction of species and collapsing abundance and distribution of populations are worsening. The Global Framework needs to go beyond objectives that simply define types of response activity, and define *recovery outcomes* in terms of (for example) abated pressures, halted extinctions, sustainably maintained population levels and unimpeded migration systems.

- The GBF needs to state clearly that *any use* of wild species must be legal and sustainable.

3. Provisions encouraging Parties to include in their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) appropriate reference to other biodiversity-related conventions to which they are also Parties, ensuring effective liaison between the respective national focal points so as to reflect the priorities and align the efforts made under the various agreements.

- One of the most effective means to ensure better coordination of implementation efforts under the various MEAs is to reflect them, as relevant for each country, in NBSAPs. This has been called for in numerous COP decisions of CBD, CMS and others.

4. Recognition of the role of the various biodiversity-related Conventions as well as other relevant MEAs, for effective implementation, monitoring, and review of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

- Coordinated delivery of the GBF will be most effectively ensured if the Framework explicitly recognizes the contribution that relevant MEAs will make.

5. Promote international cooperation for the implementation of the new Global Biodiversity Framework.

- While implementation of the GBF is principally a matter for each CBD Party, aspects of the GBF will only be achievable if there is international cooperation to implement them. The Aichi Targets omitted this key point, and it is important that it be reflected clearly in the GBF.

Specific recommendations

➢ GOAL A

Current language:

Goal A: *The integrity of all ecosystems is enhanced, with an increase of at least 15 per cent in the area, connectivity and integrity of natural ecosystems, supporting healthy and resilient populations of all species, the rate of extinctions has been reduced at least tenfold, and the risk of species extinctions across all taxonomic and functional groups, is halved, and genetic diversity of wild and domesticated species is safeguarded, with at least 90 per cent of genetic diversity within all species maintained.*

    Milestone A.1: *Net gain in the area, connectivity and integrity of natural systems of at least 5 per cent.*

    Milestone A.2: *The increase in the extinction rate is halted or reversed, and the extinction risk is reduced by at least 10 per cent, with a decrease in the proportion of species that are threatened, and the abundance and distribution of populations of species is enhanced or at least maintained.*

    Milestone A.3: *Genetic diversity of wild and domesticated species is safeguarded, with an increase in the proportion of species that have at least 90 per cent of their genetic diversity maintained.*

Recommendation

(Goal A): *The <u>area, connectivity and</u> integrity of all ecosystems <u>are</u> ~~enhanced, with an~~ increase<u>d by</u> ~~of~~ at least 15 per cent ~~in the area, connectivity and integrity of natural ecosystems,~~ supporting healthy and resilient populations of all species, <u>human-caused</u> ~~the rate of~~ extinctions ha<u>ve</u>~~s~~ been <u>halted</u> ~~reduced at least tenfold, and the~~*

risk of species extinctions across all taxonomic and functional groups, is halved, and *genetic diversity of wild and domesticated species is safeguarded, with at least 90 per cent of genetic diversity within all species maintained.*

Milestone A.1: *Net gain in the area, connectivity and integrity of natural systems by of at least 5 per cent, and in connectivity and integrity by at least 10 per cent.*

Milestone A.2: *Human-caused extinctions are halted, The increase in the extinction rate is halted or reversed, and the extinction risk is reduced by at least 20 10 per cent, with a decrease in the proportion of species that are threatened, and the abundance and distribution of populations of species is significantly enhanced or at least maintained.*

Rationale

- The first clause of Goal A uses the word "integrity" as the umbrella concept for "area, connectivity and integrity". While "integrity" may capture some aspects of ecological connectivity within individual areas, it does not adequately address connectivity between areas that comprise ecological networks which are critical for supporting the life-cycles of migratory animals. The revised Glossary (CBD/WG2020/3/3/Add.2/Rev.1) defines "integrity" in terms of properties of "an ecosystem", thus reinforcing this point. It is critically important that ecological connectivity be clearly articulated as a distinct and independent element of Goal A. The proposed wording is in line with the original version of the Goal set forth in the updated Zero Draft of the GBF (CBD/POST2020/PREP/2/1, August 2020).

- The objectives relating to species extinctions should focus on human causes of extinction (as proposed by several Parties during the 1st part of the WG2020/3 meeting in August 2021), and these objectives need to be more ambitious. Under Milestone A, increasing connectivity can be achieved through restoration and other measures. Under Milestone A.2, reducing the rate of extinction by tenfold and halving the risk of extinctions by 2050 is not sufficient to address the alarming trends of species loss. Merely halting the increase in the rate of extinctions (Milestone 1) will be inadequate for many endangered species. In Milestone 2, merely "maintaining" the abundance and distribution of species may condemn those with currently non-viable populations to inevitable extinction.

➢ TARGET 1

> Current language:
>
> *Ensure that all land and sea areas globally are under integrated biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning addressing land- and sea-use change, retaining existing intact and wilderness areas.*

Recommendation

Ensure that all land and sea areas globally are under integrated biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning addressing land- and sea-use change, improving their connectivity and retaining existing intact and wilderness areas.

Rationale

- Improving connectivity is an integral function of spatial planning. Several Parties at the 1st part of the WG2020 meeting in August 2021 proposed adding reference to improvement of connectivity.

➢ TARGET 2

Current language:

Ensure that at least 20 per cent of degraded freshwater, marine and terrestrial ecosystems are under restoration, ensuring connectivity among them and focusing on priority ecosystems.

Recommendation

Ensure that at least 20 per cent of degraded ~~freshwater, marine and terrestrial ecosystems~~ land and sea areas and their connectivity are ~~under restoration~~ restored, ~~ensuring connectivity among them and~~ focusing on priority ecosystems.

Rationale

- Text in the updated zero draft provided for restoration of connectivity "*to restore [X%] of degraded freshwater, marine and terrestrial natural ecosystems and connectivity among them*" (in former Target 1). Now the provision is only for ensuring connectivity *among* the ecosystems that are being restored, i.e. not for restoring connectivity itself. Three Parties at the 1st part of the WG2020 meeting in August 2021 proposed amendments to address this. The target is also relatively weak by only aiming to have ecosystems be "under restoration" (which could be satisfied by minimal efforts) rather than being "restored".

- The Working Group Co-Chairs in their "reflections" paper (CBD/WG2020/3/6) have suggested replacing "freshwater, marine and terrestrial ecosystems" with "land and sea areas". Since the definition of "land and sea areas" in the revised Glossary (CBD/WG2020/3/3/Add.2/Rev.1) includes "all terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems", this change would be an improvement, given that it better covers (for example) inland brackish and saltwater aquatic systems. It would also make Target 2 consistent with Target 1.

➢ TARGET 3

Current language:

Ensure that at least 30 per cent globally of land areas and of sea areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and its contributions to people, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.

Recommendation

Ensure that at least 30 per cent globally of land areas and of sea areas, ~~especially~~ including all areas of particular importance for biodiversity ~~and its contributions to people,~~ are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.

Rationale

- The recognition here of the need for protected areas and OECMs to be "well connected" is crucial; it reflects the concept of connectivity   not only in terms of connecting contiguous areas but as part of a network of areas of importance for migratory species.

- The Co-Chairs' "reflections" paper ([CBD/WG2020/3/6](CBD/WG2020/3/6)) confirms that the 30% target is seen as a global objective, not something to be achieved in every country. This could lead to inadequate protection in some   areas.

- Regarding the reference to biodiversity's contributions to people, that is the focus of Target 9, and it would be better to address the concept there, rather than complicate Target 3 by adding this extra criterion here.

➢ TARGET 4

> Current language:
>
> *Ensure active management actions to enable the recovery and conservation of species and the genetic diversity of wild and domesticated species, including through ex situ conservation, and effectively manage human-wildlife interactions to avoid or reduce human-wildlife conflict.*

Recommendation

~~Ensure active management actions to enable the recovery and conservation of species~~ Ensure that the favourable conservation status of wild species is restored and maintained, and the genetic diversity of wild and domesticated species is recovered and conserved, including through in situ and ex situ conservation, and effectively manage ~~the effective management of~~ human-wildlife interactions to avoid or reduce human-wildlife conflict.

Rationale

- Species declines are mainly driven by the negative impacts of a range of sectors, and "active management" of species will not address those drivers. The suggested text is results-oriented, and efforts to achieve it could include, but not be limited to, active management.

- Merely "enabling" recovery and conservation of species is a "means" objective and does not express an outcome. It will be insufficient to counter the threats that species face. Two Parties at the 1st part of the WG2020 meeting in August 2021   proposed amendments to convert this provision to a more concrete objective.

- Several Parties have commented that referring only to *ex situ* conservation is insufficient, and the Co-Chairs have suggested adding reference to *in situ* measures. This would be an improvement.

➢ TARGET 5

> Current language:
>
> *Ensure that the harvesting, trade and use of wild species is sustainable, legal, and safe for human health.*

Recommendation

> *~~Eliminate all~~ ~~Ensure that the~~ harvesting, trade and use of wild species ~~that is~~ ~~un~~sustainable, ~~ill~~egal ~~or unsafe for either target or non-target species~~, ~~and safe for~~ ~~human health~~, or that risks spreading pathogens and diseases.*

Rationale

- The current wording of this target unfortunately suggests that its intent is to *increase* the current levels of harvesting, trade and use of wild species ('*ensure that harvesting … is legal')*. This important target should be drafted more clearly such that   that *any use* of wild species must be sustainable, legal, and effectively regulated. Several Parties have raised the same point, and the Co-Chairs in their paper ([CBD/WG2020/3/6](CBD/WG2020/3/6)) have suggested an alternative wording ("Eliminate unsustainable, illegal and unsafe harvesting, trade and use") which acknowledges this problem.

- The target has significantly narrowed from earlier versions by including the issue of safety solely in terms of human health. Many Parties have expressed concern about this, and the Co-Chairs' suggested alternative (quoted above) would remove this limitation.

➢ TARGET 7

> Current language:
>
> *Reduce pollution from all sources to levels that are not harmful to biodiversity and ecosystem functions and human health, including by reducing nutrients lost to the environment by at least half, and pesticides by at least two thirds and eliminating the discharge of plastic waste.*

Recommendation

> *Reduce pollution from all sources to levels that are not harmful to biodiversity, ~~and~~ ecosystem functions or ~~and~~ human health, including by reducing nutrients lost to the environment by at least half, and pesticides by at least two thirds, taking steps to minimize noise, light and lead pollution, and eliminating ~~the discharge~~ plastic ~~waste~~ pollution.*

Rationale

- The target frames "harm" in terms of *combined* harm to biodiversity, ecosystem functions and human health, whereas it would be more appropriate to address harms that affect any of these in their own right.

- There is ever-growing evidence of the impacts on wildlife of pollution from noise and light. Several Parties have also proposed adding reference to these. Significant levels of animal mortality are also caused by pollution from lead (ammunition, fishing weights,

and industrial sources – see CMS Resolution 11.15 (Rev.COP13), and reference to this should also be added.

- The term "discharge" (of plastic waste) does not capture the manner in which plastic pollution enters the environment. The target should instead seek to eliminate plastic pollution, which means that efforts to address upstream reduction of plastics and to reclaim and manage discarded plastic can ensure that plastics do not end up as pollution.

➢ TARGET 9

Current language:

Ensure benefits, including nutrition, food security, medicines, and livelihoods for people especially for the most vulnerable through sustainable management of wild terrestrial, freshwater and marine species and protecting customary sustainable use by indigenous peoples and local communities.

Recommendation

Ensure benefits, including nutrition, food security, medicines, and livelihoods for people especially for the most vulnerable through sustainable management of wild terrestrial, freshwater and marine species and protecting customary sustainable use by Indigenous peoples and local communities, consistent with national and international commitments and regulations regarding species conservation and sustainable use.

Rationale

- This target does not include any reference to the need to comply with relevant international commitments and regulations aimed at ensuring sustainable levels of take. Two Parties at the 1st part of the WG2020 meeting in August 2021 made the same recommendation as suggested here.

- The Co-Chairs in their "reflections" paper (CBD/WG2020/3/6) have suggested re-wording the target to refer to "ensur[ing] the sustainable use of species". This would unfortunately undo the benefit of the change they have suggested for Target 5 (see above).

➢ TARGET 10

Current language:

Ensure all areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, in particular through the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, increasing the productivity and resilience of these production systems.

Recommendation

Ensure all areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, consistent with national and international commitments and regulations, in particular through the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, increasing the productivity and resilience of these production systems, contributing to ecosystem restoration and improved ecological connectivity, and minimizing adverse impacts on wild species and natural habitats.

Rationale

- The language of this target does not appear to address the potential impact of these sectors (even if "sustainable" approaches are used for their operations) on natural habitats and wild species.

➤ ENABLING CONDITIONS (Section I)

Current language:

Paragraph 16: *Efficiency and effectiveness will be enhanced for all by integration with relevant multilateral environmental agreements and other relevant international processes, at the global, regional and national levels, including through the strengthening or establishment of cooperation mechanisms.*

Recommendation (for paragraph 16)

Efficiency and effectiveness will be enhanced for all by strengthening cooperation and coordination among *integration with relevant multilateral environmental agreements and other relevant international processes, at the global, regional,* bilateral, transboundary *and national levels, including through the strengthening or establishment of cooperation mechanisms*

Rationale

- In the Gandhinagar Declaration on CMS and the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, CMS Parties at COP13 (2020) called for the Framework *inter alia* to include provisions to promote international, regional, bilateral and transboundary cooperation for its implementation.

- One Party has proposed replacing "integration" in paragraph 16 with "strengthening cooperation and coordination", which better reflects the relationship between MEAs.

➤ RESPONSIBILITY AND TRANSPARENCY (Section J)

Current language:

Paragraph 18a: *Establishing national targets as part of national strategies and action plans and as contributions towards the achievement of the global targets.*

Recommendation (for paragraph 18a)

Establishing national targets as part of national strategies and action plans and as contributions towards the achievement of the global targets, including, as appropriate, commitments of Parties to relevant biodiversity-related agreements, in order to achieve synergies for national implementation*.*

Rationale

- In the Gandhinagar Declaration (referred to above), CMS Parties made recommendations regarding provisions that should be made in the Framework regarding synergies and cooperation among the various biodiversity-related agreements at the national level. Such synergies would benefit from inclusion of relevant commitments in national strategies and action plans.

Updated CMS Secretariat analysis of the
draft post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

*Prepared for the resumed sessions of the third meeting of the Working Group and the 24th meeting of SBSTTA
(13 - 29 March 2022 - Geneva, Switzerland)*

14 January 2022

Priorities for the indicators: introduction

This analysis of the currently proposed suite of "headline indicators" (document CBD/WG2020/3/3/Add.1) in the draft Monitoring Framework for the Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) updates the previous "CMS priorities" document provided in August 2021. It takes account of discussions during the first session of the third meeting of the Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework which was held virtually from 23 August to 3 September 2021 (CBD/WG2020/3/5), and the subsequent Reflections by the Co-Chairs (CBD/WG2020/3/6).

The currently proposed headline indicators touch on only a selected few elements of the goals and targets in the Framework. Some elements that are key priorities for CMS are consequently not addressed, notably those relating to objectives for:
- improving connectivity of ecosystems, including by restoration;
- addressing ecological connectivity in spatial planning;
- minimising impacts of use on non-target species; and
- minimising pollution by light, noise and lead.

This paper offers recommendations for indicators to fill these gaps. It also suggests indicators that would track outcomes specifically for migratory species in relation to objectives for area-based protection/conservation measures and for aspects of sustainable use. In most cases the suggestions here respond to the goals and targets as currently defined in the draft of the GBF. It should be noted that in a separate paper accompanying this one, CMS is providing suggestions for some improvements to the wording of certain goals and targets. Where appropriate the indicator suggestions below take these proposed changes into account.

The proposed indicators "*Conservation status of migratory species*" and "*Condition of KBAs that are important for migratory species*" offer particularly powerful assessment and "storytelling" potential for Goal A and Target 3 respectively.

The suggestions here have been developed through a collaborative process involving a range of biodiversity indicator experts and organisations, for whose input the CMS Secretariat expresses sincere thanks.   A number of the suggested measures below, in common with others in the Monitoring Framework, will need some development work before they become fully operational or can achieve global coverage. Appropriate investment in this will be important. The need to provide evidence and accountability for progress however, and rapid feedback for adaptive management, is crucial to the credibility and impact of the Framework. On issues where comprehensive science and quantitative data are not yet available, a pragmatic approach should be taken to making good use of what does exist. Qualitative information, such as self-assessment by countries in national reporting processes, can be systematically and repeatably assessed, and can play an important role where other methods are not available.

GBF Draft 1, July 2021 Goals & Targets	GBF proposed headline indicators (CBD/WG2020/3/3/Add.1)	CMS recommendations and comments on indicators
Goal A: "The integrity of all ecosystems is enhanced, with an increase of at least 15 per cent in the area, connectivity and integrity of natural ecosystems, supporting healthy and resilient populations of all species, the rate of extinctions has been reduced at least tenfold, and the risk of species extinctions across all taxonomic and functional groups, is halved, and genetic diversity of wild and domesticated species is safeguarded, with at least 90 per cent of genetic diversity within all species maintained". **Milestone A.1**: "Net gain in the area, connectivity and integrity of natural systems of at least 5 per cent. **Milestone A.2**: "The increase in the extinction rate is halted or reversed, and the extinction risk is reduced by at least 10 per cent, with a decrease in the proportion of species that are threatened, and the abundance and distribution of populations of species is enhanced or at least maintained". **Milestone A.3**: "Genetic diversity of wild and domesticated species is safeguarded, with an increase in the proportion of species that have at least 90 per cent of their genetic diversity maintained.	**A.0.1** Extent of selected natural and modified ecosystems (i.e. forest, savannahs and grasslands, wetlands, mangroves, saltmarshes, coral reef, seagrass, macroalgae and intertidal habitats) **A.0.2** Species Habitat Index **A.0.3** Red List index **A.0.4** The proportion of populations within species with a genetically effective population size > 500	➤ **Recommendation**: Add a headline indicator "*Trends in ecosystem and habitat fragmentation*". This would be a composite meta-indicator incorporating the various existing indices of ecosystem and habitat fragmentation which have already been proposed as complementary indicators for Goal A (namely *Trends in mangrove forest fragmentation*, the *Forest Fragmentation Index*, *Relative Magnitude of Fragmentation*, the *River Fragmentation Index* and the *Dendritic Connectivity Index*). ➤ **Recommendation**: Add a further headline indicator "*Conservation status of migratory species, as a proxy indicator of connectivity*". This would be based on disaggregated sub-sets of the *Red List Index*, *Living Planet Index* and *Wild Bird Index*, providing a proxy measure for the status of connectivity of natural ecosystems as it affects these species, giving particular attention to those with known responses to key connectivity factors. (Given that migratory species by definition are a connection between places, a change in status of these species can itself represent a change in the quality of the connection). **Rationale** The Goal expects a quantified net gain in **connectivity** of ecosystems, but **no headline indicator is currently included for this**. CMS proposes two measures. The first would aggregate several measures of the fragmentation of particular ecosystems (reduced fragmentation equates to increased connectivity). The second, as a proxy measure, would be based on existing indices of species status, focusing on species that depend on connectivity (migratory species).
Target 1. "Ensure that all land and sea areas globally are under integrated biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning addressing land- and sea-use change, retaining existing intact and wilderness areas".	**1.0.1** Percentage of land and seas covered by spatial plans that integrate biodiversity (*By terrestrial and marine ecosystem type. Indicator not yet developed. Would be collected via self-assessment in national reports*).	➤ **Recommendation**: The future work to develop indicator 1.0.1 should consider measures to maintain and enhance ecological connectivity. ➤ **Recommendation**: Add one or more further indicators, namely: "*Number of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans including provisions for improving ecological connectivity in spatial planning*"; "*Number of national laws, regulations, and policies promoting ecological connectivity in spatial planning*"; "*Number of international projects promoting ecological connectivity in spatial planning*".

GBF Draft 1, July 2021 Goals & Targets	GBF proposed headline indicators (CBD/WG2020/3/3/Add.1)	CMS recommendations and comments on indicators
		Rationale Improving connectivity is an integral function of spatial planning. Indicators should also assess the **drivers and policies that make biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning possible**. CMS has made suggestions for this in relation to ecological connectivity specifically. **Further comment** Collecting data via self-assessment information in national reports (as proposed by the CBD document here) is a pragmatic approach already adopted by CMS for issues where universal metrics are not (yet) feasible. This method would be an option for supporting any of the proposals where full operational indicators are yet to be developed.
Target 2. "Ensure that at least 20 per cent of degraded freshwater, marine and terrestrial ecosystems are under restoration, ensuring connectivity among them and focusing on priority ecosystems".	**2.0.1** Percentage of degraded or converted ecosystems that are under restoration	➢ **Recommendation**: (assuming target is amended as suggested by CMS): Add a headline indicator: "*Extent of degraded ecosystems successfully restored (by ecosystem type)*". This would need some development, but at least for some ecosystem types, an inventory of successful restoration projects and the areas they have restored (within defined time periods) could be compiled. A *Global Ecosystem Restoration Index* was developed for Aichi Target 15 and could be considered, but it tracks overview information on ecosystem attributes assumed to benefit from restoration, rather than directly reporting actual restoration interventions. ➢ **Recommendation**: The future work to develop indicator 1.0.1 should consider measures to maintain and enhance ecological connectivity. **Rationale** Showing that an ecosystem is "under restoration" might not necessarily indicate anything very meaningful, since *any* (minimal/temporary) efforts could qualify. Showing ecosystems *actually restored* would be more meaningful. (See separate CMS Secretariat document on the goals & targets). ➢ **Recommendation**: Add a headline indicator: "*Trends in removal or modification of obstacles that impede the movement of species or the flow of natural processes*". **Rationale** The Monitoring Framework's suggested indicator **does not address the element of the target that seeks to ensure connectivity among restored ecosystems**. A solution would be to add an indicator that specifically assesses progress in measures **to restore lost/degraded connectivity** (for example by monitoring the numbers or the extent of restoration interventions that modify infrastructures acting as barriers to hydrological connectivity or animal movement).

GBF Draft 1, July 2021 Goals & Targets	GBF proposed headline indicators (CBD/WG2020/3/3/Add.1)	CMS recommendations and comments on indicators
Target 3. "Ensure that at least 30 per cent globally of land areas and of sea areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and its contributions to people, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes".	**3.0.1** Coverage of Protected Areas and OECMS (by effectiveness)	➢ **Recommendation**: Add a headline indicator "*Extent to which protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) cover Key Biodiversity Areas that are important for migratory species*". ➢ **Recommendation**: Add a headline indicator "*Condition of KBAs that are important for migratory species*". This would link aspects of both effectiveness (producing favourable condition) and connectivity (evidenced by the status of migratory species), and would be based on standardised monitoring of KBAs derived from *in situ* and remote sensing data, building from existing monitoring and datasets for IBAs, and coordinated through the KBA Partnership. **Rationale** The proposed headline indicator's references to OECMs and to effectiveness are in line with previous CMS Secretariat comments. Comments also urged inclusion of **connectivity** (to reflect the target's aim of **"well-connected systems"**), and **this is still absent**. Coverage of areas important for migratory species will reflect the migratory range-level connectivity (*inter alia* between non-contiguous areas) that is a key indication of "well connected systems". Coverage can be assessed by reference to existing ecological "sufficiency" or "coherence" standards for ecological site networks.
Target 5. "Ensure that the harvesting, trade and use of wild species is sustainable, legal, and safe for human health".	**5.0.1** Indicator on wildlife that is harvested legally and sustainably *(Indicator not yet developed)* **5.0.2** Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels	➢ **Recommendation**: Add a headline indicator, formed from a slightly modified version of one of the existing identified potential complementary indicators: "*Implementation of measures designed to minimize the impacts of fisheries and hunting on target and non-target species and their habitats*". **Rationale** The headline indicator proposals are an improvement on the previous draft. Assessments of the sustainability of harvesting, however (and of trade, and use, which are in the target but are not covered by the headline indicator) need to take into account impacts not only on target species but **also on non-target species**. Any indicator must address this. ➢ **Recommendation**: Add a headline indicator: "*Conservation status of migratory species*". This would be based on disaggregated sub-sets of the *Red List Index*, *Living Planet Index* and *Wild Bird Index*. This would only apply to wild animals listed in the Appendices of CMS.

GBF Draft 1, July 2021 Goals & Targets	GBF proposed headline indicators (CBD/WG2020/3/3/Add.1)	CMS recommendations and comments on indicators
		Rationale **The formulation of Target 5 itself** emphasises support for use (more properly covered elsewhere in the framework) rather than conserving biodiversity (the aim of the goal it seeks to support) – see separate CMS Secretariat document on the goals & targets, where suggestions are made to amend this and to amend the reference to "safe" to refer to safety *for wild species* (rather than only human health). It would be helpful to include a species conservation status indicator for this target. ➢ **Recommendation**: Amend headline indicator 5.0.1 to cover "*Proportion of wildlife that is exploited, used or traded domestically or internationally that is legal, sustainable, and/or poses no risk of zoonotic spillover*". **Rationale** A key aspect of both the sustainability of wild species use and its impact on human health is the risk of increased spread of **pathogens and diseases**. A potential complementary indicator has been suggested for "zoonotic disease in wildlife", but it would be preferable to incorporate this issue into suggested headline indicator 5.0.1, as shown below.
Target 7. "Reduce pollution from all sources to levels that are not harmful to biodiversity and ecosystem functions and human health, including by reducing nutrients lost to the environment by at least half, and pesticides by at least two thirds and eliminating the discharge of plastic waste."	**7.0.1** Index of coastal eutrophication potential (excess nitrogen and phosphate loading, exported from national boundaries) **7.0.2** Plastic debris density **7.0.3** Pesticide use per area of cropland	➢ **Recommendation**: Add further indicators (to be developed), covering: "*Levels of pollution by lead in the environment from anthropogenic sources*"; "*Levels of pollution by anthropogenic noise impacting negatively on wild species*"; "*Levels of pollution by anthropogenic light impacting negatively on wild species*". **Rationale** The "pollution from all sources" referred to in Target 7 should include **pollution from lead, light and noise**. "Underwater noise pollution" has been identified as a potential component indicator, but noise pollution can affect wildlife in other environments too, and the levels of pollution from lead and light should also be monitored.
Target 9. "Ensure benefits, including nutrition, food security, medicines, and livelihoods for people especially for the most vulnerable through sustainable management of wild terrestrial, freshwater and marine species and protecting customary sustainable use by indigenous peoples and local communities."	**9.0.1** National environmental-economic accounts of benefits from the use of wild species	In principle all of the comments above relating to indicators for Target 5 could be applicable to the definition of indicators for the "sustainable management" part of Target 9.
	10.0.1 Proportion of agricultural area under	

GBF Draft 1, July 2021 Goals & Targets	GBF proposed headline indicators (CBD/WG2020/3/3/Add.1)	CMS recommendations and comments on indicators
Target 10. "Ensure all areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, in particular through the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, increasing the productivity and resilience of these production systems".	productive and sustainable agriculture **10.0.2** Progress towards sustainable forest management (Proportion of forest area under a long-term forest management plan)	In principle all of the comments above relating to indicators for Target 5 could be applicable to the definition of indicators for the "managed sustainably" part of Target 10.