

UNEP-WCMC comments on CBD/SP/PREP/2 Revision and updating of the strategic plan

11 January 2010

1. Page 17, Section VI, subsection E: Add the following bullet point titled 'development and use of indicators' below the existing bullet point titled 'global monitoring of biodiversity' (adapted from the Reading workshop):

"Development and use of indicators: National capacity for indicator development, data collection and information management should be further developed and properly resourced in order to strengthen countries' ability to develop, monitor and communicate indicators. The work of the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership to strengthen national development and use of indicators provides a foundation upon which to build."

Alternatively, if this is not considered a 'science-based input', then this additional bullet point could be inserted under Section VI sub-section A (page 16).

The reasons for this suggestion are as follows:

- The first bullet point (Global monitoring of biodiversity) combines issues that may be better expressed in two separate bullet points, namely (i) biodiversity monitoring, and (ii) indicator development and use.
 - Global biodiversity monitoring (with standardised metrics, and mechanisms to share data as per GBIF and GEO-BON intentions) is important for tracking global biodiversity change and, as an impact indicator, progress towards a global target focused on reducing biodiversity loss. Improving this as a coherent global effort is clearly an important issue that should be highlighted here.
 - Developing and using indicators in the context of strategic planning, particularly at regional or national scale, requires something more than a global biodiversity monitoring effort. Capacity is required to develop and use specific indicators/metrics for every part of a plan, including both process (inputs and outputs) and impact (proximate outcomes and ultimate impacts). What requires monitoring is more than just biodiversity status and trends. What will be required will largely be context specific – indicators need to be tailored to specific targets and goals, and moreover are best developed and owned (and reported on) by those responsible for implementing biodiversity strategies and action plans. This is particularly true at national scales where most action takes place, but even at a global scale the CBD SP includes targets that go beyond biodiversity status and trends and address threats, benefits, responses etc.
 - Some of this national/regional indicator-based monitoring and assessment may feed into global biodiversity monitoring efforts, and likewise some of the streamlining efforts of a global biodiversity monitoring initiative like GEO-BON may help to shape some of what countries choose to do in monitoring biodiversity (which will be one element of their likely efforts to track progress towards their goals and targets). However there will not be complete synergy between what is essentially a top-down global biodiversity monitoring initiative and what are essentially bottom-up M+E tools.
2. Page 15, Section V., second paragraph: It seems entirely correct that the SP should be 'a flexible framework' that is translated into appropriate plans at the national scale where most action takes place. This includes parties setting their own targets. Given this sentiment, it would seem that any global goals/targets (and associated indicators) proposed within this SP should be as high level/general as possible so as to be as inclusive as possible to national level

variation/flexibility. With that in mind, a set of 20 targets to be agreed at the global level as per Section IV seems over-elaborate. A small number of key high-level global targets and associated headline indicators, that covers in general terms the major elements of activity (reducing drivers/pressures, enhancing responses and implementation of the convention) and impact (on biodiversity and ecosystem services) and that allows regional/national uptake and further specification of more detailed, locally-relevant SMART targets, would seem most appropriate.

3. Page 16, Section VI, subsection A, bullet points 4 (access to knowledge) and 5 (monitoring): These points, particularly the second, stress the importance of assessing progress towards goals and targets nationally, and of good knowledge of national biodiversity. Given that these bullets are in a section on 'support mechanisms: capacity-building for effective national action', it would be worth pointing out that the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership has been providing training and materials to support national level indicator development and use (see also next comment).
4. Page 19 Annex table: The column entitled 'possible indicators' needs updating for some indicators that are italicised and thus marked as not developed. These include 'proportion of products derived from sustainable sources', 'health and well-being of communities dependent upon local ecosystem goods and services', and biodiversity for food and medicine'. All of these have been under development as part of the 2010BIP and all have metrics and methods trialled. Thus they are better termed 'under development', rather than 'not developed'.