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Convention on Biological Diversity

• Convention came into force in 1993 - 196 Parties
• 3 objectives: conservation of biological diversity; sustainable use of biodiversity; fair and equitable sharing of benefits from use of genetic resources
• Current Strategic Plan of CBD which comes to an end in 2020 comprised of a shared vision, a mission, 5 strategic goals and 20 targets, collectively known as the Aichi Targets.
• Negotiations have just begun on post 2020 biodiversity framework. the new plan
Aichi Biodiversity Targets

**Goal A Drivers** - Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society

**Goal B Pressures** - Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use

**Goal C Responses** - Improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity

**Goal D Impact/Benefits** - Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services.

**Goal E Enabling conditions** - Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building
Brings together over 60 organizations working at the forefront of global indicator development

Partnership of biodiversity indicator users, producers and supporters

Secretariat, hosted at UNEP-WCMC, and a Steering Committee.
Identification of indicators for the 2011-2020 Plan

1st CBD AHTEG ON INDICATORS
Developed a list of headline and operational indicators, with BIP support

June 2011

2nd CBD AHTEG ON INDICATORS
Developed a revised list of indicators, with BIP support

September 2015

CBD SBSTTA 19
Took note of the indicative list; Facilitate a peer review of the list

November 2015

CBD SBSTTA 20
Endorsed the revised list of indicators
To be kept under review to enable new indicators to be incorporated

April 2016

CBD COP 13
List of indicators recommended by SBSTTA 20 welcomed by COP

December 2016

CBD COP 14
Consideration of the process for identifying indicators for the Post-2020 framework

November 2018

‘MIND THE GAP’ – BIP project for identifying indicators for the Strategic Plan

BIP expansion to incorporate AHTEG indicators

BIP support to GBO-4

BIP support for defining the process
Lessons learnt from the Strategic Plan 2011-2020

SMART targets give firm foundation for indicator development & use (Specific, Measurable, Ambitious, Realistic, Timebound)

General (& unquantified) targets often lead to poorly aligned indicators

CBD/COP/14/INF/40
The Biodiversity Indicator Development Framework promotes an iterative process, of defining targets and identifying indicators, to ensure SMART targets and effective indicators.

Lessons learnt from the Strategic Plan 2011-2020
Lessons learnt from the Strategic Plan 2011-2020

Multiple indicators may provide better picture of progress, to support one another and to produce integrated storylines.

Where response indicators are needed, balance input, output, outcome & impact indicators.

Data collection, indicator production and indicator updating require ongoing resourcing.

Gaps in data (e.g. geographic, taxonomic) need to be addressed.
Lessons learnt from the Strategic Plan 2011-2020

Many indicators on the final CBD list in 2016 based on one-off studies; no organisation responsible for them, or ideas with no funding.

Available indicators should not limit the choice of targets. New indicators can be developed where new targets

Stephanie Foote UNEP-WCMC
Lessons learnt from the Strategic Plan 2011-2020

Indicators that work across multiple scales help compare and understand changes, effective use of resources.

Global targets often translated into different national targets due to differing contexts & priorities; use of common indicators therefore problematic.

Uptake of global indicators at national scale limited as reticence to use such data.

Some global indicators built directly from national indicators but many cannot be disaggregated; others not easily scalable in robust way –
Recommendations for the post-2020 biodiversity process

• Post-2020 targets should be as SMART as possible

• The development of targets and indicators should be an iterative process

• While it is important to build on what already exists, the lack of a known existing indicator should not limit target setting.

• For indicators to work across scales, targets also need to work across scales.

• New technologies should help dynamically track and communicate progress on targets using visual as well as narrative means e.g. indicator visualization platforms and model-based scenarios.
Post 2020 biodiversity framework process

- **Dec 2018** CBD-COP14 - Process approved, Co-Chairs appointed; targets and indicators proposed to be developed in parallel
- **Throughout 2019** – regional and thematic consultations, informal conferences (e.g. Trondheim)
- **August 2019** – OEWG-1 Nairobi; discussions on structure and scope, Co-Chairs text on possible elements
- **November 2019** – SBSTTA 23 Montreal – Chairs Informal Briefing
- **February 2020** – OEWG-2 China – Discussions on content and wording, Co-Chairs draft text to be issued
- **July 2020** – OEWG 3 – Colombia – Final Co-Chairs text to be issued for CBD COP15
- **November 2020** CBD COP-15 Kunming China – text to be agreed
The SDG indicator process

• 17 SDGs, 169 Targets, 232 indicators.
• Indicator process and review undertaken by IAEG-SDG comprised of 28 Member States supported by observers & experts under guidance of UN Stats Division
• Custodian agencies within UN system for each indicator
Tier Classification Criteria/Definitions

• **Tier 1:** A methodology exists and data are available for more than half of countries where indicator is relevant.

• **Tier 2:** A methodology exists but data are available for less than half of countries.

• **Tier 3:** No methodology or standards are yet available for the indicator, though these are being (or will be) developed or tested.
Challenges in measuring environmental progress on SDGs

93 environment related SDG indicators out of 232

68% have not enough data to assess global progress

23% of 93 environment-related SDG indicators on track to meet target if current trends continue; 9% show no progress toward achieving target

UNEP (2019) Measuring Progress – towards achieving the environmental dimension of the SDGs
Challenges in measuring environmental progress on SDGs

Data & statistics remain a substantial constraint

More than 30% of environmental SDG indicators still do not have agreed methodology

Insufficient info for spatial and gender analyses

UNEP (2019) Measuring Progress – towards achieving the environmental dimension of the SDGs
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