

WCS recommendations for technical experts and CBD Parties on the draft GBF monitoring framework

Updated: June 2022 || Contact: adegemmis@wcs.org

Prior to CoP15, CBD Parties and technical experts must work to develop a GBF monitoring framework that:

Identifies synergies to reduce the overall number of indicators: WCS recognizes the significant costs associated with monitoring a large number of indicators. We recommend that Parties identify one indicator, including its "disaggregations," which can facilitate tracking of progress against multiple goals/targets. The IUCN Red List, for example, can provide both an overall picture of progress on species conservation for Goal A, while Red List assessments for specific species within specific taxonomic groups can provide an indication of whether species are subject to sustainable exploitation (Target 5), etc. Proposals can be found across Annex I.

Clarifies the relationship between indicators and composite metrics: There is a need to differentiate between indicators (or variables) and *composite* metrics in the monitoring framework. For example, the Red List of Ecosystems assessment for coral reefs in the Western Indian Ocean (Obura et al. [2021](#)) used data on hard coral cover (currently complementary indicators a.14 and a.13), fleshy algae cover (indicator a.21), and abundance of herbivorous fish and piscivorous fish (both would fall under indicator a.46). Should Parties wish to adopt the Red List of Ecosystems, or UN SEEA Condition Accounting, or any other framework using composite approaches, the monitoring framework should specify that such metrics will draw on ecosystem-specific indicators at the complementary level. Furthermore, the Secretariat and broader community - including partnerships for specific ecosystems like forests and coral reefs - could then provide guidance to Parties on the application of these frameworks at the national level to specific ecosystem types.

Decides on the best headline indicator for ecosystem integrity under Goal A: There remains strong support from Parties for a headline indicator under Goal A that assesses [ecosystem integrity](#) and connectivity, in addition to ecosystem extent, for selected natural and modified ecosystems. Several options have been put forward (including those below), though the differences merit further discussions.

	SEEA Condition Accounting	Red List of Ecosystems	Human Footprint/Modification
<i>Does it measure ecosystem integrity?</i>	Yes, although it is not necessarily spatially explicit or precise.	Focuses on whether ecosystems are above or below a threshold of concern with respect to its risk of collapse.	Yes, and it is spatially explicit (resolution depends on tool/data underpinning it). Different approaches by realm.
<i>Is it ready for use by Parties?</i>	Yes (methodology is ready). Some Parties have already completed condition accounts.	Yes, methodology is ready). However, data must be compiled (and updated) for assessments.	Yes (methodology is ready). Global datasets will be available annually, should Parties use them.

Tracks land (and sea) use change in Target 1: The most important and unique contribution of draft Target 1 is the *outcome* of halting the degradation, conversion, and loss of intact natural ecosystems that are necessary to conserve biodiversity. We therefore propose using an indicator of human pressures on ecosystem intactness and connectivity, such as the **Ecosystem Intactness Index** [currently a.32] to assess the extent to which human activities are degrading, fragmenting, or altogether eliminating intact habitat. Complementary indices are available for marine areas (e.g. t2.7), and Parties are free to use this methodology with national data to enhance accuracy, rather than using global datasets that will be freely available.

Annex I. WCS comments on the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 GBF

Goal or Target	Proposed Headline Indicator	Our Recommendation	Notes and Comments
<p>Goal A</p>	<p><i>A.0.1 Extent of [selected] natural and [seminatural and] modified [sustainably] [managed] ecosystems [in all biomes of the IUCN ecosystem typology] by type [(e.g. forest, [desert,] savannahs and grasslands, wetlands, [lakes, rivers,] [alpine vegetation,] mangroves, saltmarshes, coral reef, seagrass, macroalgae and intertidal habitats)]</i></p>	<p>A.0.1 Extent of select natural and modified ecosystems by ecosystem type (e.g., forest, desert, savannah and grasslands, wetlands, mangroves, coral reefs)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many Parties supported this indicator at SBSTTA-24. • Measures trends in the extent of specific ecosystems over time, thereby providing a “quantity” measure for ecosystems. • “By ecosystem type” is a necessary disaggregation which can be informed by the IUCN Global Ecosystem Typology (itself linked to SEEA Ecosystem Extent Accounting). • How it would work: Parties would be free to use national approaches to monitoring trends in the area and spatial extent of ecosystems. Where national ecosystem classifications are available, they can be mapped to the IUCN Global Ecosystem Typology to enable global aggregation for analyses.
	<p><i>A.0.2 Species Habitat Index</i></p>	<p>A.0.2 Condition [integrity] of select natural and modified ecosystems by ecosystem type (e.g., forest, desert, savannah and grasslands, wetlands, mangroves, coral reefs)</p> <p><i>OR, as a less-preferred alternative</i></p> <p><i>A.0.2 Red List of Ecosystems</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parties requested that A.0.2 Species Habitat Index be moved to Component level. • Parties did, however, strongly support an additional headline indicator that measured ecosystem integrity and connectivity, in addition to extent (A.0.1). • Proposed here is a measurement of ecosystem condition, which is the term used by the UN SEEA Ecosystem Accounting framework for ecosystem integrity. They are interchangeable in this context. • “By ecosystem type” is a necessary disaggregation which can be informed by the IUCN Global Ecosystem Typology (itself linked to SEEA Ecosystem Extent Accounting). • How it would work: Parties would be free to use national approaches to monitoring trends in the condition/integrity of ecosystems, by identifying appropriate variables based on ecosystem type and data availability. Such analyses would be done in tandem with monitoring extent, and therefore the IUCN Global Ecosystem Typology provides a standardized methodology for identifying ecosystems.
	<p><i>A.0.3 Red list index (SDG 15.5.1)</i></p>	<p>A.0.3 Red List Index (SDG 15.5.1), by taxonomic group</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.0.3 Red List Index was widely supported by Parties in Geneva as a means to measure overall extinction risk. • Evaluating trends by taxonomic group or by threats

			<p>identified means that the Red List Index can be used/disaggregated to track trends in addressing drivers of biodiversity loss (see Targets below).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences in global and national application can be refined between 2022 and 2030. • How it would work: Red List assessments are carried out by a wide range of actors, including national governments, and the RL Index is managed by the IUCN and Red List Partnership.
	<i>A.0.4 The proportion of populations within [umbrella] species with a [genetically] effective population size > 500</i>	A.0.4 Living Planet Index , by taxonomic group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several Parties proposed replacing A.0.2 with the Living Planet Index, as a means of measuring overall species population abundance, one specific aspect of overall ecosystem condition or integrity. • How it would work: The index is built from a high quality annual time-series of population sizes (or proxies) for species from terrestrial, freshwater, and marine habitats around the world. The data sources are listed for each data set and are checked and verified before use. Data comes primarily from scientific studies of species and habitats, or from national species monitoring programmes.
Goal B	<i>B.0.1 National environmental economic accounts of ecosystem services*</i>	No comment from WCS	
Goal C	<i>C.0.1 Indicator on monetary benefits received tbc*</i>	No comment from WCS	
	<i>C.0.2 Indicator on nonmonetary benefits tbc*</i>	No comment from WCS	
Goal D	<i>D.0.1. Indicators on funding for implementation of the global biodiversity framework [available and ready to use] tbc (aligned with Target 19)</i>	D.0.1 Biodiversity finance gap , at national and global levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The idea of Goal D focusing on closing the gap between the mean of implementation, including funding, needed to implement the GBF and those currently available, taking into account harmful incentives and expenditures, enjoyed wide support in Geneva • Calculating this gap requires three things at national scales: 1) an assessment of harmful incentives and expenditures (see 18.0.1, and D.0.2); 2) an assessment of resources generated mobilized domestically and multilaterally (see 19.0.1 and 19.0.2, , and D.0.2); and 3) an assessment of needs at the national level (see

			<p>D.o.2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National assessments can feed into the global analyses. • For clarity, the order with proposed D.o.2 could be reversed. • How it would work: Parties would identify (quantify) and report on national biodiversity finance gaps as part of the development of national biodiversity finance plans, and report on these as part of National Reports or through Financial Reporting Frameworks.
	<p><i>D.o.2 Indicator on national biodiversity planning processes and means of implementation including IPLC engagement tbc*</i></p>	<p>D.o.2 Development of national biodiversity finance plans that address harmful incentives, positive finance for biodiversity, and an assessment of needs at the national level.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generating an assessment of biodiversity finance gaps at the national level is necessary to calculate global biodiversity finance gaps. • Such plans will also be forward looking and represent a commitment from Parties to close gaps at the national (and therefore global) levels. • This is also relevant to Target 19, but it would address elements of Targets 18, 19.1, and 19.2., so it is proposed here. • How it would work: Parties would report on the development of national biodiversity finance plans and submit them to a portal on the CBD website.
<p>Target 1</p>	<p><i>1.0.1 Indicator of the percentage of land and seas covered by [landscape-level] spatial [plans that integrate] [integral] biodiversity [plans] tbc*</i></p>	<p>1.0.1 Ecosystem Intactness Index (EII), by ecosystem type, ecoregion, KBA status, etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At SBSTTA-24 in Geneva, Parties expressed support for spatial planning, but noted that there is no available repository or way to measure coverage of spatial planning. • In addition, many Parties supported an indicator that would track progress against the outcome of Target 1: halting land- and sea-use change and retaining highly intact ecosystems. • We therefore propose using an indicator of human pressures on ecosystem intactness and connectivity, such as the Ecosystem Intactness Index (EII) [currently a.32] to assess the extent to which human activities are degrading, fragmenting, or altogether eliminating intact habitat. Complementary indices are available for marine areas (t2.7). • The EII is listed as an alternative for Goal A in SBSTTA/24/2, but may make more sense for Target 1. • How it would work: Parties would be free to use global datasets aggregated as part of updates to the EII, and validate them nationally, or use similar datasets and the methodology underpinning the EII to

			undertake spatially explicit calculations of the trends in ecosystem intactness and connectivity.
Target 2	<i>2.0.1 [Percentage][Area] of degraded [and] [or] converted ecosystems that are under [ecological] restoration</i>	2.0.1 Coverage of areas under restoration with positive trends in ecological integrity , by ecosystem type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At SBSTTA-24 in Geneva, Parties expressed support for an indicator on ecosystem restoration, but there was no consensus on how to proceed. • Bracketed text in Target 2 focuses not only on areas under restoration, but how restoration contributes to overall ecosystem integrity and connectivity. • The International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI) has made similar proposals for trends in live coral cover within areas under restoration, which seeks a similar approach. • We therefore propose this indicator which would link to A.0.2 Condition/integrity of select ecosystems. • How it would work: Parties would report on how areas identified as under restoration are improving in ecosystem integrity using similar measures as identified for Goal A.
Target 3	<i>3.0.1 [Percentage] [Coverage] of protected areas and OECMs, by effectiveness, [ecosystem type,] [KBA/EBSA status]</i>	3.0.1 Coverage and effectiveness protected areas and OECMs , by ecosystem type, KBA status, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At SBSTTA-24 in Geneva, Parties expressed support for a headline indicator for the coverage of area-based conservation measures -- but they also expressed support for a headline indicator measuring effectiveness or quality of such areas (as one illustration see alternatives proposed in SBSTTA/24/2). • The UK has proposed an indicator building on an indicator for MPAs under the OSPAR Regional Sea Convention, which would entail answering four short questions for each protected area. While work is underway to adapt this for global use, the effectiveness element of a headline indicator is essential. • There are several ways this could work -- having two indicators (3.0.1 for coverage and 3.0.2 for proportion meeting certain effectiveness criteria), or the total coverage could be disaggregated by criteria, or only those meeting certain criteria could be counted towards the 30%, etc. The Bonn meeting is well placed to consider the modalities for such options. • How it would work: Parties would report on the area and spatial extent (coordinates) of area-based conservation measures, and would answer key questions when reporting into the WDPA/WD-PAME about management effectiveness. The CBD could use

			global ecosystem maps and databases on, for example, Key Biodiversity Areas to do disaggregations of coverage so that such information is not required from Parties, and would be disaggregations for analysis only.
Target 4	<i>4.0.1 Proportion of species populations that are affected by human wildlife conflict [requiring intensive recovery due to human wildlife conflict]</i>	4.0.1 Green Status of Species Index , by taxonomic group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed headline indicator (“Proportion of species populations affected by HWC...”) was not well received by Parties in Geneva. • The IUCN Green Status of Species, currently listed as a component indicator, would be well placed, over time, to track progress towards species recovery and would be an excellent complement to the Red List Index. • Some further refinement may be necessary prior to 2030, but we understand that work is underway on this.
	<i>4.0.2 Number of plant [and animal] genetic resources [for food and agriculture] secured in medium or longterm conservation facilities (SDG 2.5.1)</i>	No comment from WCS	
Target 5	<i>5.0.1 Proportion of [wildlife] [wild species][wood and plant] that is harvested and traded legally and sustainably</i>	5.0.1 Trends in illegal exploitation and trade of wildlife , by taxonomic group <i>OR, as a less-preferred alternative</i> <i>Implementation of existing</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was wide agreement that headline indicators are needed to track whether harvest/exploitation, trade and use is both sustainable and legal. Put another way, it must track whether illegal and/or unsustainable trade is being eliminated. • Since trade could be legal but not sustainable, or legal and sustainable but still pose a risk of zoonotic spillover, different policies and strategies will be needed to address each of these 3 elements separately in the headline indicators for Target 5. • Given the scope of Target 5, a headline indicator on legal exploitation, trade and use should cover all wild species (both terrestrial and marine, including wild capture fisheries). • How it would work: Trends could potentially be articulated using proportionality (building on and expanding SDG indicator 15.7.1 “Proportion of traded wildlife that was poached or illicitly trafficked”), although that would rely on seizure data and CITES trade data, both of which can be incomplete (including not dealing with domestic protections) and therefore

			<p>misleading -- CITES data underestimates illegal trade in all species, and seizures are a subset of illegal trade). A composite metric of seizure data and other forms of information, perhaps building on existing databases (e.g. CITES illegal trade reports), compliance mechanisms (CITES and CMS), and intergovernmentally organized assessments (UNODC wildlife crime report) could be developed by building on SDG indicator 15.7.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As an alternative, Parties may wish to explore a composite metric of the "degree of implementation of international instruments aiming to combat wildlife and forest crime" (closely mirroring the design of SDG indicator 14.6.1 "Degree of implementation of international instruments aiming to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing"). However, this would focus on actions and not on the outcomes sought for Target 5.
	<p>5.0.2 Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels (SDG 14.4.1)</p>	<p>5.0.2 Red List Index (SDG 15.5.1), [wild species subject to commercial exploitation], by taxonomic group</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rather than focus on the sustainability for a single taxonomic group (fish stocks), which would have some overlap with considerations of proposed 5.0.1 (which does not yet exist), we propose building on consensus for the Red List Index elsewhere in the framework. We recommend using the IUCN Red List assessments of the conservation status and trends for species that are or may be exploited commercially, ensuring that both international and domestic use, trade and consumption are assessed. Relevant methodology to measure this is described in the Biodiversity for Food and Medicine indicator. Inclusion of species in the CITES or CMS Appendices may be used as a complementary indicator of the unsustainability of use and/or Trade. How it would work: Red List assessments are carried out by a wide range of actors, including national governments, and the RL Index is managed by the IUCN and Red List Partnership. A specific disaggregation for species, both terrestrial and marine, that are exploited and traded commercially could provide an examination of whether commercial trade is threatening wildlife while avoiding perverse impacts on customary sustainable use and food security.
		<p>5.0.3 Prohibitions on trade and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trade could of course be both legal and sustainable,

		markets to prevent pathogen spillover	<p>but may include specific taxonomic groups, activities, or conditions that are “unsafe” -- particularly from the perspective of zoonotic pathogen spillover to humans, wildlife, or other animals (thereby risking epidemics and pandemics).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the focus of this target on the safety of exploitation, trade, and use of wild species, the proposal for language specifically pertaining to preventing pathogen spillover, and the need for the GBF to inspire transformative action to correct our unhealthy relationship with the natural world and prevent the next pandemic of zoonotic origin, it is essential that Parties prohibit, and report on prohibitions, of commercial trade and markets in certain higher taxonomic groups (not species by species), such as birds and mammal which are known to present a significant risk to human and animal health when traded live and marketed live or freshly slaughtered. The focus should be on commercial markets and trade. An indicator could reflect the number of Parties that are working to close domestic and international commercial trade and markets in live animals, due to the risk of both pathogen spillover and becoming invasive. How it would work: This would be handled through national reports, though online repositories could be developed to share best practices and lessons learned.
Target 6	<i>6.0.1 Rate of invasive alien species spread [and rate of impact]</i>	<i>No comment from WCS</i>	
Target 7	<i>7.0.1 Index of coastal eutrophication potential (excess nitrogen and phosphate loading, exported from national boundaries) [by waterbody][by basin] (SDG 14.1.1a)</i>	<i>No comment from WCS</i>	
	<i>7.0.2 Floating plastic debris density [by micro and macro plastics] (SDG 14.1.1b)</i>	<i>No comment from WCS</i>	

	<i>7.0.3 [Most hazardous] Pesticide [use] [load] [per area of cropland]</i>	<i>No comment from WCS</i>	
Target 8	<i>8.0.1 National [net] greenhouse [emissions] [gas inventories] from land use and land use change [by land use and land use change category, subcategory, land] natural/modified]</i>	<p>8.0.1 Carbon stock in natural habitats, by ecosystem type</p> <p><i>Or, alternatively:</i></p> <p><i>8.0.1 Trends in extent and condition of carbon rich ecosystems or areas providing carbon sequestration</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We recognize concerns from Parties about quantitative mitigation targets being developed and adopted under the CBD, given the role of the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement in guiding international cooperation on climate change mitigation. However, the CBD does certainly have expertise and competence in measuring ecosystem extent and integrity. One disaggregation of Goal A indicators could look at the extent and integrity of certain carbon-rich ecosystem types. A more direct way to frame this, in terms of an indicator, would be to track global carbon stocks (both above and below-ground) within such ecosystems.
		<p>8.0.2 Proportion of countries with national climate commitments, strategies and plans that reflect biodiversity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many Parties have sought to identify synergies between multilateral efforts to address biodiversity loss and climate change. • A metric of whether countries are actively including biodiversity within mitigation commitments (such as nationally determined contributions) or within adaptation commitments or communications (e.g., National Adaptation Plans), would be an essential first step to see if national leads for climate and biodiversity are working together to implement nature-based solutions to climate change. This information is already publicly available, and provides a basis for further analysis, discussion, and potentially cooperation between the two multilateral environmental regimes.
Target 9	<i>9.0.1 National environmental-economic accounts of benefits from the use of wild species</i>	<p>9.0.1 National environmental-economic accounts of benefits and negative impacts affecting different sectors of society, especially the most vulnerable, and indigenous peoples and local communities, as a result of changes in the stocks and flows of wild species.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Systems of Environmental-Economic Accounts (SEEA) as currently developed and implemented do not include an Extent Account for wildlife, terrestrial or marine (UN-Statistical Commission, 2021). Some relevant information may be included in current Ecosystem Services Accounts and in the Conditions Account, but not to the point required by headline indicator 9.0.1. This means that significant capacity building will be needed in many countries to ensure all relevant information is collated and analyzed. The proposed indicator would move the SEEA in that direction. • In addition, there is no methodology in SEEA to

			<p>differentiate wildlife uses by type of users (Indigenous Peoples or local communities), which introduces further complications. In order to introduce protection to Indigenous Peoples and local communities, the distinction by type of user should be included in wildlife extent accounts.⁹ As proposed for the Headline Indicators 5.0.1 to 5.0.3, objective data on the extent of use is critical for the establishment of robust, consistent, and comparable baselines.</p>
Target 10	<p><i>10.0.1 Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture (add SDG 2.4.1)</i></p>	<p>10.0.1 Proportion of productive areas with targeted environmental safeguards for biodiversity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We support the proposed formulation, provided during the Geneva SBSTTA meeting, as a modifier to the originally proposed headline indicator for two reasons. • First, it addresses a wider variety of productive ecosystems, which could include, for example, aquaculture. • Second, it alludes to a specific intervention of targeted biodiversity safeguards (we would amend it to focus on nature-positive safeguards to add greater specificity and link it to language being discussed in the context of goals and targets). • How it would work: The FAO would still be well placed to advise on how to track this across landscapes and seascapes used for agriculture, aquaculture and forestry.
	<p><i>10.0.2 Progress towards sustainable forest management (Proportion of forest area under a long-term forest management plan) (add SDG 15.2.1(4))</i></p>	<p><i>No comment from WCS</i></p>	
Target 11	<p><i>11.0.1 National environmental-economic accounts of regulation of air quality, quality and quantity of water, and protection from hazards and extreme events for all people, [from ecosystems]to maintain or increase relevant ecosystem services]</i></p>	<p><i>No comment from WCS</i></p>	

Target 12	<i>12.0.1 Average share of the built-up area of cities that is green/blue space for public use for all (SDG 11.7.1)</i>	<i>No comment from WCS</i>	
Target 13	<i>13.0.1 [Percentage of countries that have] [Indicator(s) of] operational legislative, administrative or policy frameworks which [facilitate access to and] ensure fair and equitable sharing of benefits], including those based on PIC and MAT] [shared in the ABS Clearing-House] tbc*</i>	<i>No comment from WCS</i>	
Target 14	<i>14.0.1 Extent to which national targets [have been adopted] for integrating biodiversity values [as cornerstones for implementation] into policies, regulations, planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies [and accounts] [are established] at all levels, ensuring that biodiversity values are mainstreamed across all sectors and integrated into assessments of environmental impacts</i>	14.0.1 Proportion of countries with legislation/regulation mainstreaming biodiversity at all levels, by sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We recognize that brackets imply that this is not yet conclusive and there is probably some disagreement on how to proceed. • We prefer the formulation proposed during SBSTTA in Geneva, which would look at national legislation and regulation rather than national targets -- which for integrating biodiversity values should just be 100%. It would not list every type of policy and intervention, though Target 14 would retain this list and the reporting template could allude to these categories (see below). • How it would work: Much like our proposed 5.0.3, this would rely on some qualitative reporting by Parties, which could be guided by amendments to the national reporting template. For example, it would need to break down questions by sector to achieve the disaggregations necessary to track progress on mainstreaming (and the LTAM) for each mainstreaming area.
	<i>14.0.2 [Number of countries with] Implementation of the System of EnvironmentalEconomic Accounting [(SDG 15.9.1b)]</i>	14.0.2 Proportion of countries that have undertaken biodiversity valuation exercises e.g., SEEA (SDG 15.9.1b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We support this indicator with a small amendment to focus on the proportion of countries.
Target 15	<i>15.0.1 [Number of companies assessing and reporting on their][Quantified volumes of]</i>	15.0.1 Number of countries reporting on the full scope of their dependencies and impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We welcome progress from the Task Force for Nature Disclosure and believe that Parties should continue to invest in this area.

	<i>Dependencies [and] impacts[, risks and opportunities] of businesses on biodiversity [and related human rights</i>	on biodiversity	
Target 16	<i>16.0.1 Food waste index (SDG 12.3.1b)</i>	No comment from WCS	
	<i>16.0.2 Material footprint per capita (SDG 8.4.1/12.2.1)</i>	No comment from WCS	
Target 17	<i>17.0.1 Indicator of [capacity and] measures in place to [prevent] manage [or] [and control] potential [adverse] impacts of [LMOs and other products from the sustainable use of biodiversity] [LMOS resulting from modern] biotechnology on biodiversity taking into account [conservation] [cultural and social economic considerations and] human health [and environment safety] tbc*</i>	No comment from WCS	
Target 18	<i>18.0.1 [Percentage reduction in] [Value of] subsidies and other incentives harmful to biodiversity, that are [redirected, repurposed or][consistent with WTO rules] [or] eliminated [as a proportion of total subsidies]</i>	18.0.1 Value [or proportion] of incentives harmful to biodiversity that are identified and eliminated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We generally support the direction of this headline indicator, which was broadly supported by Parties during SBSTTA-24. • We believe that it should focus on the USD or financial value of harmful incentives eliminated, in order to generate a common currency with which to aggregate and scale assessments towards the global figure identified in draft Target 18.
Target 19	<i>19.0.1 Official development assistance for biodiversity (SDG 15.a.1)</i>	19.0.1 Official development assistance for biodiversity (SDG 15.a.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This can continue to be tracked through the OECD, with modifications, as necessary.
	<i>19.0.2 Public [funding] [expenditure] and private [funding] [expenditure] on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and</i>	19.0.2 Domestic funding for biodiversity , by sector (public, private, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This can continue to be tracked through the financial reporting framework, with modifications as necessary. • Efforts should be made to tabulate and identify public and private flows.

	<i>ecosystems [as well as development and access to innovation, technology transfer and research on innovation]</i>		
Target 20	<i>20.0.1 Indicator on biodiversity information and monitoring, including traditional knowledge [with FPIC][and scientific knowledge], for management tbc*</i>	<i>No comment from WCS</i>	
Target 21	<i>21.0.1 [Mechanisms for the full, equitable participation of] [Indicator on [the degree to which]] indigenous peoples and local communities [respecting all their rights in particular of land, waters and resources], women and girls [in all their diversity] as well as youth [and human rights defenders] participat[ion] in decision-making related to biodiversity tbc</i>	<i>No comment from WCS</i>	
	<i>21.0.2 [Land use change and] Land tenure [in the traditional territories] of indigenous peoples and local communities [by sex and type of tenure]</i>	<i>No comment from WCS</i>	