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Lessons learned from the SDGs and Aichi
Lessons learned from the SDGs

- Strong national ownership and national buy-in.
- 68% of environment-related SDG indicators lack enough data to assess global progress - even less data for vulnerable population or geospatially.
- Very few indicators related to environmental state and trends, people or SCP.
- There is no way to link if the enabling mechanisms are better protecting our planet.
Lessons learned from the Aichi

- Strong partnership with support from major global data providers.
- Lack of national ownership and national buy-in of the indicators.
- Global indicators are not fit-for-purpose for national ownership.
- Monitoring framework based on what data exists at the global level as opposed to what data we need at the national level.
- Difficult to access national disaggregations of global indicators.
Lessons learned from environment stats

- Coordination between National Statistical Offices, Ministries of Environment and other stakeholders is essential for monitoring the environment

- Using indicators which are linked to the FDES or SEEA provides a foundation for engagement and has existing tools that can be used to advance measuring biodiversity and ecosystems
  - ESSAT
Developing the post 2020 GBF Monitoring Framework
Approach

- Introduce levels of monitoring
  - Proposing Headline indicators as mandatory for National Reports
  - Component and Detailed indicators for more detailed national or global monitoring

- Goals versus Targets
  - Goals: State indicators, including biodiversity interactions with people
  - Targets: Action indicators, including policy and actions of people (like reducing pollution)

- Balance aspiration and feasibility
  - Preference to existing indicators, but not at the expense of attempting to measuring what we treasure
  - Indicators which are already captured or can be captured in the FDES or the SEEA
Monitoring levels

- **Group 1 - Headline indicators**: A minimum set of high-level indicators which capture the overall scope of the goals and targets of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework which can be used for tracking national progress, as well as for tracking regional and global progress.

- **Group 2 - Component indicators**: for monitoring each component of each goal and target of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework at the national level as well as for tracking regional and global progress.

- **Group 3 - Detailed indicators**: for thematic or in-depth analysis of each goal and target and which are less relevant for a majority of countries, have significant methodological or data collection gaps, are highly specific and do not cover the scope of a Goal or Target component or can only be applied at the global and regional level.
Headline indicators

- In order to maximize uptake and minimize the reporting burden, the proposed list of headline indicators comprises a small number of indicators which are intended to capture the overall scope of a goal or target in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

- The headline indicators may not capture all components of a goal or a target but for analytical purposes can be complemented, as appropriate, with the component and detailed indicators.

- Some countries may wish to focus on only the Goal level headline indicators or a subset of the indicators in terms of high-level communication products (like the current 30x30 communication effort).
Next steps

- The SCBD will draft and release a proposed monitoring framework (this will be released for the SBSTTA – dates are tbc, but likely a blended meeting with some online meeting this year).
  - Headline indicators based on analysis mentioned previously.
  - Component and Detailed indicators based on a detailed analysis of all proposals supported by WCMC
  - Proposing some form of an expert group to guide the process.
- The SBSTTA will review the proposal and make recommendations for revising the document or sending it on to the OEWG and then the COP in Kunming.
- We (or at least I) am hoping that the Monitoring Framework will be an Annex to the GBF which would make it formally part of the post-2020 agenda (this is a huge elevation of the monitoring work)
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