Indicator metadata sheet

Indicator metadata form for compilation of data relating to headline indicators proposed in the first draft of the monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

1. Indicator name

Insert full indicator name and number [number to be populated after the adoption of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework]

(5.0.1) Sustainable use of wild species

2. Date of metadata update

Insert date of metadata update

15 January 2022

3. Goals and Targets addressed
Please provide details about the proposed goals and targets of the first draft post-2020 global biodiversity framework for which the indicator will measure progress in the <u>first draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework</u>

3.a Goal

Provide the corresponding draft goal name, draft goal number, or N/A

Draft **Goal A** of the Global Biodiversity Framework

3.b Target

Provide the corresponding draft target name, draft target number, or N/A

Draft **Target 5.** Ensure that the harvesting, trade and use of wild species is sustainable, legal, and safe for human health

Description of the purpose and rational behind the indicator, noting its relevance to the corresponding draft goal or target

The proposed indicator would fill a present gap in a comprehensive headline indicator for Target 5 of the draft Global Biodiversity Framework. Although an index exists for the proportion of fish stocks that are harvested sustainably (FAO https://www.fao.org/sustainable-development-goals/indicators/1441/en/), no similar index exists for terrestrial species of fauna, flora or fungi. The sustainable harvest of terrestrial species whether for domestic or international consumption, subsistence or income generation, is vital for local livelihoods, businesses and national economies. However, the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) Global Assessment Report on biodiversity and ecosystem services (2019) estimated that the direct overexploitation is the main cause of marine biodiversity loss and second most significant cause of terrestrial biodiversity loss. Unsustainable harvest threatens not only the species being used and the benefits derived from them (linked to Target 9), but the ecosystems that may themselves provide vital services and those that depend on them.

The IUCN Red List provides a global assessment of species and the threats that are contributing to the extinction risks that they face. Within these assessments each species is evaluated for whether it is used at Local, National and International level as well as whether "biological resource use" including intentional harvesting is a contributing threat to extinction risk. At a global level this can assess whether use is a threat (unsustainable) or not (sustainable) thus giving a proportion of assessed species that are harvested as being sustainably so. Furthermore, the changing threat from use can be further monitored over time by using a Red List Index for taxonomic groups that have been fully assessed multiple times, and the contribution of the harvest and trade as a threat can be further investigated (see Butchart, 2008).

While this gives an extremely useful overview of species that have been assessed against the IUCN Red List, a large number of species that are harvested are yet to be assessed, many of which may be considered to be of "Least Concern" and not in imminent peril of extinction, but where use may still be unsustainable, which may be masked within this wide category of the Red List.

Furthermore, given the importance of the use of wild species nationally, concerns and warnings over unsustainable use are most likely need to be tackled at a national level before they are elevated to an international level. Therefore, indicators that are nationally based and relevant both to assessing sustainability, but also to highlighting concerns that can be addressed nationally would be particularly useful.

We propose developing a new indicator for sustainable use of wild species, data for which would be collected nationally, with the potential to aggregate up to a regional or global indicator. TRAFFIC will work with others to develop a framework that would populate with national data and it will be driven by Parties themselves. Given the specific reference to trade in wild species, the intension would be to be able to disaggregate the indicator for species that were traded internationally. This would have relevance to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), as well as the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals 12, 14 and 15 and the IPBES Sustainable Use Assessment.

TRAFFIC have already started reaching out to some Parties for their buy-in and the UK, Mexico, and Georgia have expressed their interest. Others interested in engaging on development include IUCN, UNEP-WCMC, BirdLife, IIED as well as the partners of the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management (CITES, CBD, UNEP, CIFOR, FAO). We have also reached out to others that have also expressed an interest in developing indicators for this target, such as UNCTAD.

4. Definitions, concepts and classifications

5.a Definition:

Precise definition of the indicator, including references to standards and classifications. The indicator definition should be unambiguous and in expressed in universally applicable terms. It must clearly express the unit of measurement (proportion, dollars, number of people, etc.).

Precise definition is not yet available.

5.b Method of computation

Explanation of how the indicator is calculated, including mathematical formulas and descriptive information of computations made on the source data to produce the indicator (including adjustments and weighting). This explanation should also highlight cases in which mixed sources are used or where the calculation has changed over the time (i.e., discontinuities in the series). If there is an existing standard or manual, please include a link here.

Not yet available.

5.c

Data collection method

Description of all methods used for data collection. This description should include, when applicable, the questions used to collect the data, the type of interview, the dates/duration of fieldwork, the sample size and the response rate. Hyperlinks to methodologies are acceptable

Not yet available.

5.d

Accessibility of methodology

Note whether the methodology for the indicator and the underlying data are published in a peer reviewed location that can be accessed, and the methodology can be repeated by other scientists or agencies with the same overall result obtained. For "global indicators" please note whether a methodology is available for use at national or regional scales

The development of this new headline indicator will require substantial resources for development, consultation and capacity building at the national level to ensure standardized data are collected.

Once a framework is developed an academic journal article will be prepared so that the method is peer reviewed.

5.e

Data sources

Data would need to be gathered at the national level. At the global level, following sources of data will be used:

- IUCN Red List data will provide a source of data
- IUCN Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group's Sustainable Use of Species database (under development)
- CITES wildlife trade database
- TRAFFIC's Wildlife Trade Information System (WiTIS)
- FAO Fisheries and Timber data

Data would need to be gathered at the national level under standardized methods. Customs data may also be a source of information.

At the global level, following sources of data will be drawn on:

- IUCN Red List data will provide a source of data
- IUCN Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group's Sustainable Use of Species database (under development)
- CITES wildlife trade database
- TRAFFIC's Wildlife Trade Information System (WiTIS)
- FAO Fisheries and Timber data
- Other global datasets as identified.

5.f Availability and release calendar

Please note whether the indicator is available now or in development. If in development, please state the year it will be available. Additionally, state how often the indicator will be updated with additional data. (e.g. annually, every five years etc).

The indicator is in the early stage of development. It is
expected that methods will available by the end of 2023 (conditional on securing resources for its development).

The key datasets for this indicator will be submitted by the CBD Parties in their Annual Reports, with information consolidated and reported bi-annually.

5.g Time series

Date range for which indicator is available, e.g. 1993 – 2021

Indicator not yet developed. Data collection will commence 2023 once the method is developed and peer reviewed.

5.h Data providers

Identification of data provider(s), where relevant noting any national data providers. Specify the organisation(s) responsible for producing the data.

CBD Focal points (including as necessary in collaboration with the CITES focal points), and other relevant national organizations of Parties will be the key national data providers.

5.i Data compilers

Organisation(s) responsible for compilation of this indicator [if relevant, at the national level Global/International context only: Description of how missing values for individual countries or areas are imputed or otherwise estimated by international agencies to derive regional or global aggregates of the indicator].

At the global level, TRAFFIC will compile the data received from the national level.

5.j Gaps in data coverage

Please note any gaps in the data coverage for this indicator (e.g. taxonomic, thematic, or geographic data gaps)

It is anticipated that initially there will be gaps in the data coverage for this indicator (being new indicator established for the post-2020 GBF), however those will be addressed through the national-level capacity-building and gradual increase in the coverage of data.

5.k Treatment of missing values

Description of the methodology employed for producing estimates for the indicator when country data are not available, including any mathematical formulas and description of additional variables used as input into the estimation process.

Global/International context only: Description of how missing values for individual countries or areas are imputed or otherwise estimated by international agencies to derive regional or global aggregates of the indicator

To be determined during method development.

6   Scale

6.a Scale of use

Indicate if indicator data is applicable at the global, national, regional scale. Specify whether global or regional scale indicators can be disaggregated for national use, and/or whether national data can be collated to form global indicator. Additionally, please mention any plans to nationalise the indicator.

It is anticipated that the indicator data will be collated at national levels to form the global indicator.

Initial engagement with a selection of Parties (Mexico, Georgia, UK) shows interest and opportunities to develop a nationally constructed indicator, that can be aggregated to the regional and global scale.

6.b National/regional indicator production

For global indicators, please note whether a national/regional methodology available for use and provide links to any online documentation. Please also specify if underlying data can be accessed and used by countries to produce national indicators.

See above

6.c Sources of differences between global and national figures

> *Explanation on the differences between country produced and internationally estimated data on the indicator, highlighting and summarising the main sources of differences.*
>
> Not yet available

6.d

Regional and global estimates & data collection for global monitoring
6.d.1 *Description of the methodology*

> *Include any mathematical formulas, used for the calculation of the regional/global aggregates from the country values. Description of the weighting structure used for aggregating country indicator values to regional and global levels.*
>
> Not yet available

6.d.2 Additional methodological details

> *Description of how the data from countries or areas is assembled by custodian international agencies to provide regional and global aggregates. This is distinct from the method of computation section), which looks at how the indicator is compiled at a national level.*
>
> Not yet available

6.d.3 Description of the mechanism for collecting data from countries

> *Include: (i) the official counterpart at the country level; (ii) description of any validation and consultation process; (iii) description of any adjustments with respect to use of standard classifications and harmonization of breakdowns for age group and other dimensions, or adjustments made for compliance with specific international or national definitions.*
>
> To be development/confirmed

7   Other MEAs, processes and organisations

7.a Other MEA and processes

> *Please note where the indicator is already in use (e.g. by the CBD, other MEAs (such as CITES, CMS, Ramsar, UNCCD),SDGs, the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services - IPBES).*
>
> The indicator is not yet developed and in use, however the development of the indicator will involve relevant processes and datasets, including those under SDGs, CITES, CMS and IPBES among others.
>
> The development process will also capitalize on the Collaboration Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management (which includes CBD, CITES, CMS, UNEP, FAO, IUCN, IIED among its members) and the Global Partnership on Plant Conservation (which involved a wide range of national botanic and international organizations) among others.

7.b Biodiversity Indicator Partnership

Is the indicator include in those approved and promoted by the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (Y/N). If Y, insert a link to BIP website.

This is a new indicator, but communication with BIP is established

8 Disaggregation

Specification of the dimensions and levels used for disaggregation of the indicator (e.g., species, taxa, ecosystem, geographic location, income, sex, age group, disability status, etc.)

It is anticipated that the disaggregation by species, taxa, ecosystem, geographic location, number of users/beneficiaries, intervention types, among other dimension and levels, will be possible.

9 Related indicators

Description of linkages to other indicators proposed in the first draft monitoring framework

Headline, component and complimentary indicators under Target 9.

10 Data reporter

10.a Organisation

Organisation of the contact person(s) for the data or metadata

TRAFFIC International

10.b Contact person(s)

Person(s) and email addresses to be contacted with any questions regarding the data or metadata.

Thomasina Oldfield – Thomasina.oldfield@traffic.org

Anastasiya Timoshyna – Anastasiya.timoshyna@traffic.org

11 References

Links to other literature helpful in understanding, interpreting and using the indicator. A maximum of ten references is preferred.

Butchart, S.H.M., (2008) Red List Indices to measure the sustainability of species use and impacts of invasive alien species. Bird Conservation International. 18

IPBES (2019): Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. E. S. Brondizio, J. Settele, S. Díaz, and H. T. Ngo (editors). IPBES secretariat, Bonn, Germany.

Timoshyna, A. and Rodina, K. (Eds) (2019), Workshop Proceeding: Sustainable Wildlife Management Beyond 2020: Report of the Consultative Workshop.