WWF welcomes the opportunity to contribute to the consultation on “grey” indicators for SDG targets. **An important number of environmentally relevant indicators are included in this category**, including proposals where the environmental dimensions of targets have been left out. WWF urges the IAEG-SDG to refine these in a way that **ensures our ability to track the environmental sustainability components** of the SDG framework as part of a balanced assessment of progress. We also welcome the **IAEG-SDG’s commitment to supporting new and innovative indicators**, which we hope to see reflected in the agreement of clear timetables for work on the more pioneering proposals.

WWF proposals

Target 1.4

Secure land rights are an integral part of this target. We encourage the IAEG-SDG to **reconsider a comprehensive land indicator as 1.4.2 tracking “secure rights to land”**: *Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected*. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It has been supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank, and UN-Habitat, and facilitated by GLTN), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. This indicator could also be included in 17.18.

Target 1.b

***Indicator 1.b.1***: Number of national action plans related to multi-lateral environmental agreements that support accelerated investment in actions that eradicate poverty and sustainability use natural resources

*Discussion prompt*: The IAEG­SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator.

WWF proposes “Number of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans adopted and supported through adequate measures for a) resource mobilization and b) legal preparedness”, as assessed by the CBD NBSAP Peer Review Framework.

Target 2.3

**Alternative to proposal for** ***Indicator 2.3.2: Total Factor Productivity***

*Discussion prompt*: The IAEG­SDGs Members would like to either consider the current proposal or suggestions for an alternative indicator.

WWF suggests the indicator “% credibly certified sustainable production (as defined by ISEAL http://www.isealalliance.org/our-members) of overall production”, with data from FAO and ISEAL/Credible certification schemes. An increasing body of literature shows the positive impacts of credible schemes on farmer outreach and increased yields/reduced inputs compared to conventional production, and protection of areas of High Conservation values from conversion. This indicator would also inform targets 2.5, 6a, 8.4, 12a, 14.1 & 14.2.

Target 2.4

***Indicator 2.4.1***: Percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices (indicator moved to grey following results of IAEG­SDGs member consultation)

*Discussion prompt*: This might also include components currently addressed in indicators 2.4.2 and 2.4.3.

Indicators of sustainable agricultural practices could include: Improved resource efficiency in land use, measured as greenhouse gas emissions from land-based sectors [CIFOR]; Annual change in forest area and land under cultivation (modified MDG Indicator) [SDSN]; Annual change in degraded or desertified arable land (% or ha) [SDSN]; Improved resource efficiency in land and energy use, measured as greenhouse gas emissions from land-based sectors: agricultural gross ghg (total), tonnes of C02 equivalent / C02, CH4, N20, others (tonnes of C02 equivalent); Nitrogen and phosphorous pollution of waters balance; Water use intensity by irrigated agriculture = cubic metres of water used per unit of value added (in US $) by irrigated agricultural activity.

***Indicator 2.4.2****:*Percentage of agricultural households using irrigation systems compared to all agricultural households

WWF agrees that the current proposal does not inform the sustainability elements of the target. We suggest: “% of drainage basins with agricultural activity exceeding 80% in the blue water scarcity index”[[1]](#footnote-1). Basin health: The blue water scarcity index of any drainage basin with agricultural activity does not exceed 80%, thus indicating sustainable use (including irrigation) and allowing for environmental flow requirements. Also includes uses beyond agriculture within the basin, thus taking into account full basin water context.

***Indicator 2.4.3***: Percentage of agricultural household using eco-friendly fertilizers compared to all agricultural household using fertilizers

The definition of "eco-friendly" fertilizers is unclear. Possible alternatives are included in the response to 2.4.1.

Target 3.9

***Indicator 3.9.2***: Mortality rate attributed to "hazardous chemicals, water and soil pollution and contamination"

This indicator is important to fully representing environmental risks to health. If current data allows only tracking of air pollution impacts, a programme of work should be established to rapidly advance methodologies to track the health burden from the broader set of hazards identified.

Target 4.7

***Indicator 4.7.1****:*Percentage of 15-year old students in secondary school demonstrating at least a fixed level of knowledge across a selection of topics in environmental science and geoscience. The exact choice/range of topic will depend on the survey or assessment in which the indicator is collected (Disaggregations: sex and location (and others where data are available))

The suggested indicator is too narrow, with a limited view of ESD while suggested tools such as PISA need to be revised. WWF suggests replacing it with “Percentage of 10 and 15-year old students enrolled in education for sustainable development demonstrating at least a fixed level of knowledge and skills to argue, take a stand, and take action for sustainable development across a selection of topics.” (Source: UNESCO country reports/ ICCS reports next to be updated 2016). An additional indicator could include: “Number of countries with ESD integrated in national curricula (including efforts for entrepreneurial skills for sustainable development and active participation in other programmes for SDGs) (Same source).

Target 6.4

***Indicator 6.4.2****:*Percentage of total available water resources used, taking environmental water requirements into account (Level of Water Stress)

WWF supports the following indicator: “Freshwater withdrawal as a percentage of available, sustainable freshwater supply, which includes allocation of water for the environment.” This indicator builds on that being supported by UN-Water. The concept of sustainability is central to this target and therefore is explicitly included in WWF’s proposed indicator to ensure that environmental requirements are accounted for. Basin-level and temporal information will both be important in measuring the sustainability of water withdrawals. WWF suggests disaggregation to basins, with country-level data to then be developed using proportional averages within country boundaries. To address the need to include temporal water withdrawal information, WWF suggests that a third metric around spatio-temporal monitoring of supply and demand would be highly useful.

Target 6.5

***Indicator 6.5.1****:*Degree of Integrated water resources management (IWRM)

WWF strongly supports the inclusion of both IWRM and transboundary indicators as priorities in order to accurately capture the full intention of target 6.5. In addition to an IWRM indicator, we also support the following transboundary indicator: “Percentage of international watercourses with a formal operational arrangement between all riparians for water cooperation disaggregated by inclusiveness of gender-specific arrangements, objectives and commitments.” This indicator builds on that being proposed by UN-Water, but includes alterations to make the terminology consistent with the UN Watercourses Convention, a global treaty adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1997, and to bring it in line with suggestions for gender-sensitive indicators by World Water Assessment Program/UNESCO.

Target 8.8

***Indicator 8.8.2****:*Number of ILO conventions ratified by type of convention

WWF supports the suggested indicator “Number of ILO conventions ratified by type of convention” but recommends that it be broadened to other relevant labour codes, to read: “Number of ILO conventions and other relevant labour safety instruments that are ratified and implemented”. Other conventions and instruments would include the Cape Town Agreement of 2012 on the Implementation of the Provisions of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol and IMO International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Fishing Vessel Personnel. The indicator should also be disaggregated by sector of activity.

Target 8.9

***Indicator 8.9.1****:*Tourism direct GDP (as % of total GDP and in growth rate); and Number of jobs in tourism industries (as % total jobs and growth rate of jobs, by sex)

WWF strongly supports the UNWTO proposal under 8.9.2 to replace the indicator ‘Tourism consumption” with “Environmental pressure indicator; residual flows and natural inputs...derived from a SEEA for Tourism” which would better reflect the intent of this target.

Target 11.3

***Indicator 11.3.2****:*Percentage of cities with direct participation structure of civil society in

urban planning and management, which operates regularly and democratically (IAEG­SDG

Members added this indicator during the green indicator consultation)

Proxies for direct participation could include participatory budgetary structure, referenda, and open-house consultations.

Target 11.4

***Indicator 11.4.1***: Share of national (or municipal) budget which is dedicated to preservation and conservation of national cultural and natural heritage, including World Heritage sites

An additional indicator could include percentage of urban area and percentage of historical/cultural and natural sites accorded protected status.

Target 11.b

***Indicator 11.b.1***:Percent of cities that are implementing risk reduction and resilience strategies aligned with accepted international frameworks (such as the successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action on Disaster Risk Reduction) that include vulnerable and marginalized groups in their design, implementation and monitoring

*Discussion prompt:*There is a parallel process to review this indicator.

WWF believes that it would be important to broaden the focus of this indicator to include mitigation issues by including mitigation reporting frameworks such as the Compact of Mayors and Covenant of Mayors.

Target 12.2

***Indicator 12.2.1***: Material footprint (MF) and MF/capita

WWF strongly supports the suggested indicator 12.2.2 Material footprint (MF) and MF/capita. This should cover non-food production such as wood, cotton, mining etc. This indicator can also inform targets 8.4 and 12.5.

Target 12.4

***Indicator 12.4.2***: Treatment of waste, generation of hazardous waste (tonnes), hazardous waste management by type of treatment

The proposed indicator could be amended to include "% of waste going to landfill sites" to measure reduction of release into the environment. Alternatively, or in addition, “Annual average levels of selected contaminants in air, water and soil from industrial sources, energy generation, agriculture, transport and wastewater and waste treatment plants” could be used to measure degree of treatment. This could be combined with data on emissions releases against target reductions pledged in the Paris Accord and subsequent agreements that would come under goal 8.

Target 12.a

***Indicator 12.a.1***: Number of qualified green patent applications over total

*Discussion prompt*: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator

Alternative indicators could include: “Percentage of credibly certified sustainable production (as defined by ISEAL http://www.isealalliance.org/our-members) of overall production” as proxy for ‘sustainable production” or " Investment in SCP innovations as a ratio of FDI."

Target 13.1

***Indicator 13.1.1***: Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people

*Discussion prompt*: There is a parallel process to review this indicator.

As the same indicator is already included under other goals, it would add morevalue to include here an indicator of strengthened resilience, as per the proposal by UNEP.

Target 13.2

***Indicator 13.2.1***: Number of countries that have formally communicated the establishment of integrated low-carbon, climate-resilient, disaster risk reduction development strategies (e.g. a national adaptation plan process, national policies and measures to promote transition to environmentally-friendly substances and technologies

*Discussion prompt*: Awaiting the conclusion of the COP21 talks in Paris for the final formulation of this indicator

Number of countries that have formally communicated the integrated low-carbon, climate resilient, disaster risk reduction development strategies to relevant UN agencies by 2020.

Target 13.3

***Indicator 13.3.1***: Number of countries that have integrated mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula

*Discussion prompt*: Awaiting the conclusion of the COP21 talks in Paris for the final formulation of this indicator

Number of countries that have integrated climate change mitigation and it's reduction measures, climate change adaptation, impact reduction and early warning into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula by 2020.

Target 14.1

***Indicator 14.1.1***: Nitrogen use efficiency composite indicator

*Discussion prompt*: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative eindicator that also includes marine debris.

WWF suggests replacing the proposed indicator with the suite of HELCOM (Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission) indicators in order to capture a more comprehensive set of pollution indicators. Data are collected by regional seas organisations and national coastal management organisations. Vessel based garbage into sea could be measured via proxy: MARPOL Annex V ratified and implemented by all flag states. The Red List Index and Living Planet Index of species threatened by pollution would also be of use and bring interlinkages with other targets.

Target 14.2

***Indicator 14.2.1***: % of coastal and marine development (to be defined) with formulation or implemented ICM/MSP plans (that are harmonized where applicable), based on an ecosystem approach, that builds resilient human communities and ecosystems and provides for equitable sharing and decent work

WWF proposes to replace the proposed indicator with "Percentage of change in the extent of marine and coastal wetlands”.... as proposed by Ramsar. The ability of wetlands to support the sustainable management of coastal and marine ecosystems can be measured through trends in their extent. As the suggested indicator for 6.6 focuses only on freshwater ecosystems, this indicator under target 14.2 would also allow reporting on the trends in the extent of coastal and marine wetlands. The data would be obtained through the WET index (Wetlands Extend Trends Index) and would be disaggregated by wetland type as defined by the Ramsar Convention. In addition, WWF strongly suggests to AMEND 14.5 to include coastal areas: "Coverage of protected areas in related to marine and coastal areas" to ensure full coverage.

Target 14.7

***Indicator 14.7.1***: Fisheries as a % of GDP

To capture the sustainability and productivity dimensions of this target, 14.7 should be informed jointly by the suggested indicator for 14.4 “Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable level” and the suggested indicator “Fisheries as a percentage of GDP”. In addition, in order to better represent the economic benefits for SIDS and LDCs WWF suggests an additional indicator on “Volume of aquaculture production certified against credible independent certification schemes” with data collected from the certification bodies.

Target 14.b

***Indicator 14.b.1***: Consider “Proportion of national fishery production by country that are catches by small-medium fishery business” or FAO proposal of “Progress by countries in adopting and implementing legal/regulatory/policy/institutional framework which recognizes and protects access rights for small-scale fisheries”

*Discussion prompt*: At the 2nd IAEG-SDG meeting, Members decided to consider the above two proposals

WWF supports the FAO proposal.

***Indicator 14.c.1***: Number of countries implementing either legally or programmatically the provisions set out in regional seas protocols and ratification and implementation of the ILO

Maritime and Fisheries Conventions (moved to grey by IAEG­SDG Members during the green indicator consultation)

WWF suggests amending the suggested indicator to add other relevant agreements: ‘Number of countries implementing the provisions set out in all relevant agreements and instruments (including UN Fish Stocks Agreement, IMO MARPOL and annexes, Cape Town Agreement, STWC-F, FAO Port State Measures Agreement, ILO Labour in Fishing Agreement, the UNGA annual oceans and fisheries resolutions).

Target 15.1

***Indicator 15.1.1***: Forest area as a percentage of total land area

*Discussion prompt*: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator, in particular considering coverage of protected areas of important sites for terrestrial and fresh water biodiversity

WWF supports amending the indicator suggested by France “Coverage by protected areas of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity” to include Wetlands of International Importance as designated under the Ramsar Convention: “% overage of protected areas of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, including Wetlands of International Importance”. This target could also be informed through additional BIP indicators to provide a larger picture of the extent of conservation or restoration (e.g. The Living Planet Index, Red List Index, PA cover and PA management effectiveness)

Target 15.2

***Indicator 15.2.1***: Forest cover under sustainable forest management

WWF supports the indicator “Forest cover under sustainable forest management” and propose that it this is measured from two complementary sources: (a) forest area under independent forest certification, and (b) the FAO SFM index based on country reporting. Forest certification is neutral to government policies and effectiveness. In this way it can play a vanguard role countries where sustainability is not yet well integrated into public policies and regulations. Certification also translates directly into delineated areas of forest and already applies to a significant portion of the world’s production forests (according to the FAO FRA in 2014 the world had 1,187 million ha of production forest, of which 430 million ha were certified).

Target 15.7

***Indicator 15.7.1***: Red List Index for species in trade (moved to grey by IAEG-SDG Members during the green indicator consultation)

*Discussion prompt*: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator

WWF supports the inclusion of 15.7.1 Red List Index for species in trade, especially if used with the Living Planet Index for species in trade. Both are established BIP indicators. We also support 15.7.2 as an established indicator managed by CITES that more directly measures the Target. It could be the primary indicator if supported by the RLI and Living PIanet Index; it’s linked to targets 16.4 and 16.5. Clarity is needed on use of the term “protected”. For 15.7.2, data concern species protected within a defined framework (CITES) but overlook non-CITES-listed species regulated under forestry/fisheries management regimes and trafficked illegally. Combined with data collection challenges, it would underestimate illegal wildlife trade. The RLI and LPI include a broad range of species and provide a basis to assess species status but do not always distinguish between legal and illegal trade: their utility for trafficked species is limited unless linked to trade systems through 15.7.2.

***Indicator 15.7.2***: Proportion of detected trade in wildlife and wildlife products that is illegal

(same as indicator 15.c.1)

As above, WWF supports the proposed indicator for 15.2 "proportion of detected trade in wildlife and wildlife products that is illegal", when linked with the data sources noted above, ie., the Red List Index and Living Planet Index. This combination has worked well, for example in the recent Living Blue Planet report (http://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/living-blue-planet-report-2015), which tracked the trends in exploited fish species.

Target 15.8

***Indicator 15.8.1***: Adoption of national legislation relevant to the prevention or control of invasive alien species

*Discussion prompt*: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator to cover both legislation and resources

The suggested indicator is weak in that it considers only one “measure to prevent” invasives (legislation). It would be much stronger if the impact of those measures was monitored, which could be done with a combination of appropriate BIP indicators with interlinkages to multiple targets: The Living Planet Index for species threatened by invasives (also 6.6, 14.1, 14.2, 14.4, 14.5, 15.1, 15.2, 15.4, 15.5, 15.7) and the Red List Index for species threatened by invasives (14.1, 14.2, 14.4, 15.2, 15.4, 15.5, 15.7). These would allow both “measures” taken and “impact” to be tracked.

1. http://www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Hoekstra-et-al-2012- GlobalMonthlyWaterScarcity.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-1)