



## **Factsheet on Monitoring**

On December 19, 2022, at the CBD COP 15 in Montréal, the Kunming-Montreal GBF was adopted in Decision COP/15/4. Along with it, the COP also adopted a monitoring framework developed in parallel with the framework itself. It consists of a list of Headline indicators that every party needs to report on, as well as optional component and complementary indicators (COP/15/5).

At the time of adoption, however, the list of indicators was not complete and did not cover all the targets. In order to fill the gaps, Decision 15/5 established an Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) to address these shortcomings. The AHTEG, consisting of 45 experts, met 6 times and collected input from various sources including the Liaison group on the Cartagena Protocol for target 17, the FAO expert meeting for target 7, and the TEG on finance indicators for goal D and target 18.

In an early round of discussions, the AHTEG put together suggestions for binary indicators, which consist of a set of mainly yes/no questions that Parties will be required to respond to through their national reports. For all targets where no headline indicator was adopted at COP15, a binary indicator is now the only mandatory indicator available, with the exception of target 20.

Parties negotiated the details of many of the questions, but were not able to complete their review – hence the whole annex is in square brackets in Recommendation 25/REC/1. This document, in conjunction with the AHTEG report and the underlying comprehensive SBSTTA/26/INF/14 document and the advice of the AHTEG (SBSTTA 26/2 add1), as well numerous more specific documents, will need to be put together to form one document which contains all the indicators that will be used to monitor the framework.

Even with the work done to-date, this document will still have gaps and the AHTEG has produced a gap analysis, illustrating the gaps that still exist between the content of the Goals and Targets and what the current indicators can monitor, with some suggestions on further work that should be carried out (see Annex III of draft recommendation 26/2 and, for more details, SBSTTA/26/INF/19).

The INF/14 document also contains a useful discussion on how Section C of the GBF should be taken into account in monitoring while acknowledging that another gap is represented by the fact that the indicators adopted at COP-15 were identified in relation to the Goals and Targets, and not on the crosscutting considerations for implementation contained in Section C.

It is clear that monitoring needs to start as soon as possible in order to have an idea of where the implementation of the KMGBF stands and to provide a basis for identifying trends and developments and to direct action to the places where it is most needed. So the adoption of the updated indicator framework at SBSTTA and then at COP 16 is of paramount importance.

On the other hand, if the CBD doesn't fill the gaps that have been identified, it will not be able to tell how well we are advancing on some of the other targets. It is therefore also necessary to show a way how to fill these gaps.

Draft recommendation 26/2, in its para 6, recommends parties to undertake work to fill the gaps addressed in annex III, and in paras 21-22, suggests that IPBES considers these gaps and that COP 17 undertakes a review of the indicator framework, also based on the analysis of the functioning of the indicator framework to be undertaken by the secretariat. But calling on parties to fill these gaps individually and having a review is not enough: it must be clarified that they need to be inserted into the framework after the scrutiny has been done and suggestions have been made, so another improvement can be made at COP 17.

The current proposals for indicators are included in Annexes I and II of the draft recommendation, while Annex III sums up the gaps. SBSTTA/26/INF/14 reports on the issues in detail and provides the necessary background target by target. Some of the most important insufficiencies of the framework emerging from these documents are:

- In General, there is a need for suitable headline indicators for targets where no headline indicator was adopted at COP15, many of which are targets on means of implementation, deal with cross-cutting issues (e.g. inclusive participation, rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, and gender), or address the underlying drivers of biodiversity loss. Binary indicators are limited in the extent to which they can measure outcome, effectiveness, and qualities of the measures put in place by Parties.
- Target 3 – the headline only looks at the overall area of the sites officially designated or recognized as protected or conserved areas without necessarily ensuring the representativity, quality, or connectivity of the sites or checking if human rights have been respected.

- Target 6: the elements of the binary indicator only check if there are measures in place to control invasive alien species, but don't give any idea if these really work and actually reduce the expansion of invasive alien species.
- The indicator on target 7 (pollution) does not currently address plastic pollution or the overall impacts of pollution. The complementary indicator on highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs), which was adopted at COP15, has also been removed. It would be pertinent to reinstate it, as it will help Parties to monitor, at a national level, their implementation of Target 7. The HHPs indicator is not complex, and in reporting against Headline Indicator 7.2 (ATAT) Parties will already be required to collect the data needed to report against the complementary indicator on HHPs.
- The indicator on target 8 (climate change and biodiversity) merely checks if measures are put in place but not if they actually have an impact. The KMGBF Monitoring Framework should have an indicator on ecosystem integrity that tracks ecosystem integrity as a function of four key elements: (1) dissipative structures, (2) ecosystem processes, (3) stability and risk profiles, and (4) ecosystem integrity level based on 1-3.
- The same applies to the headline indicator on wild species (target 9).
- Target 10's indicator measures the area under sustainable land use without clearly defining what can be regarded as sustainable. The component indicator for target 10 uses the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership language regarding forest management and mentions FSC and PEFC, neither of which is necessarily reliable.
- Target 12 on green and blue spaces in cities does not monitor well-being, mainstreaming, benefits, connectivity, or quality.
- On target 13, indicators remain unsatisfactory as there is no agreement on DSI yet.
- Target 14 on the alignment of government planning and activities with the requirements of the GBF focuses on actions and measures but does not check the results, the wording in 14.4 which reads "the necessary measures are in place to align the fiscal and financial flows with the target" would be an improvement in that sense. The proposed System of Environmental and Economic Accounting, however, places biodiversity in the context of economic analysis which is an inadequate approach to our planetary life support systems .

- Flaws in target 15 lies with the target itself which fails to include due diligence and liability regulations, plus verification of claims made as an important measure for corporate activities to prevent the destruction of biodiversity. The proposed application of the Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures is not acceptable because it is voluntary and omits vital reporting and verification requirements. <https://forestsandfinance.org/news/ngos-feedback-to-tnfd-calls-for-human-rights-approach-and-impact-reporting-and-more/> .
- The binary indicator for Target 16 currently does not address the reduction of the global footprint of consumption nor the reduction of global food waste by half. The target makes ‘consumers’ responsible for tackling consumption, whereas this should mainly be the responsibility of parties who need to set the right incentives.
- Targets 22 and 23 and their binary indicators are of great importance and cross-cutting; they concern human rights and gender issues. Both, however, do not measure the outcomes of efforts undertaken, and there is no clear methodology to monitor the progress of these targets.
- There is a need for headline indicator(s) for Target 22; the indicator “Land use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities” adopted by the Working group on Article 8j fits the criteria for such an indicator and is relevant for a number of other targets.

The AHTEG rightly identified Section C on principles that need to be respected when implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and established a list of indicators that are available to monitor whether these are respected (SBSTTA/26/2, Annex II, Table 2). While some of this is ready and should be used instantly, much of it requires further methodological work which urgently needs to be pursued further.

Overall, a two track-approach is necessary: agree at SBSTTA-26 on what is ripe for adoption at COP - 16 so the monitoring process can take place for a sufficient amount of time to see relevant trends, but be aware that there are substantial gaps which prevent us from getting the whole picture and which need to be filled urgently – for which there needs to be a clear mandate and an inclusive process leading up to COP 17.