



In this issue

- **CBD Alliance SBSTTA closing statement**
- **Community-based Monitoring**

CBD Alliance closing statement at SBSTTA 28

The message in the **Global Report** is clear: despite some progress, we remain dangerously off track to achieve the goals and targets of the KMGBF.

The provision of the means of implementation from developed to developing countries remains significantly below what is required for its full and effective implementation.

Parties must accelerate whole-of-government action, particularly on Targets 14 and 18, including through stronger fiscal, financial and regulatory policies to align public and private activities and fiscal and financial flows with the KMGBF, and eliminate harmful incentives in an equitable way.

Additionally, there is a collective failure to address the other “elephants in the room”.

Unless the main structural drivers of biodiversity destruction and impediments to implementation - such as sovereign debt burdens, austerity policies and tax injustices - are addressed, transformative change will not be possible. We also regret that there is no formal process or dialogues for the **Global Review**.

In the **IPBES** recommendation, we welcome stronger recognition that governments have a central role in establishing policy, legal and regulatory frameworks for business and finance.

But the text still presents business action as separate from, rather than a product of, effective public policy and regulation. This must be corrected, or we will be unable to deliver the systemic reforms needed to stop biodiversity-destructive activities and align financial systems with biodiversity and human rights.

On **synthetic biology**, the rapid pace of developments in synthetic biology warrants urgent precautionary oversight and a clear-eyed separation of hype from reality.

We must evaluate how synthetic biology may either undermine, or contribute, to the Convention and KMGBF targets, through horizon-scanning, monitoring and assessment. We call on Parties to establish an AHTEG to develop the appropriate methodologies to do so. This must be complemented by a stocktake that can strengthen the work on synthetic biology, in accordance with Articles 7 and 14 of the Convention.

The Thematic Action Plan must support Parties with the capacity to conduct independent assessments, contributing to sovereign decision-making on appropriate and safe technologies, while not bearing the burden of liability and costs associated with adverse effects and technology failures.

Upcoming CBD Alliance Side event:

How can the Global Biodiversity Framework drive effective and equitable action on the biodiversity crisis?

Civil society perspectives on the global review process

▷ Thursday, 6 August, 13:15

▷ CR-10, Grulac meeting room, 2nd floor

Community-based Monitoring remains unmonitored in the GBF review

SBSTTA 28 and SBI 7 must formalize the informal

Kevin Lunzalu, Shoshin, African CSOs Biodiversity Alliance

The deliberations on the midterm review of progress of the implementation of the GBF at SBSTTA 28 and SBI 7, represent an opportune moment for a collective stocktake on how transparent, efficient, and just monitoring of community contributions to the Global Bio-diversity Framework can be attained.

At its adoption, the monitoring framework of the GBF underlined the central contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs) in stewardship of the world's biodiversity hotspots. In particular, it recognizes the role of community-based monitoring and information systems to improve global biodiversity knowledge, data and information, while acknowledging the need to engage indigenous peoples and local communities in the development and management of those information systems.

Unfortunately, while IPLCs are increasingly encouraged and expected to continue monitoring these ecosystems, their contributions are not structurally monitored and reported in ways that align with their traditional knowledge systems.

SBSTTA 28/SBI 7 is an ideal pause-point for governments to urgently address the current epistemic biases and data-flow flaws that marginalize community-based monitoring systems (CBMS). As we rush against time to implement the ambitions of the GBF by 2030, we must be careful not to fall in the traps that failed Aichi targets.

A robust monitoring framework was attached to the GBF to ensure that all contributions to biodiversity conservation are adequately documented, for a clear

assessment of progress. A shift from over-reliance on westernized, quantitative, and 'standardized' monitoring methodologies towards organic and locally driven approaches is critically needed. Such approaches should be distinguished from forms of community engagement in research such as citizen science.

The Convention must embrace alternative, context-based, and qualitative monitoring methods traditionally used by local communities. For example, many indigenous and local Kenyan communities have monitored biodiversity for generations, using qualitative, place-based, and adaptive methods.

Shangani Amani Self-help group, a community-based organization in Msambweni Kwale county that actively restores degraded mangrove areas in Kenya's South Coast, routinely monitors restoration sites by observing natural regeneration of mangrove seedlings, return of indicator species like crabs and shellfish, and projects survival of planted seedlings using seasonal rain and tidal patterns. Discussions on interoperability within the framework drive towards ensuring that the typical science of monitoring and related mechanisms adequately incorporates community-based monitoring.

Beyond the online reporting tool, there must be a dedicated capacity-enhancement mechanism that works with IPLCs, youth, and women to translate their on-ground observations into data formats required by the online repositories, and train them on how to properly submit their contributions. We must not lose sight of the cost-effective, locally relevant, and scientifically valuable biodiversity data that is readily available within the communities.

The opinions, commentaries, and articles printed in ECO are the sole opinion of the individual authors or organisations, unless otherwise expressed.

Submissions are welcome from all civil society groups.

Email: lorch@ifrik.org or eco@cbd-alliance.org