

Indicator proposal

Date: 10/10/2023

Document version: 1

Contact: ayesha.wijesekera@unep-wcmc.org

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Indicator name** Participation of indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs)[[1]](#footnote-2) in national decision-making for biodiversity (tentative) |
| **2. Target measured by the indicator**Target 22: Ensure the full, equitable, inclusive, effective and gender-responsive representation and participation in decision-making, and access to justice and information related to biodiversity by indigenous peoples and local communities, respecting their cultures and their rights over lands, territories, resources, and traditional knowledge, as well as by women and girls, children and youth, and persons with disabilities and ensure the full protection of environmental human rights defenders. |
| **3. Other uses** of the indicator (including if it is a GBF Monitoring Framework headline indicator) |
| **4. How the indicator relates to the GBF target** (e.g., which components or elements it helps to measure or understand, and its suitability for this purpose)The Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework aims to promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, considering the perspectives and rights of IPLCs. The methodology for this indicator aims to measure the degree to which IPLCs are involved in national-level decision-making processes related to biodiversity, specifically with a focus on the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. The indicator can be used by Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) to monitor progress towards Target 22:* Components measured: This indicator will focus on measuring progress towards the “full, equitable, inclusive, effective and gender-responsive representation and participation in decision-making” by IPLCs at the national level. This may include assessing the representation of IPLCs in advisory bodies, engagement of IPLCs leaders in discussions and decisions related to biodiversity, and the extent to which traditional knowledge is integrated into policies.
* Method: The methodology includes a set of questions (with multiple choice answers) which will be summarised as a quantitative measure (index) to provide a value to measure progress over time.
* Suitability: The indicator is highly suitable for assessing progress towards Target 22. The index value aims to provide a measure to evaluate the extent to which IPLCs are actively involved in biodiversity-related decision-making processes at the national level.
* Key contribution: The indicator aims to address a key gap in the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework; the lack of indicators that provide a measure on IPLCs participation in decision-making related to biodiversity.
 |
| **5. The responsible agency** for the production and communication of the indicatorNational government agencies, in collaboration with the CBD Secretariat and UNEP-WCMC |
| **6. Development status of the indicator** (e.g. proposed, in draft form, fully specified and adopted)The methodology for this indicator is under development. More information on the timeline for development of the indicator methodology is provided on item 23. Further information and details (see Table 2). |
| **7. Definition of the indicator**This indicator aims to collect information that can be compiled and provide a meaningful measure to monitor progress towards Parties’ efforts to ensure the “the full, equitable, inclusive, effective and gender-responsive representation and participation in decision-making” of IPLCs, specifically related to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. **Development process (under development)**The indicator is under development, and it is envisioned that the methodology will be co-developed, tested and refined with a sample of Parties to the CBD and IPLCs representatives to ensure that the indicator methodology is fit for purpose and meets their needs (details on the timeline for development of the indicator methodology can be found in item 23. Further information and details, Table 2). The development of the methodology would follow two stages. The initial stage focuses on the development/refinement of a questionnaire with multiple choice answers (see below ***Stage 1***). The proposed questions are to be co-designed/refined in consultation with Parties to the CBD and IPLCs representatives to ensure that all key elements that relate to participation are addressed.The answers to the questions are then to be converted into a numerical value and the indicator will be presented as an index in the second stage (see below ***Stage 2***). The index will allow countries to track their individual progress over time with respect to Target 22, and provide countries with an approach to measure progress at regional and global level.***Stage 1:***Target 22 is relevant to multiple groups: IPLCs, women and girls, children and youth, persons with disabilities, and environmental human rights defenders. It acknowledges that various stakeholders need to be engaged in decision-making processes related to biodiversity. However, for the purposes of this methodology, the scope and target group will be IPLCs.The indicator will be based on sets of questions with categorical responses (e.g. binary “yes/no” responses similar to the binary/global indicators proposed under the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework ([CBD/COP/DEC/15/5](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-15/cop-15-dec-05-en.pdf)). The questions relate to the full, equitable, inclusive, effective and gender responsive representation and participation of IPLCs in national decision-making for biodiversity. Efforts will be made to ensure alignment with questions included under the global indicator for Target 22, which is being developed by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators (AHTEG on indicators), and information provided in document [CBD/SBSTTA/25/2](https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/229b/2a8e/b4c4c5d7c8ecf908c2272c9d/sbstta-25-02-en.pdf). The proposed questions are to be organised under four dimensions: legal frameworks; representativeness; enabling conditions; level of participation. These four dimensions aim to cover the “full, equitable, inclusive, effective and gender-responsive representation and participation” addressed in Target 22. * *Legal frameworks:* thisdimension includes questions related to current national frameworks that regulate the participation of IPLCs in decision-making processes, including policy, legal and administrative measures, as well as mechanisms established as part of the implementation of legal frameworks.
* *Representativeness:* this dimension includes a set of questions related with access to equitable, inclusive, and gender-responsive representation.
* *Enabling conditions:* this dimension includes questions related to key support that IPLCs require to ensure their effective participation (e.g., capacity building, financing, FPIC).
* *Level of participation:* this dimension includes questions to assesses the full participation of IPLCs.

The draft questions to each of the four dimensions are shown in **Table 1** (Item 23. Further information and details). These questions are proposed as a starting point, to be discussed and further refined/co-developed with Parties to the CBD and IPLCs representatives.***Stage 2:***Each question under the four different dimensions is to be answered with nuanced “yes” or “no” responses, for example: (a) Yes, fully; (b) Yes, mostly; (c) No, but planned; (d) No, not at this time. Questions may have a single answer, or allow for multiple choice (i.e., selecting all responses that apply). The questionnaire is meant to be answered by interested CBD Parties, through a lead government agency with input from other relevant government agencies and IPLCs representatives as relevant and based on national circumstances (what is appropriate for each country interested in making use of this indicator). The answers to the questions are then to be converted from categorical answers to a numerical value and summarised as an index (e.g., a value from 0 to 1). Further detail is provided in item 10. Calculation procedure.**8. Units of the indicator** (e.g. km2, number of individuals, % change)The index is presented in a range of values from 0 to 1, where 0= no participation of IPLCs in biodiversity decision-making, and 1 = full, equitable, inclusive, effective and gender-responsive representation and participation in biodiversity decision-making.**9. Forms of presentation** (graph types, maps, narrative text, etc. – give examples where possible)Line plot, histogram, choropleth maps (TBC).**10.** **Calculation procedure** (method)The index could be presented in a range of values from 0 (no participation of IPLCs in biodiversity decision-making) to 1 (full, equitable, inclusive, effective and gender-responsive representation and participation in biodiversity decision-making).There are three steps proposed for calculating the index value:**Step 1.** Converting nuanced answers to numeric values: Each question under the four different dimensions is to be answered with nuanced “yes” or “no” responses. These nuances represent a continuous scale of values, and as such each answer can be seen as a point in that scale between 0 and 1. Values for each answer correspond to: (a) Yes, fully = 1; (b) Yes, mostly = 0.66; (c) No, but planned = 0.33; (d) No, not at this time = 0. Questions may have a single answer, or allow for multiple choice (i.e., selecting all responses that apply). **Step 2.** Creating the dimension indices: Take the arithmetic mean of the questions in each of the dimensions.**Step 3.** Aggregating the dimensional indices: Take the geometric mean of the four-dimensional indices.**Illustration:** Example of how the index could be calculated as per steps described above. Let us assume Country A provides the following answers to three questions under the four Indicator dimensions: **Step 1.** Converting nuanced answers to numeric values. For illustration purposes, let us assume the maximum value is selected when multiple choices are given (e.g., if answers (a), (b) and (c) are selected, the numerical value 1 is given). **Step 2.** Creating the dimension indices**Step 3.** Aggregating the dimensional indices**Interpretation:** Country A has an *index of 0.64* in terms of participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in national decision-making for biodiversity.Note: Results can also be displayed as 3 ranges: High/ Medium/ Low participationCountry A: participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in national decision-making for biodiversity was categorised as Medium. **11. Frequency of production** **of the indicator**Data will be collected in 2025 (data point related to NBSAPs updates/revisions); 2027 (data point related to the submissions of national reports 7th NR); 2029 (data point related to the submission of national reports 8th NR). By 2030, we expect that three data points would have been collected (2025, 2027, 2029) and an updated index value for those countries that are interested in testing this indicator methodology. After 2030, collection years will be chosen accordingly to decisions and timelines adopted by COP19. A similar pattern for the frequency should be maintained.**12. Where the indicator results are published** National Reports to the CBD, if possible, via the Online Reporting Tool. |
| **13. Reports** **that use the indicator and their frequency** The indicator is expected to be used in National Reports to the CBD and could also be used in Local Biodiversity Outlooks (LBO).  |
| **14. Where data is available for the indicator** (e.g., a database)Responsible agency and person for the data sourceTBCTime period for which data is availableTBCLevel of coverage by the data for the subject of interest (e.g. geographical area, relevant populations)  |
| **15. How observations and measurements** (primary data) **are obtained for the indicator** TBC – this section will be co-developed with Parties to the CBD.  |
| **16. How to interpret the indicator results** (e.g., how effectively it helps to measure the target; limitations of the data; its suitability for aggregation; meaning of upward or downward trends; threshold values)The indicator is being developed to collect responses (data) at the national level. The data can be aggregated to a regional and global level.  |
| **17. Limits to the indicator’s usefulness and accuracy** (e.g., slow change in response to changes in the subject of interest; poor quality data; limited scope for updating)TBC |
| **18. Closely related indicators** (including in national and international processes) |
| **19. Costs and funding to produce and maintain the indicator**Annual staff and office costs (current and future years) + source of funding + any funding gapsAnnual computing and other infrastructure costs (current and future years) + source of funding + any funding gapsAnnual costs to produce information products (indicators, reports, etc.) (current and future years) + source of funding + any funding gapsActions to address any funding requirements |
| **22. Capacity development needs**Personnel or staff positions to be filledTechnical skills to be developedComputing and other infrastructure needs to be developedActions to address capacity development needs |
| **23.** **Further information and details** A draft questionnaire with four dimensions and sets of questions under each dimension is provided below in Table 1 – this is the proposed Stage 1 of the methodology. Respondents must choose at least one answer for each question, and they can provide examples (option e).Note: The proposed structure is a starting point to be further co-developed with Parties to the CBD and IPLCs representatives; a glossary of key terms (e.g., policy instruments, legal instruments, etc.) will be provided once all questions are finalised.**Table 1.** Draft questionnaire for the indicator on participation of IPLCs in national decision-making for biodiversity

|  |
| --- |
| Dimension 1. Legal frameworks  |
| 1. In terms of decision-making processes related to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework: |
| 1.1 Has your country adopted policy instruments aimed at supporting the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs) in biodiversity decision-making related to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework?(a) Yes, fully(b) Yes, mostly(c) No, but planned (d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |
| 1.2 Has your country adopted legal instruments aimed at supporting the participation of IPLCs in biodiversity decision-making related to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework?(a) Yes, fully(b) Yes, mostly(c) No, but planned (d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |
| 1.3 Has your country implemented legal and/or administrative processes aimed at supporting the participation of IPLCs in biodiversity decision-making related to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework?(a) Yes, fully(b) Yes, mostly(c) No, but planned (d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |

|  |
| --- |
| Dimension 2. Representativeness of IPLCs |
| 2. In terms of decision-making processes related to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework: |
| 2.1 Does your country support the participation of IPLCs in decision-making processes related to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework? (a) Yes, fully(b) Yes, mostly(c) No, but planned (d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |
| 2.2 Does your country ensure gender responsive participation (representing the views of women and men) to support the participation of IPLCs in decision-making processes related to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework? (a) Yes, fully (equal number of women and men participate)(b) Yes, mostly (efforts are made to gather the views of women and men) (c) No, but planned (d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |
| 2.3 How does your country ensure that the views of IPLCs in decision-making processes related to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework are accurately represented? (Select all that apply)(a) Members of IPLCs participate in decision-making processes in their individual capacities(b) IPLCs participate in decision-making processes represented by the leaders of their communities(c) IPLCs participate in decision-making processes represented by the leaders of their organisations or groups (c) IPLCs participate in decision-making processes represented by relevant government representatives that convey IPLCs interests(d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |
| 2.4 Are working documents and relevant information to support decision-making processes made available in Indigenous languages, for the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework?(a) Yes, fully (all documentation and information is available in all Indigenous languages)(b) Yes, mostly (key documents and information is available in all official languages)(c) No, but planned (d) No, not at this time (all documentation and information is only available in one official language)(e) If applicable, provide examples: |
|  |
| 3. In terms of the development and implementation of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs): |
| 3.1 Does your country support the participation of IPLCs in the development and implementation of NBSAPs? (a) Yes, fully(b) Yes, mostly(c) No, but planned (d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |
| 3.2 If your country allows for participation of IPLCs in the development and implementation of NBSAPs, are efforts made to ensure gender responsiveness?(a) Yes, fully (equal participation, equal numbers of women and men)(b) Yes, mostly (participation is not equal but efforts are made to gather the views from women and men)(c) No, but planned (d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |
| 3.3 How does your country ensure that the views of IPLCs are accurately represented in the development and implementation of NBSAPs? (Select all that apply)(a) Members of IPLCs participate in the development/implementation of NBSAPs in their individual capacities(b) IPLCs participate in the development/implementation of NBSAPs represented by the leaders of their communities(c) IPLCs participate in the development/implementation of NBSAPs represented by the leaders of IPLCs organisations or groups (c) IPLCs participate in the development/implementation of NBSAPs represented by relevant government representatives that convey IPLCs interests(d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |
| 3.4 Are working documents and relevant information for discussions available in all Indigenous languages needed for the development and implementation of NBSAPs?(a) Yes, fully (all documentation and information is available in all Indigenous languages needed)(b) Yes, mostly (key documents and information is available in all official languages)(c) No, but planned (d) No, not at this time (documentation is available in one official language)(e) If applicable, provide examples: |
|  |
| 4. In terms of the production of National Reports for the CBD: |
| 4.1 Does your country support the participation of IPLCs in the development of National Reports to the CBD? (a) Yes, fully(b) Yes, mostly(c) No, but planned (d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |
| 4.2 If your country supports the participation of IPLCs in the process of producing the National Reports to the CBD, are efforts made to ensure gender responsiveness?(a) Yes, fully (participation is equal, engagement of both women and men)(b) Yes, mostly (participation is not equal but efforts are made to reflect the views of women and men)(c) No, but planned (d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |
| 4.3 How does your country ensure that the views of IPLCs are accurately represented in the National Reports to the CBD? (Select all that apply)(a) Members of IPLCs contribute to national reports in their individual capacities(b) IPLCs contribute to national reports through the leaders of their communities(c) IPLCs contribute to national reports through representatives of IPLCs organisations or groups (c) IPLCs contribute to national reports through relevant government representatives that convey IPLCs interests(d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |
| 4.4 Are working documents and relevant information needed to contribute to National Reports to the CBD made available in Indigenous languages?(a) Yes, fully (all documentation available in at least one Indigenous language)(b) Yes, mostly (only final versions of documents and reports are available in at least one Indigenous language)(c) No, but planned (d) No, not at this time (all documentation only available in one official language)(e) If applicable, provide examples: |

|  |
| --- |
| Dimension 3. Enabling conditions to support IPLCs participation  |
| 5. In terms of decision-making processes related to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework: |
| 5.1 Does your country provide capacity building to enable participation of IPLCs in biodiversity decision-making related to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework?(a) Yes, fully(b) Yes, mostly(c) No, but planned (d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |
| 5.2 Does your country allocate financial resources to enable participation of IPLCs in biodiversity decision-making related to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework?(a) Yes, direct funding is made available to support IPLCs participation (b) Yes, some funding is made available to support IPLCs participation (c) No, but planned (d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |
| 5.3 Does your country have data platforms that relate to IPLCs and their contributions to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework?(a) Yes, there is a national database to manage and support IPLCs data (b) Yes, but needs improvement (c) No, but planned(d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |

|  |
| --- |
| Dimension 4. Level of participation by IPLCs |
| 6. In terms of decision-making related processes for the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework: |
| 6.1 Does your country provide all IPLCs with opportunities to engage in decision-making processes related to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework?(a) Yes, fully (all IPLCs have an opportunity to participate) (b) Yes, mostly (most but not all IPLCs participate) (c) No, but planned (d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |
| 6.2 What is the level of participation of IPLCs in decision-making processes related to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework?(a) Yes, fully (IPLCs actively engage as part of all relevant decision-making processes and are involved throughout the entire process)(b) Yes, mostly (IPLCs are consulted and can provide feedback as part of the relevant decision-making processes however they are not involved throughout the entire process) (c) No, but planned (IPLCs are not consulted or able to collaborate as part of the relevant decision-making processes at this moment but are kept informed)(d) No, not at this time(e) If applicable, provide examples: |

 |

### **Table 2.** Timeline for development of the proposed indicator methodology

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Steps in the development process**  | **Responsible actors** | **Oct-23** | **Nov-23** | **Dec-23** | **Jan-24** | **Feb-24** | **Mar-24** | **Apr-24** | **May-24** | **Jun-24** | **Jul-24** | **Aug-24** | **Sep-24** | **Oct-24** | **No-24** |
| ***Stage 1*** |
| Share initial proposal for indicator methodology at SBSTTA-25 | UNEP-WCMC & FPP |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Share initial proposal for indicator methodology at WG8J-12 | UNEP-WCMC & FPP |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Co-develop methodology with interested CBD Parties  | Government agencies nominated  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Co-develop methodology with interested representatives of IPLCs  | IIFB and other interested IPLCs representatives |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ***Stage 2*** |
| Test and refine the methodology with interested CBD Parties | Relevant government agencies |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Share updated version (based on co-development) at SBSTTA-26 | CBD Parties, IPLCs representatives, UNEP-WCMC, FPP |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Finalise indicator methodology  | Relevant government agencies, IPLCs representatives, UNEP-WCMC, FPP |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Present indicator methodology at COP 16 for consideration  | CBD Parties, IPLCs representatives |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

1. For the purpose of this proposed indicator methodology, we make reference to indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs), following the wording used in the CBD process [↑](#footnote-ref-2)