



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General

4 May 2026

Original: English

Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice

Twenty-eighth meeting

Nairobi, 27 July–1 August 2026

Item 3 of the provisional agenda*

Planning, monitoring, reporting and review

Monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

Note by the Secretariat

I. Background

1. Through its decision [15/5](#), the Conference of the Parties adopted the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. The monitoring framework comprises headline, binary, component and complementary indicators. In decision [15/6](#), Parties were requested to use headline indicators, supplemented by component, complementary and national indicators, in relevant national planning processes, including national biodiversity strategies and action plans, according to their national circumstances, and to use headline indicators and responses to binary questions in their national reports, supplemented, as appropriate, by optional component, complementary and national indicators.

2. In decision [16/31](#), the Conference of the Parties endorsed technical updates to the headline and binary indicators in the monitoring framework and welcomed the guidance on the monitoring framework provided by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.¹ In decision [16/32](#), the Conference of the Parties endorsed revisions to the national reporting template for the seventh and eighth national reports. Through decision [16/31](#), it set out several requests to the Executive Secretary of the Secretariat of the Convention, as well as to the Subsidiary Body, to further support the operationalization of the monitoring framework, including in the following areas:

(a) Analysis of the use of the headline, binary, component, complementary and national indicators in national reports and the review of the needs of Parties in the implementation of the monitoring framework;

(b) Further development, review and update of the monitoring framework and the metadata of the headline indicators on the basis of, among other things, the submissions of views by Parties and observers on the monitoring framework and the metadata for the headline indicators;

(c) Sharing information on the monitoring framework and providing support for its use.

3. The requests related to subparagraph 2 (a) are addressed in document CBD/SBSTTA/28/2 and in an information document. Requests related to subparagraphs 2 (b) and (c) are addressed in

* [CBD/SBSTTA/28/1](#).

¹ [CBD/COP/16/INF/3/Rev.1](#) and [CBD/COP/16/INF/4](#).

sections II and III of the present document. Section IV contains elements that the Subsidiary Body may wish to consider when developing its recommendation on agenda item 3. The annex contains indicators that could be considered for incorporation into the monitoring framework.

II. Further development, review and update of the monitoring framework and its headline indicator metadata

4. In decision [16/31](#), the Subsidiary Body was requested by the Conference of the Parties, to review updated metadata for headline indicators, as well as the list of component and complementary indicators in decision [15/5](#) that had met the criteria² for inclusion in the monitoring framework since the adoption of that decision.

A. Updates to the monitoring framework

5. In decision [16/31](#), the Executive Secretary was requested to compile submissions on additional headline, component and complementary indicators that met the criteria for inclusion in the monitoring framework to help to address the gaps in the monitoring framework. The Executive Secretary was also requested to compile submissions from Parties of inputs and relevant information to support the development of a methodology for additional component indicators for headline indicators 18.1 and 18.2. In response to those requests, the Executive Secretary invited, through three notifications, submissions on those topics.³ More than 100 changes to the monitoring framework were proposed through the submissions. The focus of the submissions from Parties and observers can be grouped into several general categories, as outlined in the following paragraphs.

6. **Opposition to the modification of the monitoring framework and the inclusion of new indicators.** Several Parties noted that no or minimal changes to the monitoring framework should be made at the present stage. Among their reasons was the fact that the headline indicators are a vital element of the national report template and modifications at this stage would be problematic. Some Parties also noted that the incorporation of additional indicators would increase the reporting burden on Parties and that adjustments to the monitoring framework should be considered only once Parties have had more experience with its use through the preparation of their seventh and eighth national reports.

7. **Proposals for additional headline, binary, component and complementary indicators.** There were suggestions for new headline, binary, component and complementary indicators that could be incorporated into the monitoring framework. Some of the proposals were related to issues already addressed in the monitoring framework to varying extents, while others were related to perceived gaps in the monitoring framework. Some of the proposed indicators had unclear levels of methodological readiness, and others were the possible disaggregation of existing indicators in the monitoring framework. In addition, there were proposals for alternative presentations of existing indicators in the monitoring framework.

8. **Reintroduction of excluded indicators.** There were calls for the reintroduction of indicators that had been included in the monitoring framework when it was adopted in decision [15/5](#) but had subsequently been removed in decision [16/31](#) when the monitoring framework was updated. It should be recalled that the indicators were removed largely on the basis of advice from the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework established by the Conference of the Parties in decision [15/5](#) to advise on the further operationalization of the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. That advice was in turn considered at the twenty-sixth meeting of the Subsidiary Body.⁴

² The criteria are included in paragraph 2 of the annex to decision [15/5](#).

³ The submissions are available at www.cbd.int/notifications/2025-044, www.cbd.int/notifications/2025-045 and www.cbd.int/notifications/2025-077.

⁴ A summary of the changes made to the monitoring framework between decisions [15/5](#) and [16/31](#), including the rationale for the changes, is available in document [CBD/COP/16/INF/5](#).

9. **Alignment of indicators already in the monitoring framework with additional or other goals or targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.** Some submitters suggested that indicators already in the monitoring framework should be repeated in order to highlight their relevance to other goals and targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. When the monitoring framework was being prepared, however, it was noted that, to the extent possible, each indicator should appear therein only once and that some indicators could be relevant to multiple goals and targets.

10. **Inclusion of additional disaggregation for existing headline indicators.** Some submitters suggested the inclusion of additional types of disaggregation for headline indicators. It should be recalled that the disaggregation of the headline indicators by Parties in their national reports is optional. Furthermore, in paragraph 14 of decision [16/31](#), the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and other Governments, including local and subnational governments, to take section C of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework into consideration when implementing the monitoring framework, including by disaggregating the headline indicators by indigenous peoples and local communities, sex, age, persons with disabilities and other relevant groups and by ecosystem type, where appropriate.

11. **Inclusion of indicators that could be the disaggregation of indicators already in the framework.** Some submitters suggested including as stand-alone indicators the disaggregation of indicators that are already in the framework, such as indicators related to specific ecosystem types or species groups. It should be recalled that, when the monitoring framework was being developed, indicators with the widest possible applicability were included and Parties have the option to disaggregate them according to their national circumstances.

12. **Indicators under development and issues to monitor.** Some submitters identified indicators under development that could be included in the monitoring framework. Some submitters proposed indicators but did not include any information on the way in which they addressed the criteria identified in decision [15/5](#). Other submitters identified specific issues that should be monitored but did not identify a specific indicator.

13. **Change in indicator category.** Some submitters suggested that changes should be made to the category of some indicators in the monitoring framework. For example, some complementary indicators could be changed to component indicators or some component indicators could become headline indicators.

14. Taking into consideration the requests in decision [16/31](#) and the criteria for indicators in decision [15/5](#), the Secretariat has identified among the submissions 12 indicators that could be considered for inclusion in the monitoring framework. With a view to minimizing the reporting burden on Parties, taking into account the views expressed by some Parties on keeping changes to the monitoring framework to a minimum and noting that the use of complementary indicators in national reports is optional, the Subsidiary Body may wish to recommend that the Conference of the Parties consider adding those 12 indicators to the monitoring framework as complementary indicators when the monitoring framework is next updated

15. In relation to Target 18 of the Framework, Parties proposed six indicators, of which five met the criteria for indicators set out in decision [15/5](#) and could be considered for incorporation into the monitoring framework. Given that, in paragraph 8 of decision [16/31](#), the Conference of the Parties decided that further work was needed to develop component indicators on subsidies harmful to biodiversity, the Subsidiary Body may wish to recommend that the Conference of the Parties consider adding those five indicators to the monitoring framework as component indicators when the monitoring framework is next updated. In addition, in all their submissions on the indicators for Target 18, Parties highlighted observations, challenges and limitations related to the associated headline indicators. The observations were considered as part of the update to the metadata for the headline indicators described in subsection II B of the present document.

16. Regarding the review of the list of component and complementary indicators in decision [15/5](#) that have met the criteria for inclusion in the monitoring framework since the adoption of that decision, 71 component and complementary indicators in the monitoring framework adopted in decision [15/5](#) were removed from the updated monitoring framework in decision [16/31](#) owing to their lack of an available methodology. The Secretariat has reviewed those indicators and four now meet the criteria for inclusion in the monitoring framework and could be considered for reintroduction when the monitoring framework is next updated.⁵

17. The annex contains a list of indicators that the Subsidiary Body may wish to recommend that the Conference of the Parties include in the monitoring framework. The indicators meet the criteria set out in decision [15/5](#) and could help to address gaps in the monitoring framework. In keeping with the logic of the monitoring framework, the suggested updates do not include any indicators that are the disaggregation of existing indicators. Similarly, the suggested updates do not include any new binary indicators. The binary indicators agreed by the Conference of the Parties are calculated from the responses to specific questions in the national report template. New binary indicators would need to be reflected in the template for the eighth national reports, which is expected to be agreed at the eighteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Changes to the mapping of the indicators to the goals and targets have also not been proposed, given that Parties already have the flexibility to use the headline indicators in the monitoring framework for monitoring progress towards any of their national targets as relevant to their national circumstances. Furthermore, the additional disaggregation of existing indicators in the monitoring framework has not been suggested, given that the use of disaggregation by Parties is optional and that there is nothing in the monitoring framework that prevents Parties using additional disaggregation.

B. Updates to the metadata

18. In decision [16/31](#), the Executive Secretary was requested to work with relevant organizations to further develop the metadata for headline indicators 1.1, 7.2 and 9.1 and with organizations identified in table 1 of annex II to document [CBD/SBSTTA/26/2](#) and other relevant organizations to update the metadata of other headline indicators, especially for those indicators at a lower level of development, as necessary. The Executive Secretary was also requested to compile submissions from Parties and indigenous people and local communities on inputs and relevant information to support the development of a methodology for headline indicator 22.1.⁶ Furthermore, in response to notifications Nos. [2025-044](#), [2025-045](#), [2025-046](#) and [2025-077](#), Parties and observers also provided suggestions for updating the metadata for the headline indicators.

19. In response to the requests in decision [16/31](#), the Secretariat, in cooperation with relevant organizations and considering the submissions received, updated the metadata for the headline indicators. When updating the metadata, the Secretariat considered the study on opportunities to strengthen tracking of the various sources of biodiversity finance, which was prepared in response to the request in subparagraph 25 (b) of decision [16/34](#). The study will be made available in an information document.

20. The updated metadata for the headline indicators are available in an information document. That document also provides, in addition to an overview of the current methodological readiness of the headline indicators, a summary of the updates that have been made to the metadata since the guidance on the monitoring framework, including the metadata, provided by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework was welcomed by the Conference of the Parties at its sixteenth meeting.

21. Through the updating process, minor changes were made to 17 headline indicators in order to improve the clarity of the text, include additional references and provide updated information on the

⁵ Two of the indicators – scorecard of genetic diversity in wild species and global environmental impacts of consumption – were also proposed by a Party and have been considered in the context described in paragraph 4 of the present document.

⁶ The submissions are available at www.cbd.int/notifications/2025-046.

data and guidance that are available for calculating the indicator. More substantive changes were made to four indicators to account for progress that has been made in developing their methodologies. Six indicators remain unchanged, in some cases because no organization is currently working on the indicator. No changes were made to the methodologies for the binary indicators, but the wording of the metadata was updated to reflect the wording agreed by the Conference of the Parties in annex III of decision [16/31](#).

22. The current status of the headline indicators that were singled out for particular attention in subparagraphs 30 (a) and 30 (d) of decision [16/31](#) is described in the following paragraphs.

23. **Headline indicator 1.1: percentage of land and sea area covered by biodiversity-inclusive spatial plans.** When preparing its guidance, the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework noted that further development of the metadata for the indicator was required for it to be operational. Currently no organization is actively working on the indicator, and the Secretariat has been unable to identify any potential collaborators to work on its development. The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services is undertaking a methodological assessment of integrated biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning and ecological connectivity, which could provide information relevant to the further development of the metadata for the indicator. The methodological readiness of the indicator remains low.

24. **Headline indicator 7.2: pesticide environment concentration and/or aggregated total applied toxicity.** For Target 7, two possible headline indicators were agreed by the Conference of the Parties. The pesticide environmental concentration indicator does not currently have metadata; the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework recommended the use of the aggregated total applied toxicity indicator, for which it had developed metadata. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) has been facilitating the further development of the aggregated total applied toxicity indicator by a group of experts in environmental toxicity, pesticides and pesticide risk assessment, and of national and global pollution indicators. On the basis of that work and considering the submissions from Parties and the views expressed during the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the metadata for the aggregated total applied toxicity indicator have been updated. In addition, FAO has been piloting the use of that indicator with several Parties.

25. **Headline indicator 9.1: benefits from the sustainable use of wild species.** The Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework did not develop or identify metadata for this headline indicator and noted that more work was needed to make it operational. No organization is currently actively working on the indicator, and the Secretariat has been unable to identify any potential collaborators to work on its development. Consequently, no updates to the metadata have been made. The methodological readiness of the indicator remains low.

26. **Headline indicator 22.1: land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous peoples and local communities.** Across the submissions received, there was general support for the continued development of the indicator. Many submissions included suggestions for specific refinements to ensure that the indicator is technically rigorous, can be reported on through the national reports and remains responsive to rights-based concerns and the concerns of indigenous peoples and local communities. On the basis of the submissions and drawing on prior methodological work led by FAO, the International Land Coalition and the World Resources Institute, the metadata for the indicator have been updated with the aim of improving the methodological clarity, strengthening operational feasibility at the national level and reflecting better the diversity of tenure systems, data sources and monitoring realities across countries. Furthermore, the descriptions of central terms and the structure and concepts underpinning the indicator methodology have been updated for clarity. Similarly, the structure of the indicator and the treatment of its data sources have been further clarified. Overall, the updates to the metadata have been made in order to address the

recurring issues that were raised through the submission process, including ensuring that the metadata better reflect the recognition of customary, ancestral and spiritual dimensions of traditional territories, of free, prior and informed consent and of indigenous data governance principles; include greater recognition of indigenous and community-led monitoring systems; and have greater focus on freshwater, coastal and marine, gender and participation dimensions. The changes help to increase the methodological readiness and relevance of the indicator.

III. Information-sharing

27. In decision [16/31](#), the Executive Secretary was requested to support inclusive and participatory processes to facilitate the operationalization of the monitoring framework, including by using, where relevant, the regional and subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centres and the Global Knowledge Support Service for Biodiversity, by sharing updates with Parties on the implementation of the monitoring framework, by identifying options and potential collaborators to address gaps and by facilitating capacity-building and development activities related to the implementation of the monitoring framework at the national level. The Executive Secretary was also requested to ensure that the guidance on the monitoring framework was easily accessible. In the same decision, various requests were made to Parties, other Governments, observers and entities to support the further development, operationalization or implementation of the monitoring framework, including through the provision of adequate, timely and predictable financial resources; the exchange of knowledge and information; and support for capacity-building and development, technical and scientific cooperation and technology transfer, and enhanced international cooperation.

28. In the light of decision [16/31](#) and to support the further operationalization of the monitoring framework and its uptake by Parties, the Secretariat, in cooperation with various partners, has:

(a) Convened nine regional and subregional dialogues on national biodiversity strategies and action plans, during which issues related to national reporting and the monitoring framework were considered and the capacity needs related to the use of monitoring were discussed, in particular in the context of the preparation of the seventh national reports;⁷

(b) Convened a series of webinars, for different time zones, on the national reporting template, the monitoring framework and the use of the online reporting tool;

(c) Presented the monitoring framework at relevant meetings and promoted complementary approaches to monitoring across the wider United Nations system;

(d) Developed or strengthened collaboration with organizations supporting the development and operationalization of the headline indicators and with organizations supporting Parties in using the monitoring framework and in developing or strengthening their national monitoring systems;⁸

(e) Further developed with various partners the metadata for the headline indicators and identified options and approaches for addressing gaps in the monitoring framework;

(f) Developed and operationalized the online reporting tool, including the elaboration of templates for the submission of indicator information, and worked with relevant partners, such as FAO and the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre, to make indicator information contained in international databases accessible through the online reporting tool;

⁷ For further details on the dialogues, including a summary of the main findings, see document [CBD/SBI/6/INF/6](#).

⁸ The organizations with which the Secretariat collaborated included CDP, FAO, the Forest Peoples Programme, the Global Environment Facility, the Group on Earth Observations, the Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network, the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, the International Union for Conservation of Nature, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Statistics Division. The Secretariat has also co-organized with many of those partners side events at relevant meetings.

(g) Provided direct support to Parties, on a request-driven basis, on the use of the monitoring framework in the preparation of their national reports.

IV. Considerations for possible updates to the monitoring framework

29. When deciding whether an update to the monitoring framework is required, the Subsidiary Body may wish to consider the points set out in the following paragraphs.

30. The reporting burden and the technical and financial constraints faced by Parties, in particular developing countries, in the implementation of the monitoring framework need to be considered in the further development of the headline, component and complementary indicators (decision [16/31](#), para. 7). Given the indicator information in the national reports, it appears that Parties are encountering challenges in using the indicators that are currently in the monitoring framework. Many Parties have noted in their national reports, however, that they were actively working on putting in place or strengthening mechanisms to enhance their use of the headline indicators, and some Parties plan to provide updated information through their national reports before the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (see CBD/SBSTTA/28/2 for further details on this issue).

31. The monitoring framework provides good coverage of the overall scope of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (decision [16/31](#), para. 6).

32. The headline indicators in the monitoring framework comprise a small number of indicators that are intended to capture the overall scope of a goal or target in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. The headline indicators may not capture all the components of a goal or target but, for analytical purposes, can be complemented, as appropriate, with the component and complementary indicators. That approach is aimed at maximizing the uptake of the monitoring framework and minimizing the reporting burden (decision [15/5](#), annex I, para. 5).

33. The indicators in the monitoring framework are part of the core elements of the national reporting template. The format of the next round of national reporting, which will be held in 2029, will be decided by the eighteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. National reports, including the headline and, as appropriate, other indicators, are part of the enhanced multidimensional approach to planning, monitoring, reporting and review adopted by the Conference of the Parties, and all Parties have been requested to use headline indicators and to provide responses on binary questions in their national reports, supplemented, as appropriate, by optional component and complementary indicators and other national indicators (decision [15/6](#), paras. 1 and 13).

34. The disaggregation of the headline indicators and the use of the component and complementary indicators identified in the monitoring framework in the national reports are optional and subject to national circumstances and priorities (decision [16/31](#), para. 2). The voluntary nature of disaggregation creates flexibility for Parties when reporting, while also providing a space where useful information related to the planning, monitoring, reporting and review processes under the Convention can be collected.

35. The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services is currently preparing a methodological assessment on monitoring biodiversity and nature's contributions to people. The assessment, which is expected to be considered during the thirteenth session of the Plenary of the Platform, to be held in 2027, will likely contain information relevant to the further development and operationalization of the monitoring framework.

36. Given the submissions received and the elements for consideration set out above, the Subsidiary Body may wish to consider recommending that the Conference of the Parties update the monitoring framework at its eighteenth meeting, at the same time that it considers the reporting template for the eighth national reports. In that way, a more detailed analysis of the use of the headline indicators could be undertaken and information from the monitoring assessment by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services could be considered. To facilitate the consideration of the update of the monitoring framework, the Subsidiary

Body may also wish to consider recommending that the Conference of the Parties convene a group of experts to provide advice on the topic. Such a group could help to ensure that a broad spectrum of perspectives and experiences is considered in any process to update the monitoring framework. Among the group's areas of focus could be experience with the use of the monitoring framework, the results of the global review of the collective progress in the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, the methodological status of the headline indicators and the available metadata, and the results of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform monitoring assessment.

Annex

Indicators that meet the criteria set out in decision 15/5 and that would help to address gaps in the monitoring framework if included as component or complementary indicators

<i>Most relevant goal or target</i>	<i>Indicator type</i>	<i>Indicator</i>
A	Complementary	Scorecard of genetic diversity in wild species
A	Complementary	Dendritic connectivity index
4	Complementary	Number and list of tree and other woody plant species that have been included in in situ conservation programmes of forest genetic resources
4	Complementary	Extent of lost farmed types of aquaculture species
4	Complementary	Extent of populations of wild relatives of aquaculture species subject to conservation measures
4	Complementary	Extent of ex situ conservation for important farmed types of aquatic genetic resources
4	Complementary	Extent of non-native species used in aquaculture posing a risk for native biodiversity
7	Complementary	Levels and trends of mercury and mercury compounds in the environment and in humans due to anthropogenic emissions and releases
7	Complementary	Freshwater eutrophication index
11	Complementary	Mortality rate attributed to household and ambient air pollution
16	Complementary	Global environmental impacts of consumption indicator
18	Component	Monetary value of agriculture-related market price support
18	Component	Monetary value of agriculture-related non-exempt direct payments
18	Component	Monetary value of agriculture-related other product-specific support
18	Component	Monetary value of agriculture-related product-specific equivalent measurement of support
18	Component	Monetary value of agriculture-related non-product-specific aggregated measurement of support
19	Complementary	Biodiversity investment ratio