



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/8/3
1 October 2019

ENGLISH ONLY

REPORT OF THE GLOBAL CONSULTATION ON THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK IN RELATION TO ACCESS AND BENEFIT- SHARING AND THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL, NAIROBI, 25 AUGUST 2019

I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

1. At its fourteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties adopted decision [14/34](#) on a comprehensive and participatory process for the preparation of the [post-2020 global biodiversity framework](#), which includes the promotion of active engagement of the focal points of the Convention and the Protocols through appropriate consultation process.
2. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopted decision [NP-3/15](#) on the preparation for the follow-up to the [Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020](#), in which it welcomed the decision by the Conference of the Parties, invited Parties to the Protocol to participate in the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and encouraged Parties to undertake measures to enhance implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing in the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
3. The Global Consultation on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework in Relation to Access and Benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol was organized in response to the decisions referred to above. With a financial contribution from South Africa, the Consultation was held at the United Nations Office at Nairobi on 25 August 2019, prior to the first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. The Consultation was attended by 92 participants, including representatives of the Parties to the Convention, 9 representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities, and 9 representatives of organizations and academia. The Consultation was conducted in English.
4. The present report details the proceedings and outcomes of the Consultation. Section II provides an account of the proceedings of the Consultation. The outcomes of the discussions summarizing the views expressed in plenary and small group sessions are contained in the annex to the report.

II. ACCOUNT OF PROCEEDINGS

A. Opening of the Consultation and introduction

5. The Consultation was opened at 9:30 a.m. on 25 August 2019 by Mr. David Cooper, Deputy Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity. In his remarks, he welcomed the participants to the Consultation and noted that Parties to the Protocol wished to see an integration of access and benefit-sharing and of the Nagoya Protocol in the work of the Convention. He reminded participants that, at the last meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, it had been decided that there would not be a separate framework or plan for the Nagoya Protocol. He also made reference to the submissions and regional consultations in which Parties expressed that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should address the three objectives of the Convention – conservation, sustainable use and access and benefit-sharing – in a balanced manner. Finally, he encouraged participants to reflect on how access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol could contribute to the state of biodiversity and the relationship between humankind and nature desired for 2050. Noting environmental challenges and technological advances, he

invited all participants to be ambitious and think “out of the box” with a view to identifying access and benefit-sharing-related elements and approaches that might be considered for inclusion in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

6. Following the opening remarks, participants elected Mr. Gaute Voigt-Hanssen, Access and Benefit-sharing National Focal Point of [Norway](#), and Ms. Christine Echokit Akello, Deputy Executive Director, [National Environment Management Authority of Uganda](#), to serve as chair and rapporteur, respectively, of the Consultation.

7. The Secretariat, represented by Mr. Worku Yifru, Officer-in-Charge of the Access and Benefit-sharing Unit, then provided an overview of the objectives and programme of the Consultation based on the provisional programme of work ([CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/8/1](#)). The Secretariat informed participants that the Co-Chairs of the Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework would join the Consultation from 4 to 5 p.m. that day. The Secretariat emphasized that the purpose of the Consultation was not to negotiate but, rather, to identify some elements that might be integrated into the post-2020 framework in order to address access and benefit-sharing issues.

8. The chair invited the participants to undertake a group exercise whereby they would share their expectations of the Consultation. Afterwards, each group presented to the plenary, through a spokesperson, its top two or three expectations on topics to be addressed. The expectations identified included the following:

- (a) Strengthening the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol at the national level;
- (b) Developing a long-term goal and vision for the Protocol, including ensuring its visibility in the post 2020-framework, as well as developing ambitious goals and targets related to access and benefit-sharing;
- (c) Addressing the question of how to include the essence of the Nagoya Protocol in the framework since not all Parties to the Convention are Parties to the Protocol;
- (d) Operationalizing the concept of digital sequence information on genetic resources and the role of access and benefit-sharing in the utilization of digital sequence information;
- (e) Issues of indigenous peoples and local communities, synergies among the Convention and its Protocols and other related conventions and instruments, technology transfer, a financial mechanism for the implementation of the Protocol, awareness-raising and capacity-building.

B. Background and considerations on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in relation to access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol

9. The Secretariat introduced the background and considerations on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in relation to access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol based on the note prepared to facilitate discussions on the post-2020 framework in relation to access and benefit-sharing in the context of the Nagoya Protocol ([CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/8/2](#)).

C. Access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol: looking at the big picture

10. Under this item, the Secretariat made a presentation providing a brief introduction to access and benefit-sharing in general and the Nagoya Protocol in particular, including highlighting some guiding questions on the following three topics:

- (a) Impact of Aichi Biodiversity Target 16 on promoting the ratification and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and how the post-2020 global biodiversity framework can support Parties in their implementation of access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol;
- (b) Visioning the state of nature or biodiversity desired for 2050: the contribution of access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol;

(c) Access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol in the light of technological changes: challenges and opportunities.

11. The chair invited the participants to form small break-out groups, ensuring that the language preferences of participants were accommodated, and asked each group to discuss all three topics on the basis of the guiding questions provided by the Secretariat. Each group assigned a notetaker and spokesperson who reported the outcomes of the group's discussion to the plenary. A synthesis of the views expressed by the participants is contained in section III below.

D. Possible elements on access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

12. The Secretariat introduced the agenda item on possible elements related to access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol that might be considered for integration into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, on the basis of CBD/POST2020/WS2019/8/2, section VII, and the annex to the document, which contained a table presenting possible elements.¹

13. The Secretariat proposed the formation of discussion groups on six key issues relating to possible elements of the post-2020 framework:

- (a) Goal, milestones and indicators;
- (b) Integration of access and benefit-sharing into other areas of work under the Convention;
- (c) Enabling elements and review mechanisms: Access and Benefit-sharing-Clearing-House, capacity-building, resource mobilization, national reports, communication;
- (d) Indigenous peoples and local communities;
- (e) Digital sequence information on genetic resources;
- (f) Other relevant international instruments.

14. The chair invited the participants to choose one topic out of the six they wished to discuss and then to rotate at intervals to other topics. However, due to time constraints, it was not possible to allow participants to move from one group to another and discuss several topics, as had originally been planned. Discussions in each group were facilitated or supported by a representative of the Secretariat. Each group also selected a notetaker and spokesperson, who reported the outcomes of the discussion back to the plenary. A summary of outcomes of the group discussions on possible elements for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework which were reported back to the plenary is contained in section III below.

E. Closure of the Consultation

15. The Co-chairs of the Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework joined the Consultation and shared their reflections and expectations for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Following their remarks, the Co-Chairs took questions from the participants.

16. After the exchanges with the Co-Chairs of the Working Group, the Rapporteur provided a summary of the outcomes of the Consultation.

17. Following the rapporteur's summary, the Secretariat expressed thanks to the rapporteur and the chair for their roles in steering the Consultation and facilitating the outcomes. The representative of the Secretariat also thanked all the participants for their active engagement in the Consultation and their contribution to the substantive outcomes.

18. After closing remarks by the chair, the Consultation was closed at 6 p.m.

¹ The annex to document CBD/POST2020/WS2019/8/2 is contained in the appendix to the present document.

Annex

OUTCOMES: SYNTHESIS OF VIEWS

1. The following is a summary of the outcomes from the discussions held during the Global Consultation on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework in Relation to Access and Benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol, held on 25 August 2019. The summary provides an overview of the perspectives and views expressed. It should not be interpreted as a consensus outcome but, rather, as an input for further discussions in the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

2. Section A below contains a synthesis of the views expressed on three different topics, namely (a) the impact of Aichi Biodiversity Target 16, (b) the role of access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol in the pursuit of the 2050 vision and (c) issues related to technological changes. Section B presents the summary of the outcomes of the discussions on possible elements for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

A. Access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol: looking at the big picture

1. Impact of Aichi Biodiversity Target 16 on promoting the ratification and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and how the post-2020 global biodiversity framework can support Parties in their implementation of access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol²

3. A number of participants noted that Aichi Target 16 was very helpful for promoting ratification and developing national legislation, including setting national targets in national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs). Furthermore, they agreed that the target had a positive impact on awareness-raising, mobilizing funds for ratification and implementation and raising the profile of issues of concern to indigenous peoples and local communities. A few others noted that the target was less useful for advancing the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. The need for more guidance to achieve the target was highlighted. It was also noted that the issue of indigenous peoples and local communities should have been better reflected in the target.

4. In considering the post-2020 framework, it was stated that Target 16 was still valid and fundamental, since more ratifications were needed and the implementation of the Protocol enhanced. However, it was stressed that new targets and indicators should be crafted in such a way as to also target non-Parties to the Protocol and that the framework should reflect the fact that access and benefit-sharing is broader than the Nagoya Protocol. Participants further pointed out that the new framework should be practical and well structured and kept simple in order to ensure its communication to a wide audience.

5. Some noted that access and benefit-sharing should be integrated in the post-2020 framework as a cross-cutting element and a guiding principle for the overall framework. It was also mentioned that elements related to access and benefit-sharing should be more prominent in the post-2020 framework and should signal that benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources should be redirected to conservation.

6. A number of participants expressed the view that enabling elements and other aspects of relevance to the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, such as capacity-building, technology transfer, information sharing, financial support and resource mobilization, enhancing collaboration between providers and users of genetic resources, and monitoring the utilization of genetic resources (through the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House), awareness-raising and participation of indigenous peoples

² The group discussed the impact of Aichi Biodiversity Target 16 on promoting ratification and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and how the post-2020 global biodiversity framework can support Parties in their implementation of access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol on the basis of the following guiding questions: (a) Did having Aichi Target 16 help promoting ratification and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol? How did it help/not help? What were the reasons? What should be changed or done differently? (b) How can the post-2020 framework help facilitate the implementation of ABS and the Nagoya Protocol? What elements should be included in the framework to facilitate ABS (goal, milestones, targets, indicators, enabling mechanisms, etc.)? What are the key requirements to make the element feasible, effective, successful (for example SMART, level of ambition)?

and local communities and other stakeholders (private sector, scientific and research community, consumers) as well as synergies with other related international instruments, should be integrated in the framework as targets and indicators.

7. Participants also raised the need for alignment of national reporting on access and benefit-sharing and the Protocol to the new targets so that national reports could respond directly to the actions under the post-2020 framework.

2. *Visioning the state of nature or biodiversity desired for 2050: the contribution of access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol*³

8. In considering the 2050 vision, participants stressed the importance of demonstrating the concrete linkages between the [Sustainable Development Goals](#) and access and benefit-sharing in order to show how access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol contributed to the vision. Many noted that benefit-sharing is essential in order to achieve the vision. It was recommended that a clear linkage be established between access and benefit-sharing, conservation and sustainable use. Participants suggested that benefit-sharing be reflected as an incentive for promoting sustainable use and conservation.

9. Some participants suggested looking more broadly at the health of ecosystems and considering biodiversity as an asset rather than an opportunity cost. It was also recommended that the vision be utilized to raise awareness on the value of biodiversity and its socioeconomic benefits. Participants proposed to communicate access and benefit-sharing as a social responsibility to value nature and strengthen the links to health, food and water. Some also noted the need to change stakeholders' perspective on benefit-sharing and to demonstrate how benefits derived from the utilization of genetic resources contribute to national development.

10. The need to specify the vision from an access and benefit-sharing perspective in order to create more precise milestones was suggested in a small group discussion. The small group provided a possible wording of the vision which states that "by 2050, all genetic resources are accessed and derived benefits shared in an equitable way, and such benefits contribute to conservation and sustainable use of nature." According to the small group, the contribution of access and benefit-sharing to the long-term vision could be articulated by:

(a) Using genetic resources for bio-economies and business, and access and benefit-sharing would be the key tool for facilitating this development;

(b) Facilitating effective governance and management of genetic resources at various levels, from government to local communities;

(c) Application of funds and capacities raised through access and benefit-sharing to conservation and sustainable use (access and benefit-sharing as a financing tool).

3. *Access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol in the light of technological changes: challenges and opportunities*⁴

11. Participants noted that technology would always advance more rapidly than policymaking and that the post-2020 framework should include provisions for addressing and adapting to technological changes and potential emerging issues, such as digital sequence information on genetic resources,

³ Participants discussed their vision of the state of nature in 2050 and the contribution of access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol along the following guiding questions: (1) How can ABS and the Nagoya Protocol contribute to the vision of "living in harmony with nature"? (2) What would need to change in the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol to make the vision a reality by 2050?

⁴ Participants discussed the challenges and opportunities of access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol in the light of technological changes based on the following guiding questions: (1) What technological changes and advances are (or can be) of relevance for the implementation of ABS and the Nagoya Protocol? What are the challenges? What are the opportunities? (2) How can the technological changes be addressed or promoted at the national or international level?

synthetic biology and blockchain. It was suggested that precautionary principles be strengthened in the framework.

12. A number of participants recognized the issue of digital sequence information to be one of the technological changes that were most relevant to access and benefit-sharing. It was noted that the main challenge would be the control over this technology and the general issue of ownership of data and information. The potential benefits of digital sequence information as an incentive for sustainable use were also mentioned.

13. Participants noted the need to take advantage of opportunities and, at the same time, avoid the drawbacks of emerging technological changes. Participants emphasized that biotechnology could be a motive for promoting conservation and sustainable use and a solution for challenges relating to health and poverty and that technological advancements could promote scientific cooperation. Exploration of funding opportunities through biotechnologies and how money could be channelled back into biodiversity was recommended.

14. It was noted that many of the emerging technologies were information technologies, which opened up opportunities for more efficient and easier information exchange. Some participants recommended exploring the implications and opportunities arising from those new technologies, including the development of monitoring and compliance systems.

15. Some participants also expressed concerns about the implications of some of the new technologies and the need to obtain advice and appropriate information and to consider them carefully before taking any action from an access and benefit-sharing perspective.

16. Others noted that the most relevant technologies from an access and benefit-sharing perspective were those that allowed users to bypass the bilateral access process. In that context, it was recommended that a discussion be initiated on operationalizing the global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism which could contribute to the three objectives of the Convention. In that regard, the issue of biodiversity beyond national jurisdictions was mentioned. It was also mentioned that a global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism would be useful for data governance and regulation.

17. Finally, the lack of capacities to take advantage of technological advancements was stressed.

B. Possible elements for a post-2020 framework

1. Goals, milestones and indicators

18. In considering goals, milestones and indicators, participants used the annex to the background document on possible indicators for goals and milestones,⁵ which is also included as an appendix to the present report, as a basis for their discussion. The group noted that the proposal of milestones and indicators presented in the annex was a good starting point for the development of access and benefit-sharing and Nagoya Protocol related elements for the post-2020 framework. However, they suggested that some of the milestones and indicators proposed in the annex would need some adjustments and the language could be more generic, especially with a view to accommodating non-Parties to the Protocol.

19. The group also addressed the questions how the development of milestones and indicators could be moved forward, addressing the issues of Parties and non-Parties to the Nagoya Protocol and whether there should be a target for access and benefit-sharing only or also a target specifically considering the Nagoya Protocol. Participants noted that not all the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol were reflected in the milestones.

20. Some participants mentioned that it might be useful to have an action plan to operationalize the milestones.

⁵ CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/8/2, annex.

21. Finally, some participants noted that issues related to indigenous peoples and local communities should be more visible.

2. *Integration of access and benefit-sharing into other areas of work under the Convention*

22. Participants considered the relevance of the different articles of the Convention to access and benefit-sharing, such as Article 10(e), Article 16, paragraph 3, Article 8(j) and articles 9(a) and (b), in the context of their discussion on integration of access and benefit-sharing into other areas of work under the Convention.

23. In addressing Article 10(e) on sustainable use of components of biological diversity, the group suggested increasing cooperation between governments and the private sector in developing methods for sustainable use in relation to genetic resources.

24. Regarding Article 16, paragraph 3, on access to and transfer of technology, participants suggested that the [BioBridge Initiative](#) could be further enhanced to encourage technological transfer.

25. In discussing access and benefit-sharing in relation to Article 8(j), participants considered how to share and deliver the benefits arising from the use of genetic resources and relevant traditional knowledge to indigenous peoples and local communities.

26. Finally, regarding Article 9(b) on ex situ conservation, building DNA banks/seed banks, participants noted the need for a vision on how to implement that provision and suggested exploring further the idea of maintaining regional centres of excellence.

3. *Enabling elements and review mechanisms: Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, capacity-building, resource mobilization, national reports, communication*

27. In discussing enabling elements, participants focused on elements that are common in approach and applicable for the Convention and its protocols.

28. As regards capacity-building, participants attempted to identify what could be the new approach to capacity-building and what would be the building blocks to strengthen capacity. Participants raised the importance of assessing required competencies at the national and local levels, including that of indigenous peoples and local communities, for different aspects related to access and benefit-sharing and the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, for example national institutions, negotiating agreements, monitoring the utilization of genetic resources or checkpoints. It was suggested that awareness-raising be coupled with capacity-building and specifically targeted to indigenous peoples and local communities and other stakeholders.

29. In discussing information exchange, supportive frameworks were noted as a tool to enhance the clearing-house mechanism. It was also suggested that regional approaches to sharing information should be considered.

30. With regard to national reporting, participants were generally of the view that reporting should reflect on the implementation of the post-2020 framework and that a common implementation structure for the review mechanism would be useful and could be adapted to access and benefit-sharing issues. The need for more specific guidance on reporting requirements was highlighted. It was also mentioned that reporting every four years might be too short and would not allow enough time for implementation, while, at the same time, recognizing that there might be a need for information-sharing on short-term developments as well.

31. Finally, participants noted that resource mobilization was crucial, in addition to looking at external resources.

4. *Indigenous peoples and local communities*

32. Participants discussed how the post-2020 framework could help advance the provisions related to indigenous peoples and local communities under the Nagoya Protocol. They noted that most of the Parties

had either indigenous peoples or local communities and were thus required to implement related provisions of the Nagoya Protocol. Participants therefore suggested that indicators that reflected these provisions be included in the framework. They also proposed that, in cases wherein the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities had been established, the benefits shared should be quantified.

33. In discussing financial resources, the group mentioned the importance of ensuring the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the consultations and meetings for the preparation of the post-2020 framework as well as the implementation of relevant provisions, for example to facilitate research by indigenous peoples and local communities, capacity-building and awareness-raising for indigenous peoples and local communities to increase negotiating skills and allow for participation in implementing the Nagoya Protocol, and documentation of traditional knowledge, among other things.

34. Finally, participants proposed further elements to be addressed in the framework, such as the governance structure for managing or protecting traditional knowledge, recognition of international instruments that recognize the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, integration of customary laws into national systems, and institutional arrangements to monitor and ensure compliance.

5. Digital sequence information on genetic resources

35. It was noted that the Conference of the Parties at its fourteenth meeting had set up a science and policy-based process (see decision 14/20) to advance discussions and understanding how digital sequence information could be addressed in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, which comprised a number of studies, submissions from Parties and the convening of an ad hoc technical expert group, that would feed into the third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. However, participants raised concerns that, as digital sequence information was one of the most contentious issues, its consideration at the last meeting of the Working Group would be relatively late in the process and time might not be sufficient to address all the contentious issues and to develop appropriate recommendations.

36. The discussions highlighted the significance of the issue for the future of the Convention, especially with respect to access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol. A number of participants indicated that there was a need for a better understanding of the issue. The synthesis of views and information prepared by the Secretariat as part of the process during the biennium 2017-2018 was mentioned as an excellent source of information. Participants also noted the relevance of other existing studies on digital sequence information by the [International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture](#) and the [Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture](#).

37. Finally, participants discussed how digital sequence information could be regulated at the national level and what the challenges for such regulation would be. Some participants suggested that it might be useful to bring in benefit-sharing obligations and procedures when there are products developed through the utilization of digital sequence information. According to them, such approaches would not create excessive new administration and would rely on sound tracking systems, which were already in place.

6. Relevant international instruments

38. Participants discussed whether and how other relevant international instruments should be addressed as part of the post-2020 framework. It was noted that the Conference of the Parties had invited all multilateral environmental agreements to participate in the process of developing the post-2020 framework. Participants highlighted that the framework should be of relevance for the implementation of other multilateral environmental agreements.

39. Further, participants proposed that the framework should be endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly, bearing in mind that the [2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development](#) and the [United Nations Environment Assembly](#) did not exist when the last strategic plan had been adopted. Participants agreed that the post-2020 framework should be used as a strategic opportunity and as a platform to make the case for ratification of various instruments.

40. In the specific context of access and benefit-sharing, cooperation among the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Nagoya Protocol is most relevant. Other relevant entities and treaties discussed or mentioned were the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), as well as the ongoing negotiating processes on (a) access and benefit-sharing of marine biological diversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea; and (b) Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore under the World Intellectual Property Organization.

41. Participants noted that the question how other international instruments should be addressed was not only relevant to access and benefit-sharing but also to biodiversity more generally. It was proposed that cooperation should focus not only on the development of the framework but also on its implementation. Furthermore, it was suggested that interlinkages should be embedded in the framework throughout its elements. Participants stressed the need to make cooperation an operational and enforceable aspect of the framework, which could even be included in the reporting mechanism. Participants suggested two approaches to facilitating cooperation with other multilateral environmental agreements:

(a) A “top-down” approach, including through the [Environmental Management Group](#) and the [Biodiversity Liaison Group](#);

(b) A “bottom-up” approach: the post-2020 framework could include wording on setting up coordination mechanisms at the national level, similar to coordination mechanisms established for Sustainable Development Goals, ensuring that environment, biodiversity and access and benefit-sharing would be part of it.

*Appendix***POSSIBLE INDICATORS FOR GOAL AND MILESTONES****A. Goal**

Goal	Possible indicators on access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol	Source of indicators	Source of information
Benefits from the utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge are shared fairly and equitably and contribute to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.	<p>Number of countries that have received monetary or non-monetary benefits from granting access to genetic resources for their utilization.</p> <p>Number of countries with indigenous peoples and local communities that received monetary or non-monetary benefits from granting access to traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources for its utilization.</p> <p>Number of countries reporting that implementation of the Nagoya Protocol has contributed to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in their country.</p> <p>Evidence of contribution of access and benefit-sharing to conservation and sustainable use.⁶</p>	Framework of access and benefit-sharing indicators (decision NP-3/1)	National reports

B. Milestones

Milestones	Possible indicators on access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol	Source of indicators	Source of information
-------------------	--	-----------------------------	------------------------------

⁶ Not a SMART indicator.

Milestones	Possible indicators on access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol	Source of indicators	Source of information
Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity have ratified the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing.	Number of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity that have ratified the Nagoya Protocol.	Indicator for Aichi Target 16 and SDG Target 15.6. Framework of access and benefit-sharing indicators	United Nations Treaty Collection
Legislative, administrative or policy measures on access and benefit-sharing are in place to implement the Protocol and information is published in the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House	Number of countries that have published access and benefit-sharing measures in the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House	Indicator for Aichi Target 16 and SDG Target 15.6. Framework of access and benefit-sharing indicators	Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House
Institutional arrangements are in place to implement the Protocol and information is published in the access and benefit-sharing Clearing-House	Number of countries that have established a national focal point Number of countries that published one or more competent national authorities in the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House Number of countries that have published one or more checkpoints in the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House	Indicator for Aichi Target 16 and SDG Target 15.6. Framework of access and benefit-sharing indicators	Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House
Information on access and benefit-sharing procedures is published in the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House	Number of countries that require prior informed consent that have published information on access and benefit-sharing procedures in the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House	Framework of access and benefit-sharing indicators	Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House
Permits for access are granted and information is published in the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House	Number of countries that have published internationally recognized certificates of compliance in the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House	Framework of access and benefit-sharing indicators	Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House

Milestones	Possible indicators on access and benefit-sharing and the Nagoya Protocol	Source of indicators	Source of information
Genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge are utilized and checkpoint communiqués are issued	Number of countries that have published checkpoint communiqués in the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House	Framework of access and benefit-sharing indicators	Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House
