



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General
17 October 2023

Original: English

Ad Hoc Open-ended Intersessional Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity Twelfth meeting

Geneva, 12–16 November 2023

Item 7 of the provisional agenda*

Joint programme of work on the links between biological and cultural diversity: review and update of the four adopted traditional knowledge indicators

Joint programme of work on the links between biological and cultural diversity: review and update of the four adopted traditional knowledge indicators

Note by the Secretariat

I. Background

A. Relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties towards the adoption of the four indicators for the status of and trends in the knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities

1. Traditional knowledge indicators have been the subject of several decisions by the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Those decisions include guidance on implementation related to successive biodiversity strategies, including the 2010 Biodiversity Target, as adopted in decision VI/26 of 19 April 2002, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets adopted with decision X/2 of 29 October 2010 and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework adopted with decision 15/4 of 19 December 2022, reflecting the long-standing work on traditional knowledge undertaken under the Convention.

2. In annex II to decision [VII/30](#), the Conference of the Parties adopted a framework to enhance the evaluation of progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan, covering seven focal areas, one of which is “protect traditional knowledge, innovations and practices”. In annex I to the decision, the Conference of the Parties adopted a suite of indicators for assessing progress towards the 2010 Biodiversity Target comprising indicators for immediate testing and possible indicators for development. With regard to traditional knowledge, an indicator on the status of and trends in linguistic diversity and speakers of indigenous languages was included as an indicator for immediate testing.

3. At its eighth meeting, the Conference of the Parties proposed to develop an indicator for the following strategic objective: “Indigenous and local communities are effectively involved in

* CBD/WG8J/12/1/Rev.1.

implementation and in the processes of the Convention, at national, regional and international levels” (decision [VIII/15](#), annex I, objective 4.3), thereby underlining that continued implementation of the programme of work should be conducted taking note of work carried out in other relevant international bodies.

4. On the basis of the above, the Conference of the Parties adopted the following indicators for status of and trends in the knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity: (a) trends in linguistic diversity and numbers of speakers of indigenous languages; (b) trends in land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities; (c) trends in the practice of traditional occupations; and (d) trends in the degree to which traditional knowledge and practices are respected through their full integration, safeguards and the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the national implementation of the Strategic Plan.

B. Decisions adopted by the Conference of Parties at its fifteenth meeting on the four traditional knowledge indicators

5. At its fifteenth meeting, the Conference of Parties adopted decisions [15/2](#), [15/5](#), [15/6](#), [15/10](#), [15/22](#), which are relevant to the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

6. By decision [15/5](#), the Conference of the Parties adopted a monitoring framework composed of headline indicators, binary indicators, component indicators and complementary indicators. In the same decision, it invited Parties and relevant organizations to support community-based monitoring and information systems and citizen science (para. 6), and decided to establish an ad hoc technical expert group, with a time-bound mandate until its sixteenth meeting, to advise on the further operationalization of the monitoring framework (para. 8). Also in the same decision, it requested the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice to review the outcomes of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, to complete the scientific and technical review of the monitoring framework and to report its findings for subsequent consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and by the Conference of the Parties at its sixteenth meeting (para. 9). It also invited the Ad Hoc Open-ended Intersessional Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions to continue the development and operationalization of indicators related to traditional knowledge and indigenous peoples and local communities, and to report on this work to the Conference of the Parties (para. 12). A mechanism for planning, monitoring, reporting and review of the Framework was adopted in decision [15/6](#).

7. In decision [15/10](#), the Conference of Parties decided to develop a new programme of work and institutional arrangements on Article 8(j) and other provisions of the Convention related to indigenous peoples and local communities. Furthermore, in decision [15/22](#), the Conference of Parties renewed its commitment to the Joint Programme of Work on the Links Between Biological and Cultural Diversity, noting that it remained relevant to the Framework. In the same decision, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with relevant partners and other Governments and with the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, to implement, subject to the availability of resources, the elements and tasks related to the Joint Programme of Work contained in the annex to the decision. One of the elements and tasks is a call for the Ad Hoc Open-ended Intersessional Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions, together with the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, to review and update the four traditional knowledge indicators adopted in decision [XIII/28](#) in the light of the Framework, as well as the ongoing work on biological and cultural diversity and human well-being.¹

¹ Decision 15/22, annex I, task 2.a.1.

II. Local and global initiatives addressing indicators relevant to indigenous peoples and local communities

8. The Statistics Division has noted the importance of issues related to indigenous peoples in social statistics and that the consideration of data collection related to indigenous peoples was groundbreaking work.² Data collection and disaggregation related to indigenous peoples pose unique challenges in terms of developing both data for global comparative purposes and data useful at a micro level for indigenous peoples.

A. Working Group on Indicators and community-based monitoring and information systems of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity

1. Working Group on Indicators of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity

9. To address the need for indicators on traditional knowledge under the 2010 biodiversity target of the Convention, the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity established a working group on indicators in 2006 as a research and information network engaged in various monitoring activities using relevant indicators on biological and cultural diversity, sustainable development and human rights.

10. Early activities of the Working Group on Indicators included collaboration with the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues and the Secretariat of the Convention in a series of regional and global workshops on indigenous peoples, well-being and sustainable development carried out in 2006 and 2007. Those initiatives culminated in the holding of an international expert seminar on indicators relevant to indigenous peoples, the Convention and the Millennium Development Goals.³ A resource book was published, which included the reports of the regional and international workshops and selected readings on the topic.⁴ Recommendations resulting from the meetings informed the subsequent adoption in decision X/43 of two additional traditional knowledge indicators, on the status of and trends in land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities, and the status of and trends in the practice of traditional occupations, respectively, to supplement the indicator on linguistic diversity.

2. Community-based monitoring and information systems

11. Community-based monitoring and information systems has been the primary approach of indigenous peoples and local communities for generating data to inform local self-governance, as well as contributing evidence in support of broader reporting on the implementation of global commitments. These serve as true measures about progress on the ground towards meeting globally agreed targets on biodiversity, climate action and sustainable development.

12. Community-based monitoring and information systems refer to the bundle of monitoring approaches and tools based on traditional knowledge and combined with digital technology for the management and documentation of the lands, territories and resources of communities, including community surveys, participatory 3-D cultural mapping, resource inventories, and countryside management software and others adapted for the priorities and needs of each community.⁵

3. Indigenous Navigator and human rights monitoring

13. The Indigenous Navigator is a prime example of a community-based monitoring and information system, targeted at the upholding of indigenous peoples' rights at national and community levels. It provides a framework and a comprehensive set of tools to systematically monitor the level of recognition and implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous

² See E/C.19/2004/2.

³ See [UNEP/CBD/WG8J/5/INF/2](#).

⁴ Tebtebba Foundation, *Resource Book on Indicators Relevant for Indigenous Peoples*, (Baguio City, 2007).

⁵ Tebtebba Foundation, *Enhancing Indigenous Peoples' Development through Community-Based Monitoring and Information Systems (CBMIS)* (Baguio City, 2018).

Peoples, core human rights conventions pertaining to indigenous peoples, essential aspects of the Sustainable Development Goals and the outcomes of the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples.

14. The Indigenous Navigator generates data using three types of human rights indicators: structural indicators, process indicators and outcome indicators. Structural indicators reflect the legal and policy framework of a given country. Process indicators measure the ongoing efforts of States to implement human rights commitments through programmes, budget allocations and other strategies. Outcome indicators capture the actual enjoyment of human rights by indigenous peoples in their everyday lives. Traditional knowledge indicators under the Convention have been included in the tools and methodologies of the Indigenous Navigator since its piloting in 2014, and those tools and methodologies are currently being used in 28 countries,⁶ with published community level data covering approximately 300,000 indigenous peoples and more than 300 indigenous communities.⁷ At its sixteenth session, the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues recommended the use of the Indigenous Navigator as a tool to monitor the implementation of the United Nation Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and encouraged partnerships and contributions from States, United Nations agencies, indigenous peoples, national human rights institutions and civil society organizations.

4. Local Biodiversity Outlooks and use of traditional knowledge indicators (2011–2020)

15. Noting minimal coverage of local experiences and perspectives in the third edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity decided to publish the *Local Biodiversity Outlooks*⁸ to better highlight the perspectives and contributions of indigenous peoples and local communities to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The first edition of the *Local Biodiversity Outlooks* was launched at the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, in 2016, as a complement to the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*. Welcoming the publication, the Conference of the Parties, in its decision XIII/29, requested the Executive Secretary to prepare a second edition, in conjunction with the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*. Both reports were successfully launched during the special virtual sessions of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, held from 15 to 18 September 2020.⁹ At its fifteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties took note of the second edition of the *Local Biodiversity Outlooks* in its decision 15/2. In its decision 15/3, it encouraged Parties, when developing, updating or revising their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, to take into account the lessons from the review of progress towards the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 at the national and global levels, as well as information contained in the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, the second edition of the *Local Biodiversity Outlooks*. Lastly, in its decision 15/5, it invited Parties and relevant organizations to support community-based monitoring and information systems and citizen science and their contributions to the implementation of the monitoring framework.

5. Global statistics and the challenges faced by indigenous peoples

16. The fourth volume of the *State of the World's Indigenous Peoples: Implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, launched in 2019, contains an extended discussion about indigenous peoples in global statistics, highlighting the serious challenge in ensuring that data are appropriately disaggregated, comprehensive, timely, reliable and transparent. Insufficient resource support and weak political commitment are factors preventing the community-based monitoring and information systems of indigenous peoples from fully producing complementary data that would fill many of the information gaps that currently exist. It contains a

⁶ Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Finland, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Uganda and United Republic of Tanzania.

⁷ indigenousnavigator.org/.

⁸ See <https://localbiodiversityoutlooks.net/>.

⁹ See [CBD/SBSTTA-SBI-SS/1/2](http://cbd/sbstta-sbi-ss/1/2).

recommendation that national statistical offices and indigenous peoples' organizations and communities cooperate and work to ensure that community-based data are effectively recognized and integrated into national statistics.

17. Recognizing the gaps in analytical research on indigenous peoples, the Permanent Forum initiated a publication covering its six mandated areas. The Department for Economic and Social Affairs issued the first volume of the *State of the World's Indigenous Peoples* in 2009, as the first global authoritative report by the United Nations system focused on indigenous peoples. The second volume (2014) was focused on indigenous peoples' access to health and the third volume (2017) on indigenous education. The fourth volume is a review of the global implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, while the fifth and latest volume (2021) is focused on rights to lands, territories and resources.¹⁰

6. System-wide action plan for ensuring a coherent approach to achieving the ends of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

18. The system-wide action plan for ensuring a coherent approach to achieving the ends of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples¹¹ is aimed at increasing the coherence of the activities of the United Nations system in addressing the rights and well-being of indigenous peoples, including in work conducted support of Member States. Its action areas include conducting a mapping exercise of existing policies, standards, guidelines, activities, resources and capacities within the United Nations and multilateral systems to identify opportunities and gaps.

19. The Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and its monitoring framework covering numerous targets requiring the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples, constitutes a major opportunity for the Convention on Biological Diversity and other multilateral environmental agreements to make substantive contributions from the vantage point of advances in environmental law, policies and plans towards advancing the rights of indigenous peoples.

III. Analysis of submissions on the four traditional knowledge indicators

20. Through notification No. [2023-024](#) Parties, other Governments, indigenous peoples and local communities and stakeholders were invited to submit views and information on the status of the data and information, operationalization, review, and update of the four traditional knowledge indicators. Submissions received relating to traditional knowledge indicators in response to this notification are presented below.

21. In its submission, the International Land Coalition provided an overview of various global initiatives for monitoring the customary land tenure of indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as available data sets. The International Land Coalition noted that the Sustainable Development Goals included indicators 1.4.2 and 5.a.1 on land tenure, with established methodologies, communities of practice and available data. However, it also noted that those indicators lack specific data pertaining to land tenure information related to indigenous peoples and local communities and that they do not offer gender-disaggregated information. While recognizing that those indicators had important gaps in data related to the land tenure of indigenous peoples and local communities, it further noted that there were ample sources that could provide such data and allow for the operationalization and contextualization of the indicator in the context of the Framework. The submitter pointed out that the custodians of those Sustainable Development Goals indicators were supportive of that approach. Furthermore, it observed that international partners, including the Global Land Observatory, hosted by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Fund for Agricultural Development and data providers, such as LandMark, Prindex,

¹⁰ www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/publications/state-of-the-worlds-indigenous-peoples.html.

¹¹ Available at www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2015/11/System-wide-action-plan.pdf.

LANDex, the Indigenous Navigator, the Rights and Resources Initiative, were already working towards a more inclusive land tenure indicator.

22. One joint submitter stated that, for appropriate indicators to allow for reporting on progress of and trends in change in biocultural diversity, it was necessary to connect essential biodiversity and traditional knowledge variables spatially, especially where temporal data were not available. The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) technical support unit for knowledge and data at the Senckenberg Society for Natural Research and the IPBES technical support unit for indigenous and local knowledge at the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization said that that the underlying map of Garnett (Garnett and others, 2018) could be adapted as a proxy representing the traditional territories of indigenous peoples, and that this could be overlaid with a variety of essential biodiversity and ecosystem variables. Specifically in terms of the indicator on trends in land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities, it is possible to assess the status of and trends of a few indicators within the indigenous lands mapped by Garnett (Garnett and others, 2018), for comparison with the global status and trends. This could be done by intersecting suitably fine-scale raster of indicator values with shapefiles of the indigenous lands, for multiple years so that a trend could be estimated.

23. In one submission, it was noted that the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre and the Forest Peoples Programme planned to work with relevant partners to develop an indicator methodology concerning the full, equitable, inclusive, effective and gender-responsive participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in decision-making. The development of the indicator methodology will be carried out as part of the Transformative Pathways project funded by the German Climate Fund. In this context, the next steps in the development of the indicator methodology to be carried in 2024 will include identifying and consulting representatives of government agencies, indigenous peoples and local communities, and relevant stakeholders, determining key questions and indicator use and developing, testing and refining the methodology for application with partners.

24. One submitter noted that trends in linguistic diversity and number of speakers of indigenous languages is an indicator already being monitored by the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership and Terra Lingua. This indicator uses complementary data from global statistics, national reporting and community-based monitoring that can be further enriched through numerous partnership activities during the current United Nations International Decade on Indigenous Languages. For example, Canada continues to work with national indigenous organizations to implement legislation designed to help revitalize, maintain and strengthen First Nations, Inuit and Métis languages, including through the Indigenous Languages Act and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act, as well as through the first appointments to the Office of the Commissioner of Indigenous Languages. In Mexico, native languages are recognized in Article 2 of the Political Constitution, but Spanish serves as official language, being the language of government, commerce and the administration of justice.

25. One submitter pointed to a discussion paper published by the International Labour Organization in November 2022 on Traditional Occupations of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Labour Statistics. The paper describes the concepts needed and the methods that might be used to compile statistics on the practice of traditional occupations and related indicators. It tests the feasibility of compiling estimates related to these indicators based on microdata from three national labour force surveys (Ecuador, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Nepal). The paper notes that these are only the first steps which will require further testing and development of the methods proposed. The paper provides a solid basis for further discussion at both the national and international levels, notably by national statistical offices, indigenous experts, statisticians and other specialists from United Nations and other international agencies, as well as non-governmental organizations.

26. Several submitters mentioned networks already monitoring the four traditional knowledge indicators in varying degrees, including the Working Group on Indicators, ICCA Consortium-Global Network of Territories of Life, Indigenous Peoples' Global Partnership on Climate Change, Forests and Sustainable Development, Indigenous Knowledge and Peoples of Asia, the Indigenous Navigator, the Transformative Pathways project and Customary Sustainable Use Partnership. In its submission, the International Work Group on Indigenous Affairs provided detailed information about the methodology of the Indigenous Navigator and its current coverage of the traditional knowledge indicators developed under the Convention and other provisions of the Convention related to the rights of indigenous peoples.

27. One submitter highlighted the interlinkages among the four indicators on traditional knowledge as a holistic suite of concepts and elements complementing each other, stating the following:

Critical to understanding the significance of land in many indigenous ontologies is understanding that land is not simply an ecology of natural elements – an amalgamation of geological and geographical features, flora and fauna. Land is, rather, a wholly cultural and spiritual sphere made up of a network of human, non-human, living and ancestral beings all interconnected and interdependent. In indigenous cultures, language is born or derived from the land, from the sounds and rhythms of ecology, nature in action.

IV. Operationalization of the traditional knowledge indicators

A. Holistic and cross-cutting nature of the suite of traditional knowledge indicators

28. Decisions of the Conference of the Parties on traditional knowledge indicators were understood as interrelated and designed jointly to provide a holistic assessment of the status of and trends in traditional knowledge under successive biodiversity strategies: the 2010 Biodiversity Target, followed by the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020. The four traditional knowledge indicators are essential to the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, requiring consideration about how the suite of traditional knowledge indicators can contribute to the monitoring framework.

29. This approach underscores the profound relevance of the principles of inclusivity, human rights, equality, participation and accountability of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, with which the Framework is aligned, especially in the context of cross-cutting Targets 22 and 23 and the traditional knowledge indicators. This alignment encompasses a broad spectrum of crucial issues, including the protection of land rights, the elimination of poverty and hunger (Sustainable Development Goals 1 and 2), ensuring equitable access to vital services such as healthcare and education (Goals 1, 3 and 4), advancing environmental sustainability (Goals 12, 13 and 14), promoting inclusive and peaceful societies, reducing disparities (Goals 10 and 16) and addressing discrimination and inequality through targeted strategies (Goals 5 and 10).

B. Operationalization of the Framework and application of the traditional knowledge indicators

30. The traditional knowledge indicators have not been fully operationalized with clearly agreed scope and coverage, methodology, metrics and custodian agencies. A technical process will be needed to further review and update these indicators, building on already existing initiatives and in collaboration with other United Nations bodies and indigenous peoples and local community organizations. Members of the Inter-Agency Support Group for Indigenous Peoples Rights are upscaling their monitoring activities as contributions to the United Nations system-wide action plan for a coherent approach to achieving the ends of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and there are numerous networks of indigenous peoples and local communities that are actively establishing community-based monitoring and information systems and conducting other activities to revitalize languages and traditional practices. Bringing these initiatives and

agencies together in an expert workshop would be an efficient way to further operationalize the traditional knowledge indicators. Due attention should be given to the unique challenges relating to data collection and disaggregation, ensuring complementarity between developing data for global comparative purposes their usefulness at a micro level for indigenous peoples.

31. The monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework included a global-level indicator based on binary responses on Target 22 which would capture progress towards that target via questions in the national report. They will provide a count of the number of countries having undertaken specified activities (decision [15/5](#)). The further development of the binary indicator was developed by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators and presented for the consideration of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at its twenty-fifth meeting ([CBD/SBSTTA/25/2](#)) The proposed text of questions under Target 22 have been reproduced in the annex to the present document.

C. Full and Effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities as a cross-cutting indicator

32. On the basis of national reports, the Secretariat of the Convention has been tracking the indicator on the degree to which trends in traditional knowledge and practices are respected through their full integration, safeguards and the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the national implementation of the Strategic Plan and summarizing its findings in the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*. Given its relevance for the implementation of multiple goals and targets of the Framework, this should be considered a cross-cutting indicator, underpinning the whole-of-government and whole-of society approach of the Framework.

D. Role of national focal points on Article 8(j)

33. National focal points on Article 8(j) can provide support to Governments towards ensuring full and effective participation of indigenous peoples in updating, monitoring, reporting and review processes of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

E. Collection of data: role of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services

34. The IPBES data and knowledge systems are important repositories of information and data related to the four traditional knowledge indicators. The IPBES assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services,¹² as well as other assessments, contains a summary of quantitative and qualitative data on indigenous and local knowledge, including identification of knowledge gaps in mobilizing indigenous and local knowledge. Partnerships towards establishing comprehensive traditional knowledge information and data management systems are timely and very much needed.

F. Support and strengthening of community-based monitoring and information systems at all levels

35. It will be important going forward to support and strengthen community-based monitoring and information systems at all levels, including complementarity and linkages to national, regional and global databases and tools in the monitoring and evaluation of progress towards reaching national and global biodiversity goals and targets.

V. Recommendations

36. The Working Group may wish to adopt a recommendation along the following lines:

The Ad Hoc Open-ended Intersessional Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity,

¹² IPBES, *Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services* (Bonn, 2019).

1. *Takes note* of the progress made by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, including in its work on the headline indicators, component indicators and complementary indicators, disaggregation by indigenous peoples and local communities status, the global indicator collated from binary responses related to Target 22 of the Framework and filling temporal spatial data gaps, including through the use of big data, citizen science, community-based monitoring and information systems, remote sensing, modelling and statistical analysis and other forms of data and diverse knowledge systems;

2. *Notes* that the proposed global indicator collated from binary responses related to Target 22 of the Framework¹ could provide a basis for continuing to track the indicators on the degree to which trends in traditional knowledge, innovation and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities are respected through their full integration, safeguards and the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the national implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and stresses that, given its relevance for the implementation of multiple goals and targets of the Framework, this should be considered a cross-cutting indicator that underpins the whole-of-government and whole-of society approach of the Framework;

3. *Invites* the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators and the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice to take into account the submissions received on the traditional knowledge indicators in their work to further develop the indicators, in particular for:

(a) Headline indicator 9.2 (Percentage of the population in traditional occupations), as one of the four traditional knowledge indicators;

(b) Headline indicator 21.1 (Indicator on biodiversity information for monitoring the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework), as the indicators on biodiversity information should include the indicators related to traditional knowledge, innovations and practices;

(c) Ensuring that indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as their traditional knowledge, innovation and practices, are well reflected in the component and complementary indicators;

4. *Encourages* indigenous peoples and local communities, Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to contribute to the online discussion forum on the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, in particular to provide examples of community-based monitoring and information systems;

5. *Stresses* the importance of community-based monitoring and information systems for filling temporal and spatial data gaps and for building capacity to implement the monitoring framework;

6. *Requests* that the Secretariat facilitate a scientific and technical review of the four traditional knowledge indicators and their suggested link with the headline, component and complementary indicators of the monitoring framework, subject to the availability of resources, taking into account the work conducted by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and in consultation with the Co-Chairs of the Expert Group, and make the outcome available to the Expert Group and to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice for consideration at its twenty-sixth meeting and further submission to the Conference of the Parties at its sixteenth meeting.

7. *Recommends* that, at its sixteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties adopt a decision that includes the following elements, also taking into account the outcomes of the consideration of the agenda item on the monitoring framework by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at its twenty-sixth meeting:

The Conference of the Parties,

¹ See [CBD/SBSTTA/25/2](#).

Recalling its decision [XIII/28](#) of 12 December 2016, on indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets,

Underscoring the critical importance of the engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities and of taking into consideration their traditional knowledge, innovations and practices in reviewing progress in the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework,²

Recognizing the contributions of community-based monitoring and information systems to improving global biodiversity knowledge, data and information,

Encourages Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to provide support for community-based monitoring and information systems, including in the use of data from those systems in the implementation of the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.³

² Decision 15/4, annex.

³ Decision 15/5, annex I.

Annex

Excerpt from the global indicators collated from binary responses and corresponding binary questions and answers for Target 22*

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.

Proposed indicator text: Number of countries recognizing the legal rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, environmental human rights defenders, women, youth and persons with disabilities with respect to their traditional territories, cultures and practices.

22.1 Does your country have policy, legislative and administrative frameworks at the national and subnational levels that:

(a) Ensure the full, equitable, inclusive, effective and gender-responsive representation and participation in biodiversity decision-making of the following? (Select all that apply)

- (a) Indigenous peoples and local communities
- (b) Women and girls
- (c) Children and youth
- (d) Persons with disabilities

(b) Respect indigenous peoples and local communities? (Select all that apply)

- (a) Culture and practices
- (b) Rights over lands and territories
- (c) Rights over biodiversity resources
- (d) Rights over traditional knowledge
- (e) Other: _____

(c) Ensure the full protection of environmental human rights defenders?

- (a) No
- (b) Yes

(d) Ensure public access to information related to biodiversity disaggregated for indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth and persons with disabilities?

- (a) No
- (b) No, but under development
- (c) Yes, partially
- (d) Yes, fully

(e) Provide access to justice for one or more of the categories opposite? (Select all that apply)

- (a) Indigenous peoples and local communities
- (b) Women and girls
- (c) Children and youth
- (d) Persons with disabilities

22.2 Does your country have operational frameworks and mechanisms related to the policy, legislative and administrative frameworks listed under question 22.1?

- (a) No
- (b) No, but under development
- (c) Yes, partially
- (d) Yes, fully

22.3 Does your country have financial resources or budgets for the frameworks listed under questions 22.1 and 22.2? (Select all that apply)

- (a) No
- (b) Yes, financial allocations from the national budget
- (c) Yes, financial allocations from other sources

22.4 Has your country undertaken capacity-building activities for the frameworks listed under questions 22.1 and 22.2?

- (a) No
- (b) Yes

* [CBD/SBSTTA/25/2](#), annex.

22.5 Does your country monitor the following:

(a) The full, equitable, inclusive, effective and gender-responsive representation and participation in biodiversity decision-making of the following? (Select all that apply)

(b) The following culture and rights of indigenous peoples and local communities? (Select all that apply)

(c) The full protection of environmental human rights defenders?

(a) Indigenous peoples and local communities

(b) Women and girls

(c) Children and youth

(d) Persons with disabilities

(a) Culture and practices

(b) Rights over lands and territories

(c) Rights over biodiversity resources

(d) Rights over traditional knowledge

(e) Other: _____

(a) No

(b) Yes
