



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/POST2020/WS/2020/1/3
27 March 2020

ENGLISH ONLY

REPORT ON THE THEMATIC CONSULTATION ON TRANSPARENT IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING, REPORTING AND REVIEW FOR THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

ROME, 20-22 FEBRUARY 2020

INTRODUCTION

1. In [decision 14/29](#) (para. 4 (a)), the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity requested the Executive Secretary to further develop options to enhance review mechanisms, with a view to strengthening the implementation of the Convention. In the same decision (para. 4 (d)), the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to further consult Parties, stakeholders and the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework on modalities for enhancing the review of implementation and to report on progress to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting.
2. The Conference of the Parties at its fourteenth meeting adopted [decision 14/34](#) on a comprehensive and participatory process for the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and requested the Executive Secretary to facilitate its implementation. In paragraph 6 of the decision, the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and invited other Governments and stakeholders to “actively engage and contribute to the process of developing a robust post-2020 global biodiversity framework in order to foster strong ownership of the framework to be agreed and strong support for its immediate implementation”.
3. Pursuant to the above requests and with generous financial support from the Government of France and the European Union, the Secretariat of the Convention convened the Thematic Consultation on Transparent Implementation, Monitoring, Reporting and Review at the headquarters of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), in Rome, from 20 to 22 February 2020, prior to the second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. The consultation was open to all participants in the Open-ended Working Group, including Parties and representatives of United Nations organizations, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, indigenous peoples and local communities, industry, academia and youth (the list of participants is available at: <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/post2020/POST2020-WS-2020-01/documents>.)
4. This consultation focused on eliciting and discussing views on elements related to transparent implementation, monitoring, reporting and review to be considered in the further development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The outcomes of the thematic consultation would be made available to the Co-chairs of the Open-ended Working Group. Further review of options for an enhanced implementation, monitoring, reporting and review mechanism will be undertaken by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting and by the Open-Ended Working Group at its third meeting.
5. The consultation was organized under the guidance of the Co-Leads of this thematic stream of the post-2020 process, Ms. Rosemary Paterson (New Zealand) and Mr. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana), and of the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, Mr. Francis Ogwal (Uganda) and Mr. Basile van Havre (Canada). The organization of work and other relevant documentation, including a set of “issue briefs” related to national planning, national reporting,

the voluntary peer review process, the use of indicators for tracking progress, and monitoring and review by the Conference of the Parties and its subsidiary bodies, are available on the Convention's website at: <https://www.cbd.int/meetings/POST2020-WS-2020-01>.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE THEMATIC CONSULTATION

6. The thematic consultation was opened by Ms. Elizabeth Maruma Mrema, Acting Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, who welcomed participants to the event and expressed her deep regret that it had not been possible to hold the event in Kunming, China, as originally planned, due to issues related to the novel coronavirus. She expressed her appreciation to China for its tireless efforts to prepare for the thematic consultation and for the second meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group. She also expressed appreciation to FAO for hosting the meetings.

7. The Acting Executive Secretary stated that an enhanced review mechanism under the Convention held perhaps the greatest promise for assisting Parties in achieving the 2050 Vision. She added that such a mechanism would allow the Conference of the Parties and its subsidiary bodies to track progress towards global goals and targets and identify strategic actions to scale up implementation. It would also enhance the visibility of the contribution of each Party towards the global goals and targets while increasing overall transparency and confidence among Parties, facilitate mutual learning and support, and identify obstacles in national implementation and the specific approaches, actions or resources needed to overcome them. She indicated that such a mechanism should also be: (a) comprehensive, in that it should allow for review of the contribution of each Party and the aggregate progress; (b) participatory, in that the process should be available to all Parties; (c) facilitative, in that an enhanced review mechanism should not be a punitive mechanism but, rather, a supporting tool aiming at peer learning, the identification of constraints and obstacles and ways and means to overcome them. Furthermore, it should be evidence-based and results-oriented.

8. The Acting Executive Secretary concluded her remarks by emphasizing that the collective expertise and experiences of participants in implementing, and in supporting the implementation of the Convention, were invaluable to the design of a review mechanism for enhancing the effectiveness of the Convention. She stressed that the moment was opportune to collect ideas, think creatively, discuss, debate, evaluate, and listen to one another.

9. The Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework made a brief presentation which included an overview of the post-2020 process to date, selected messages from other consultations, an explanation of the "logic model" of zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and how it included elements of transparency and accountability, and, finally, some words of advice and their expectations for the consultation.

10. The designated thematic Co-Leads for the consultation provided a brief overview of the consultation's objectives and the programme that would be followed over the three days. The aim of the consultation was to provide the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group with concrete and constructive inputs for consideration in their future work on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The consultation would not constitute a negotiation process but would serve to seek areas of convergence.

11. Ms. Suneetha Subramanian, facilitator for the consultation, provided participants with logistical details.

ITEM 2. REFINING THE EXISTING ELEMENTS OF PLANNING, MONITORING, REPORTING AND REVIEW UNDER THE CONVENTION

12. The first substantive item of the workshop was about the existing elements of planning, reporting, monitoring and review under the Convention, and how they could be refined or enhanced. The Secretariat made a short presentation on each of the "issue briefs" prepared for the consultation, highlighting the main issues for discussion regarding national reporting, indicators, global monitoring, review and reporting, national planning, and voluntary peer review (<https://www.cbd.int/meetings/POST2020-WS-2020-01>). Following the presentations, participants were divided into five discussion groups and asked to reflect on the existing elements and how they could be improved. Each group was asked to cover two of the five

topics. Each group then reported to the plenary on the outcomes of their discussions, and further discussion among participants was facilitated by Ms. Subramanian. The results of those discussions and those on the work of the second breakout group are presented in the annex to the present report.

ITEM 3. PLANNING, REPORTING, MONITORING AND REVIEW MECHANISMS UNDER OTHER CONVENTIONS AND RELEVANT PROCESSES

13. Under this item, presentations¹ were made by representatives of other Conventions and relevant processes on planning, reporting, monitoring and review mechanisms utilized in their respective organizations. Presentations were made by: (a) Mr. Walters Tubua, Associate Programme Officer, Adaptation Programme, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC); (b) Ms. Katia Katsourakis, Biodiversity Programme Leader, Environment Directorate, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD); and (c) Mr. Archi Rastogi, Evaluation Specialist, Independent Evaluation Unit, Green Climate Fund (GCF). That was followed by a question-and-answer session.

14. Following a brief recap of Day 1 by the Co-Leads, Ms. Rosemary Paterson and Mr. Alfred Oteng Yeboah, presentations were made on review mechanisms employed by other relevant processes. Remote presentations were made by Mr. Shantanu Mukherjee, Chief, Policy and Analysis Branch, Division for Sustainable Development, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, and Mr. Gianni Magazzeni, Chief, Universal Periodic Review, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Other presentations were delivered by Ms. Anna Krotova, Manager, Standards Division, Global Reporting Initiative and Mr. Juha I. Uitto, Director, Global Environment Facility (GEF) Independent Evaluation Unit, who were present in the room. That was followed by a question-and-answer session.

ITEM 4. CONCRETE PROPOSALS FOR ENHANCED PLANNING, REPORTING, MONITORING AND REVIEW UNDER THE CONVENTION AND THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

15. Presentations were delivered by several representatives of organizations that had formally submitted to the post-2020 process a concrete proposal on review mechanisms. A remote presentation was delivered by Mr. Gianni Ruta, Senior Environmental Economist, World Bank, together with Mr. Raffaello Cervigni, Lead Economist, Manager, Global Program on Sustainability, World Bank, who was present in the room. Presentations were also made by Mr. Didier Babin, Team Leader, European Union Project “Follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020”, Expertise France, Mr. Clement Metivier, Policy Advisor, Biodiversity, WWF-UK, Mr. Neville Ash, Director, United Nations Environment Programme’s World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), and Ms. Christina Supples, Senior Technical Advisor, CBD Sixth National Reports, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), together with Jamie Ervin, Manager, Nature for Development, UNDP and Mr. Michele Poletto, Project Manager for the CBD Sixth National Reports, UNEP. That was followed by a question-and-answer session.

16. Following the presentation, participants were divided into eight groups and asked to brainstorm and develop one to three options for an enhanced planning, reporting, monitoring and review mechanism under the Convention and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The options were to be clear, concise, realistic and well thought-out and had to include proposals on planning, reporting, monitoring and review. They were to include consideration of both national and global levels and of their inter-linkages, and of how existing elements under the Convention (such as national biodiversity strategies and action plans, national reports, voluntary peer review and the Conference of the Parties) should be refined. Additional elements or instruments, from those presented during the consultation or others, could be proposed. Each group then presented in plenary on the options it had developed. That was followed by a question-and-answer session. The results of those discussions and those of work of the first breakout group are presented in annex I.

¹ All the presentations made are available on the Convention’s website at <https://www.cbd.int/meetings/POST2020-WS-2020-01>

ITEM 5. CLOSING STATEMENTS

17. The Acting Executive Secretary expressed her gratitude to all participants for having contributed to rich discussions over the three days, adding that, while it was necessary to plan accordingly for the post-2020 period, it was essential that implementation continue in parallel. The Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group also expressed their gratitude to participants and requested that they continue thinking over the topics that had been discussed, including the role that the national biodiversity strategies and action plans would play in relation to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, the feasibility of establishing a peer review mechanism at the regional level, and how the impact of actions could better be measured. The Co-Leads highlighted the abundance of convergence on issues, including on the role of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and national reports and the need for global data and smarter reporting, and interesting new ideas proposed in relation to action plans, the establishment of an implementation support committee and a role for regional monitoring.

18. The meeting was closed at 5 p.m. on 22 February 2020.

Annex

SYNTHESIS OF BREAKOUT GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON EXISTING ELEMENTS OF PLANNING, MONITORING, REPORTING AND REVIEW UNDER THE CONVENTION AND ON OPTIONS FOR AN ENHANCED MECHANISM IN THE POST-2020 PERIOD

The following is a synthesis of the discussions on existing elements of planning, monitoring, reporting and review under the Convention, and on options for an enhanced planning, reporting, monitoring and review mechanism under the Convention and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Although, during the thematic consultation, these were two separate group work sessions, they are combined here to minimize repetition and enhance comprehension.

The purpose here is to present the points raised in the plenary discussion and breakout groups but not to comprehensively review all the points raised in the discussion. These points are organized thematically with respect to the issues that were addressed. Furthermore, it should be noted that consensus/agreement on these points was not sought during these discussions and that points reflected herein do not represent points that were agreed upon among all workshop participants.

National planning

(a) National biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) should continue to be the main national planning instrument under the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(b) There will need to be an alignment of existing NBSAPs with the new framework. There are questions as to how this should happen and what form it should take. Among the issues raised and options proposed were:

- (i) The need for new (or updated) guidance, guidelines and standards;
- (ii) The need for standardization to enable better review of NBSAPs, including for the estimation of a potential global ambition gap, but also the need to keep some flexibility to reflect national circumstances, as expressed in Article 6 of the Convention;
- (iii) The possibility of having a small number of common elements or of disaggregating the information contained in the NBSAP into separate instruments;
- (iv) The option of having additional instruments or addendums to existing NBSAPs submitted at regular intervals (national commitments). There was a suggestion that “action plans” might be developed as more streamlined and frequent means of reporting on commitments and that an “adaptive management” approach could be taken to action plans. Action plans could be at the national and subnational levels and could be used by non-State actors;
- (v) Mention was made of the Sharm el-Sheikh Action Agenda as a means of registering commitments;
- (vi) The importance of NBSAPs reflecting how Parties are contributing to the new framework, including the need for tracking how national goals, targets and actions add up to global goals and targets;
- (vii) The importance of having global goals and targets that can be disaggregated;
- (viii) The need for NBSAPs that reflect the scope of the targets under the new framework;
- (ix) The possibility for NBSAPs (depending on the global targets adopted) to become broader, more cross-cutting instruments;

(c) There is a need for stronger alignment of NBSAPs with national reporting and with monitoring at the global level (and an eventual global stocktake);

(d) The timeliness of updating NBSAPs was discussed. Some options are included in the section below on “cycles”. Among the issues raised were:

- (i) The possibility of having national commitments by the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties;
- (ii) The need to keep any updating/revision process as short as possible in order to focus on implementation;
- (iii) The need to align and synchronize the process of updating NBSAPs with other national processes;
- (iv) The possibility of having regular intervals for NBSAP revisions and updating;
- (v) The possibility of aligning the timeframe of NBSAPs (or national commitments) with that of nationally determined contributions under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (five-year intervals);
- (vi) Questions regarding the timing of the post-2020 process and the IPBES and IPCC reports;
- (e) It was noted that it could be beneficial for NBSAPs to reflect actions by all of society towards the achievement of the post-2020 goals and targets. Among the issues raised were:
 - (i) The importance of reflecting subnational actions in both NBSAPs and national reports;
 - (ii) The importance of inclusive and participatory processes and of multi-stakeholder platforms to involve all ministries;
 - (iii) Commitment from sectoral actors and from the private sector. Question as to whether the NBSAP is the right tool to achieve this;
- (f) It was noted that updating or aligning NBSAPs with the new framework could be an opportunity to re-position biodiversity as a vehicle for the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals within a country;
- (g) The need for synergies with the Rio conventions and biodiversity-related conventions was noted.

National reporting

- (a) National reporting should remain the main instrument for monitoring and reporting under the Convention, but more clarity is needed on how the national reporting process will fit in and align with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and other processes and mechanisms put in place to support its monitoring and implementation;
- (b) The purpose(s) of national reporting should include: to ensure transparency, to contribute to a global stocktake, to provide national accountability, to drive improvements in performance, and to identify capacity gaps;
- (c) At the global level, national reports should add value to reviewing/global stocktaking of the implementation of the Convention and its Strategic Plan, thus supporting the planning and decision-making processes;
- (d) Information in the national reports should be used more for domestic and for global purposes. Considering this, it was suggested that future national reports should only focus on those issues that will be used by the Convention; however, it was also noted that national reports have important functions at the national level as well, and this should not be lost;
- (e) *Regarding the contents of national reports:* There was debate as to whether national reports should be comprehensive or should focus on specific targets, and if they should use a rigid or a more flexible template. It was suggested that additional content, such as success stories, could be accommodated. The value of spatial data, particularly in relation to core indicators, was noted;

(f) Future national reports could allow countries to focus on the assessment of progress in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, while allowing for flexibility to reflect national needs and circumstances;

(g) There was a suggestion that national reports should focus more on outcomes/impacts of actions and identifying gaps in commitments and implementation. However, monitoring impacts in a short period (e.g. two to four years) could be difficult and, therefore, keeping the focus on actions could be an option. There was also a suggestion that national reports could be of different types: mandatory reports on specific targets and voluntary reports for special stories on implementation;

(h) National reporting should not be cumbersome, and the format of the report, including the online reporting tool, should be made easier to use and more consistent;

(i) The need for efforts to ensure greater comparability between the national reports in order to allow information to be meaningfully aggregated;

(j) The need for national reporting processes to engage all relevant stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities, and reflect their actions and inputs was noted;

(k) The need for additional tools and adequate resources to support national reporting was noted;

(l) *Regarding the periodicity/timing of reporting:* various proposals were put forward to have two cycles of reporting, including a streamlined report in 2024, followed by a more comprehensive one in 2028. These are outlined in a section below on “cycles”. It was noted that more specific reporting every two years (for the Conference of the Parties) could be explored. It was suggested that the timing of national reports should be aligned so that they feed into a global biodiversity stocktake. A question was raised regarding aligning the timing of reporting with that under other processes and Conventions;

(m) National planning and reporting processes should be aligned;

(n) The need to synchronize the periodicity of national reports with other processes was noted;

(o) The need for enhanced (substantive) alignment or synergies of reporting was noted;

(p) The possibility of having national reports reviewed, either by the Secretariat or by external experts or bodies, prior to submission was noted;

(q) The use of indicators from the list of indicators welcomed by the Conference of the Parties (decision XIII/28) was limited in the national reports. A core set of indicators could be used for monitoring and reporting of progress in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to enhance global assessment and comparability. Some countries indicated that both national and global indicators should be used. Further some suggested that the greater use of indicators could be helpful in reducing the length of the report and/or in making the national reports more comparable;

(r) There was a suggestion to diversify reporting from solely a biodiversity orientation to include social, cultural and human rights issues.

Monitoring and review

(a) It was noted that monitoring would be a crucial element of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and that there was a need for both a national and a global process. Several views were expressed as to the purpose of monitoring and review:

(i) To catalyse global action and/or to encourage national policy and action;

(ii) For transparency, to compare the actions of Parties against their commitments;

(iii) To ensure that Parties are reporting in accordance with the agreed guidelines;

(iv) To look at national biodiversity outcomes, clearly distinguish them from actions;

- (v) To exchange practices and lessons learned; to help countries to do more;
- (vi) To identify what is going wrong more quickly;
- (vii) To provide a forum for discussion of common issues collegially;
- (viii) To align with climate change reporting;
- (b) There were several suggestions for principles for global monitoring, reporting and review:
 - (i) Non-punitive, facilitative and participatory;
 - (ii) Highlight best practices, identify ways to fill gaps;
 - (iii) Should not single out Parties and should highlight the needs for capacity and resources;
 - (iv) Should be a multi-stakeholder process;
- (c) Clear targets and indicators are key to having a functional global monitoring, reporting and review system. The effectiveness of global and national monitoring, reporting and review largely depends on whether the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is outcome-oriented or process-oriented; the former is more rigorous and more easily measurable;
- (d) There was general support for a global biodiversity stocktake. However, some noted that a global stocktake would need to be made relevant to those implementing the Convention at the national level/ground level. The need to disaggregate global data to make it more relevant/operational was also noted. Suggestions for a global stocktake were that it could:
 - (i) Be overseen by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation;
 - (ii) Be informed by IPBES and national reports;
 - (iii) Inform the next phase of national commitments and create an upward spiral of commitments;
 - (iv) Take place every five years and be timed to coincide with meetings of the Conference of the Parties and/or the Subsidiary Body on Implementation;
 - (v) Cover all elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework or only focus on a few targets at a time;
 - (vi) Be based on global headline indicators;
 - (vii) Include the development of a global biodiversity dashboard;
 - (viii) Involve subnational entities to enhance local-level monitoring;
 - (ix) Involve private companies and encourage them to disclose their biodiversity outcomes;
 - (x) Need more simple and structured monitoring, and a common methodology to assess progress;
- (e) It was suggested that an implementation support committee could be established, possibly under the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, to provide Parties with advice to overcome obstacles (facilitative). Such a committee could be composed of independent experts, Parties and stakeholders;
- (f) Several options were discussed as complements (or alternatives) to global review. These include the voluntary peer review (detailed below), mandatory peer review, buddies or groups that review each other, expert review, and hybrid/peer review. It was thought that some of these could go into more depth than global review because they could be focused on specific countries and/or issues;
- (g) There was a suggestion for a system to file complaints.

Voluntary peer review

- (a) There were various views regarding the voluntary peer-review process:
 - (i) Some noted that the small number of Parties volunteering to be reviewed or nominating national experts as reviewers was a challenge;
 - (ii) Some thought that participation should not be voluntary. Others were of the view that making it mandatory would not be helpful. An option to have random selection of Parties, or another form of systematic selection, to participate was noted;
 - (iii) Some were of the view that Parties need to be more proactive, and many indicated that they did not know enough about the voluntary peer review process. It was suggested that Parties that have been reviewed should explain the benefits that they obtained from it;
 - (iv) Some noted that the criteria for participation should be made clearer, as should the potential benefits of the process. There were also questions regarding how the data gathered from the peer review is used and if this information could be used in a punitive manner;
 - (v) It was noted that Parties, or regions, should be invited to participate in the voluntary peer review and that regional balance in the process should be sought;
 - (vi) It was suggested that a behavioural change approach should be used; create incentives for Parties to want to participate;
 - (vii) The possible need to modify the methodology of the peer review process in view of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was noted;
- (b) Regarding the possibility of tweaking the existing voluntary peer review methodology in view of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, it was suggested that such revision should be made known to Parties in advance, and the following views were expressed:
 - (i) Complementing the voluntary peer review with open peer review of drafts (NBSAPs and national reports), public comment, including local people, more bottom-up approach;
 - (ii) Collect data that would allow for a cross-country comparison. More standardized review;
 - (iii) Scope could be expanded (ref. to UNFCCC process). Others suggested that it could be borrowed for specific topics;
 - (iv) It was suggested that the voluntary peer review should be linked to a specific outcome;
 - (v) An option could be to have a peer review to advise Parties on preparation of national reports;
 - (vi) How to encourage Parties to report shortcomings honestly;
 - (vii) Include national/regional reviewers in the review team and include capacity-building for them;
- (c) Regarding costs of and funding for voluntary peer review, some asked how to make the human resources and other costs more manageable. It was suggested that the Secretariat could maintain a roster of experts for peer review;
- (d) It was noted that voluntary peer review is very much about capacity-building, not only on implementation issues, but also on review. It was also noted that this process builds trust among Parties so that they can learn from one another;
- (e) Other benefits of the voluntary peer review process that were discussed include that it can be tailored to the needs of the country, that the review panel usually has a mix of expertise from different

disciplines, and that having a third party come to the country can open doors for and strengthen environment ministries.

Indicators

(a) The need to avoid delay in the choice and development of indicators was noted. Lessons should be learned from the use of indicators under the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Indicators should be agreed at the same time as targets and should be available before NBSAP revisions are due. It was also noted that some countries had just begun to develop implementation indicators for the Aichi Targets and, in that respect, the new global targets should not be too different;

(b) It was suggested that there should be a small list of headline indicators against which all countries should be required to report. These could then be complemented by additional global or national indicators which can be used by Parties according to their national circumstances;

(c) The need for more stringent baselines was noted;

(d) Indicators should be meaningful and clearly matched to the targets;

(e) Many participants noted that countries have their own sets of national indicators that they will continue to use. Some also noted that the indicators they use are based on national data sets and information often based on long-term monitoring data. It is important to keep continuity with these processes. The need for more consistency in data availability and use was noted;

(f) It was observed that traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use, although globally considered important, is not well reflected in indicators used by Parties in their reporting;

(g) The need for indicators which look at the outcomes or impacts of the actions taken was noted. It was also suggested that there should be indicators related to implementation and to indirect drivers. These should be in addition to indicators on status and trends;

(h) Some noted that there is often a disconnect between the indicators identified and used in the NBSAPs and in the national reports;

(i) Some suggested that a lead agency could be identified and tasked with preparing and compiling indicator information, similar to what is done for the Sustainable Development Goals. It would be good to have an organization responsible for each indicator;

(j) It was noted that indicators are tools for assessing progress but that there are other tools, including expert opinion, that can be used as well;

(k) The possibility of using indicators from other processes, such as those used by other Sustainable Development Goals and other multilateral environmental agreements, was noted.

Cycles

The options presented by each of the breakout groups on options for an enhanced implementation, monitoring, reporting and review mechanism are available online, as they were presented, at <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/post2020/POST2020-WS-2020-01/documents>.

(a) Several groups emphasized the need for coherence among the different components of the implementation and review mechanism (including “cycles of positive feedback” among them), and for synergies with other processes including those of the biodiversity related conventions, multilateral environmental agreements and the Sustainable Development Goals;

(b) It was also emphasized that the monitoring, reporting and review process should be ambitious, adaptive, transformative and action-oriented. It should be useful in enhancing implementation (and mainstreaming) on the ground;

(c) It was suggested that NBSAPs and national reports need to respond to, and perhaps even be structured like, the contents of the new global biodiversity framework;

- (d) There were various proposals for the timing of NBSAP alignment with new framework:
 - (i) By the Conference of the Parties at its sixteenth meeting (2022);
 - (ii) At years one (2021) and five (2025);
 - (iii) Three action plans in the 10-year time period — the first would be comprehensive and the second and third would be adaptations of the first, depending on implementation progress;
 - (iv) One group suggested that NBSAP revision guidance should be issued in 2021 to have NBSAPs and implementation support needs communicated before 2022;
- (e) It was suggested that commitments and their implementation could be reviewed at every meeting of the Conference of the Parties, or at year two (2022) and year six (2026). Others suggested that national commitments could correspond to a limited number of global targets/indicators rather than to the whole global biodiversity framework (in 2021, with the first “ratcheting” moment in 2025, and again in 2030). The option of compiling commitments in a global registry was noted;
- (f) It was suggested that national reports needed to be more visible in global assessments. For timing, it was suggested to have national reports at years three (2023) and eight (2028); suggestions were also made for two or three reporting cycles over the 10-year period, allowing for interim revisions based on identification of gaps and new information. A system of milestones to review and report was suggested;
- (g) Suggestions for the timing of voluntary peer reviews included one at years 4 and 10. There was also a suggestion for a comprehensive peer review to review all Parties within a review period. Peer review on the implementation of the new framework – compulsory but not punitive, rather constructive and to involve national stakeholders;
- (h) The need to strengthen the existing review mechanism with capacity-building and financing was noted;
- (i) The need to involve non-Party stakeholders in planning, reporting and review was noted. It was suggested that global goals should be disaggregated in order to be relevant to subnational implementation in addition to national. This would allow non-Party stakeholders/non-State actors to quantify their contributions and interventions – action agenda;
- (j) There were several suggestions for the timing of a global biodiversity stocktake:
 - (i) Every five years; at the seventeenth (2024) and nineteenth (2026) meetings of the Conference of the Parties; in 2023 and 2030; or only one in 2025;
 - (ii) Another idea presented was to start 2021 with a global stocktake using IPBES and the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* and national reports that are relatively fresh; in order to synchronize between multilateral environmental agreements, a suggestion was made to have a global stocktake in 2022 to include Rio+30, Stockholm+50 and the High-level Political Forum and the review of the Sustainable Development Goals in a “super multi-COP”. It was also suggested to have two meetings of the Conference of the Parties every five years instead of every four years;
 - (iii) It was suggested that a global biodiversity stocktake should include means of implementation in addition to targets. It was also suggested that the high-level segment (at meetings of the Conference of the Parties) should take advantage of the outcomes of the review to increase political will;
- (k) The need to build/strengthen platforms to enable interoperability of data from various sources/processes was noted. This would facilitate a global stocktaking exercise. Suggestion for a global GBF dashboard. Strengthening of current clearing-house mechanism was also suggested as a first step in this direction;

(l) There was a suggestion to establish a process to align the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* with the Sustainable Development Goal process;

(m) Challenges related to capacity and resources require attention to effect a new framework as early as possible;

(n) Caution was raised that much time should not be spent in working on setting up infrastructure in the new decade, as it results in loss of effective implementation time.
