



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General
13 January 2026

English only

Subregional dialogue for Latin American countries on biodiversity monitoring and reporting with a focus on ecosystem restoration (Target 2 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework)

Bogotá, 17–20 November 2025

Report of the subregional dialogue for Latin American countries on biodiversity monitoring and reporting with a focus on ecosystem restoration (Target 2 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework)

Introduction

1. The subregional dialogue for Latin American countries on biodiversity monitoring and reporting with a focus on ecosystem restoration (Target 2 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework) was held in Bogotá, Colombia, from 17 to 20 November 2025. The dialogue was co-organized by the Alexander von Humboldt Biological Resources Research Institute, one of the region's technical and scientific cooperation support centres; the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO); the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean; and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, in close collaboration with other relevant partners, and with the financial support of FAO, the UNEP China Trust Fund and the Global Environment Facility (GEF).
2. The workshop was attended by a total of 61 participants: representatives of Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay, the Caribbean Community, the Central American Commission for Environment and Development, the Center for International Forestry Research and World Agroforestry, the Global Partnership on Forest and Landscape Restoration and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan Accelerator Partnership and four representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities, two representatives of women and two representatives of youth.
3. The dialogue, which aimed towards enhancing national capacities for the implementation of the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, included sessions on the preparation of the seventh national report and the use of the online reporting tool. The dialogue supported participating countries in accelerating monitoring and reporting on ecosystem restoration in the context of Target 2 of the Framework and provided for the sharing of subregional, national and local experiences and challenges in that regard. Furthermore, the dialogue included a training of trainers session for the representatives of the regional and subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centres and a session on advancing the implementation of the Framework in Latin America.

4. An account of the proceedings of the meeting is provided below. An overview of the key observations, challenges and needs that were discussed is contained in the annex to the present report.

Item 1

Opening of the dialogue

5. The dialogue was opened on 17 November by Pierre Gerstlé, Director of Internationalization and External Relations, Universidad Externado de Colombia; Agustin Zimmermann, representative of FAO Colombia; Giselle Didier, Knowledge Director, Alexander von Humboldt Biological Resources Research Institute; Dolores Barrientos, representative of UNEP Colombia; and Caroline Pritchard, representative of the British Embassy in Bogotá. The Executive Secretary of the Convention, Astrid Schomaker, delivered a video opening statement.

Item 2

Introduction and overview of the objectives and programme of the dialogue

6. A representative of the Alexander von Humboldt Biological Resources Research Institute delivered a presentation on the objectives and programme of the dialogue. The objectives encompassed: (a) monitoring implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and preparing national reports; (b) Target 2 fundamentals; (c) tools for geospatial monitoring of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework with a focus on Target 2; (d) action plans for addressing national and local needs for monitoring and reporting, focusing on ecosystem restoration; (e) next steps for subregional priorities; and (f) a training of trainers session on Target 2 for the technical and scientific cooperation support centres. In a presentation covering the four days of the programme of the dialogue, the representative of the Alexander von Humboldt Biological Resources Research Institute outlined the progression of the topics considered, extending from global guidance to the technical fundamentals of Target 2, hands-on training on the Framework for Ecosystem Restoration Monitoring and national platforms, and cooperation mechanisms and next steps.

Item 3

Monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and online reporting tool

7. A representative of the Secretariat introduced the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, adopted by the Conference of the Parties in decision 15/5, and the technical updates endorsed in decision 16/31. He delivered a presentation on the enhanced multidimensional approach to planning, monitoring, reporting and review adopted in decision 15/6, the procedures for the global review of progress in the implementation of the Framework set out in decision 16/32 and the guidance for the preparation of the seventh national reports. The presentation outlined the relevant mandates of the Conference of the Parties, key deadlines and the importance of this information not only for the global report but also for guiding national actions and covered the structure of the national report, sources of information, the online reporting tool and practical guidance on how the required data could be entered and submitted.
8. A representative of the Alexander von Humboldt Biological Resources Research Institute gave technical presentations on steps and tools for developing a national monitoring system which focused on the Global Ecosystem Typology of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and the Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network tool box ("BON in a box").
9. After the introductory presentations, representatives of Colombia, Chile and Cuba shared information on their countries' experiences related to monitoring and highlighted efforts towards achieving ecosystem restoration on a national scale. The information-sharing was followed by a

facilitated group discussion aimed at identifying key priorities and actions that would need to be taken to develop or improve national monitoring plans, systems and indicators.

10. A representative of the Alexander von Humboldt Biological Resources Research Institute made a presentation on the institute's role as a subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centre in supporting national biodiversity strategy and action plan monitoring focusing on Target 2 of the Framework.

11. Representatives of Paraguay and Mexico gave presentations on experiences and lessons learned in assessing progress in preparing the seventh national report to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

12. After a report back from the group discussion, a representative of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan Accelerator Partnership delivered a presentation on behalf of the Secretariat of the Convention on the results of the indicators survey and led a plenary exercise and discussion on levels of confidence in the use of headline indicators. The exercise, which was co-facilitated with the Alexander von Humboldt Biological Resources Research Institute, focused on confidence levels and the challenges that countries were facing in applying and reporting on those indicators.

Item 4

Fundamentals of Target 2 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

13. A representative of the Center for International Forestry Research and World Agroforestry presented the preliminary results derived from the Target 2 self-assessment, which had been circulated and completed by parties prior to the start of the dialogue.

14. A representative of the Society for Ecological Restoration delivered a presentation on the key elements of Target 2, which included a discussion on the topics of how to determine the spatial extent of degraded areas in each of the three major ecosystem types and how to define the baseline. The presentation was followed by group discussions which were held to enable the sharing of examples derived from country and local-level experiences.

15. In a separate session, a representative of the Society for Ecological Restoration made a presentation on defining restoration outcomes and implementing effective restoration to achieve national targets, which was followed by group discussions on how to implement national targets and contribute to Target 2 key outcomes. The groups reported back to plenary on their discussions.

16. A representative of FAO provided an overview of the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration, the Accelerating Innovative Monitoring for Nature Restoration project, the Target 2 road map, the headline indicator and metadata for Target 2 and associated tools for geospatial monitoring.

Item 5

Tools for geospatial monitoring of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, with a focus on its Target 2

17. Representatives of Argentina (through remote participation), Uruguay, Mexico and Brazil delivered presentations on their national experiences in implementing and monitoring Target 2. Following those presentations, participants were divided into groups to facilitate further discussion on the implications of the presentations for national-level action. Following the group discussions, each group provided a summary of the group's observations.

18. A representative of Peru delivered a technical presentation on the component indicator for Target 2 and its linkages with the indicator for monitoring and reporting on land degradation neutrality and Sustainable Development Goal 15.3.1. She highlighted the country's national approach to integrating restoration, land degradation and sustainable land management data sets, emphasizing the importance of consistent national baselines and harmonized geospatial layers for supporting both biodiversity and land degradation reporting.

19. A representative of FAO delivered a presentation on the Framework for Ecosystem Restoration Monitoring registry, search engine and data review functionality for Target 2 reporting. Following the presentation, representatives of FAO and the Center for International Forestry Research and World Agroforestry introduced a group exercise on the Framework for Ecosystem Restoration Monitoring tool. Participants were invited to try to use the tool during a training session, which was followed by a plenary discussion aimed at identifying challenges and opportunities for monitoring and reporting on ecosystem restoration related to data collection, compilation and validation.

20. Representatives of Indigenous Peoples of Peru and Colombia presented their experiences related to ecosystem restoration in Indigenous and traditional territories in Peru. A representative of Chile gave a presentation entitled “From degradation to regeneration: the Cerro Guido restoration journey in Patagonia, Chile”.

Item 6

Action plans to address national needs for monitoring and reporting, with a focus on ecosystem restoration

21. Representatives of Paraguay, Peru, El Salvador, Guatemala and the Dominican Republic participated in a panel discussion on identifying needs and addressing gaps in the region.

22. A representative of the World Resources Institute made a presentation on Initiative 20x20 followed by a presentation by a representative of FAO on the Central American Dry Corridor flagship initiative.

23. Representatives of the Alexander von Humboldt Biological Resources Research Institute and the Center for International Forestry Research and World Agroforestry facilitated a group exercise aimed at addressing gaps and needs related to Target 2, based on self-assessment results, and all aspects of restoration.

Item 7

Conclusions and next steps for subregional priorities

24. A representative of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan Accelerator Partnership gave a presentation on opportunities for leveraging matchmaking support for implementing and monitoring national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

25. A representative of the United Nations Development Programme made a presentation on the GEF umbrella programme to support national biodiversity strategy and action plan updates and seventh national reports.

26. A representative of the UNEP China Trust Fund delivered a presentation on advancing the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework in Latin America.

27. Following those presentations, representatives of the Alexander von Humboldt Biological Resources Research Institute and FAO facilitated plenary discussions on the key points emerging from the presentations, dialogues and group exercises organized during the dialogue.

28. While representatives of many Parties indicated that their countries intended to submit their seventh national report on time, those representatives noted that their countries were facing challenges related to such issues as limited capacities for assessment and validation, data availability for some targets and inadequacy of information for reporting on actions to implement the updated national biodiversity strategies and action plans and national targets owing to the short amount of time available for implementation. Further information in that regard can be found in the summary

of key findings from regional and subregional dialogues on biodiversity monitoring and reporting to be presented at the sixth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.¹

Item 8

Training of trainers session for the technical and scientific cooperation support centres

29. The Society for Ecological Restoration led a closed training session for representatives of regional and subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centres in attendance. The organizers of the dialogue reviewed key content derived from the dialogue and available training materials to enable participating centres to host similar dialogues for the countries in their respective subregions.

Item 9

Closure of the dialogue

30. The dialogue was closed at 1 p.m. on 20 November 2025, with brief closing remarks provided by the representatives of the Secretariat of the Convention, FAO and the Alexander von Humboldt Biological Resources Research Institute.

¹ CBD/SBI/6/INF/6.

Annex

Key observations emerging from the dialogue

- **Whole-of-society approach for restoration initiatives.** Restoration actors include environment ministries, forest and agricultural agencies, research institutions, Indigenous Peoples' organizations, civil society organizations and private-sector initiatives, which results in a rich but fragmented and often siloed landscape of data and monitoring practices
- **National monitoring systems are at different stages of development.** Some countries are building integrated restoration monitoring platforms, while others are still collecting and consolidating project-level information and sectoral data sets
- **Mapping of restoration initiatives remains a priority.** Governments and practitioners stressed the need for centralized, accessible maps of restoration activities to support strategic planning, avoid duplication and account for contributions from indigenous peoples and local communities
- **Regional interest in interoperable systems is high.** Countries expressed strong interest in linking national platforms with the Framework for Ecosystem Restoration Monitoring, improving visibility of governmental and non-State contributions and facilitating data flows in the context of the seventh national report and global review efforts
- **Countries widely acknowledged the importance of Indigenous-led and community-based restoration,** noting the significant knowledge and experience in territorial stewardship that indigenous peoples and local communities contributed to restoration efforts and the need to ensure their visibility in national reporting

Challenges

- **Fragmented data and lack of harmonization** across institutions limit the integration of restoration information at national scale
- **There needs to be a structuring of institutional roles and mandates for data governance** in many countries, including for those who exercise authority for validation and reporting related to Target 2 indicators
- **Technical gaps persist in assessing ecosystem condition,** determining which areas are degraded, establishing reference conditions, calculating baselines and tracking restoration outcomes
- **Sustaining long-term monitoring systems is a challenge** due to limited financial and human resources in most of the countries of the region
- **The issues of data sovereignty and appropriate inclusion of Indigenous and territorial data** require careful consideration, as communities need clarity on the matter of how their information will be used, shared and validated

Needs, actions and opportunities

- **Advance the interoperability between national systems and the Framework for Ecosystem Restoration Monitoring,** with a view to enabling streamlined data exchange, visualization and reporting for Target 2
- **Enhance technical capacity** at national and local levels on degradation assessment, baseline setting, remote sensing and ecosystem condition-related indicators
- **Leverage the important role of indigenous peoples and local communities,** through ensuring that their data, knowledge and monitoring practices are appropriately reflected in national frameworks while respecting principles of data sovereignty
- **Invest in long-term, sustainable monitoring systems,** supported by regional cooperation through technical and scientific cooperation support centres and continued engagement of development partners and donors

- **Foster regional learning communities**, building on the strength of the exchange of experiences observed during the dialogue, including through encouragement of peer-to-peer support and follow-up training of trainers
 - **Recognize the importance of achieving high-level political (in addition to technical) follow-up and buy-in to biodiversity processes**
-