



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General  
5 June 2023

English only

**Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on  
Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal  
Global Biodiversity Framework**  
Second meeting  
Online, 11 July 2023

### **Report of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework on its second meeting**

#### **Background**

1. The Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework was established by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity through its decision 15/5 and its terms of reference are contained in the annex to that decision. The overall purpose of the Expert Group is to provide technical advice to allow the Conference of the Parties to finalize the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework at its sixteenth meeting.<sup>1</sup>
2. The Expert Group will be meeting virtually and in person up until the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Its members will also be undertaking work between official meetings of the Group. The Expert Group held its second meeting online on 11 July 2023.<sup>2</sup>

#### **Item 1**

##### **Opening of the meeting**

3. The meeting was opened by the Co-Chairs of the Expert Group.

#### **Item 2**

##### **Organizational matters**

###### **(a) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work**

4. The Expert Group adopted the agenda for the meeting on the basis of the provisional agenda introduced by the Co-Chairs.<sup>3</sup>

###### **(b) Update on the indicators discussion forum**

5. The Co-Chairs reminded the Expert Group that the online discussion forum on the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework was operational and noted that individuals had begun posting observations and comments on it.<sup>4</sup> The Co-Chairs encouraged the members of the Expert Group to consider the use of the online discussion forum in its work, particularly once the Group began its consideration of metadata.

<sup>1</sup> Further information on the composition of the Expert Group and its background is contained in [notification 2023-40](#).

<sup>2</sup> The report of the first meeting of the Expert Group is available as document CBD/IND/AHTEG/2023/1/3.

<sup>3</sup> CBD/IND/AHTEG/2023/2/1.

<sup>4</sup> The online discussion forum is available at [www.cbd.int/gbf/related/monitoring/ind/forum/](http://www.cbd.int/gbf/related/monitoring/ind/forum/).

### Item 3

#### Proposed approach for the review of the metadata for the headline indicators

6. The Co-Chairs presented a proposed approach for the review of the metadata of the headline indicators. It was noted that the objective of the proposed approach was to collect information on the metadata in advance of the third meeting of the Expert Group, in order to facilitate discussions at that meeting. To accomplish that, it was proposed to establish five subgroups, each supported by two co-facilitators (see annex), which would work between the second and third meetings of the Expert Group. It was noted that each subgroup was free to determine its methods of work and that the members of the Expert Group were free to participate in any of the subgroups they wished. Furthermore, it was noted that to facilitate the work of the subgroups, a set of questions and a template were developed. However, these questions were not intended to limit the discussions by the subgroups but rather to help guide their work.

7. Following the presentation by the Co-Chairs, the Expert Group discussed the proposed approach. The work on the disaggregation of indicators was emphasized as an important issue in both filling possible gaps in the monitoring framework and in strengthening the monitoring of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. It was noted that the Expert Group should pay particular attention to those headline indicators without existing methodologies in its work, given that developing these would take time and that this should be a particular focus of the work of the Group in the period up to the twenty-sixth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.

8. During the discussion it was also noted that the Technical Expert Group on Financial Reporting would be considering the headline indicators for Goal D and Targets 18 and 19 and that the Expert Group would wait for that group to complete its work before considering these indicators. Similarly, it was noted that issues related indicators and monitoring would be addressed during the next meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Intersessional Working Group on Article 8(j) and related Provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity and that the results of that meeting should be considered in the work of the Expert Group. As such it was observed that the Expert Group should delay its consideration of the indicators related to traditional knowledge until that meeting had taken place.

9. The Expert Group also discussed the links to the online discussion forum, clarifications on the mandate and terms of reference of the Expert Group, links to the work on the binary indicators, the approach to addressing gaps in the monitoring framework and the identification of issues that should be considered during the next meeting of the Expert Group.

10. The Expert Group agreed on its approach to reviewing the metadata for the headline indicators with the understanding that the Secretariat would reflect the results of the discussion under this agenda item into the final version of the approach.<sup>5,6</sup>

### Item 4

#### Overall approach for the binary indicators

11. The Co-Chairs presented a proposed approach for addressing the binary indicators and presented a set of questions for consideration.<sup>7</sup> Following a discussion, it was decided that it would propose to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice that the questions underpinning the binary indicators should take the form of questions with several sub-elements and that the possible responses to the questions should be categorical. It was also agreed that the proposal to the Subsidiary Body should include information on how the questions could be used to calculate

---

<sup>5</sup> The approach for the review of the metadata for the headline indicators is presented in document [CBD/IND/AHTEG/2023/2/2](#).

<sup>6</sup> Following the closure of the meeting, the subgroups established by the Expert Group to address the metadata began to undertake their work. The groups have met multiple times since the second meeting of the Expert Group. Updates on the work for the subgroups will be presented to the third meeting of the Expert Group.

<sup>7</sup> See document [CBD/IND/AHTEG/2023/2/3](#).

the binary indicators. It was also agreed that a binary indicator would be proposed for Target 20 of the Framework. Some noted that the issue around definitions for the different terms in the binary questions would also need to be addressed.

12. During the discussions on this agenda item, some experts expressed concerns that the binary indicators could be seen as a substitute for quantitative headline indicators. In this context, it was noted that quantitative indicators were important and that the focus of the work of the Expert Group and the future work of Parties on monitoring should ensure that the use of headline indicators was considered a priority, including by addressing capacity needs for the use of headline indicators. It was also noted by some that the binary indicators were different in nature from the headline indicators as they focussed on the processes around a given target. While not detracting from the importance of having headline indicators, some observed that having binary indicators for each target would provide a way to capture the policy work and processes related to a target.

13. It was also noted by some experts that the Goals of the Framework were for 2050 and were less focused on actions. In that context, it was observed that the proposed binary indicator for Goal B was slightly different in nature than the other binary indicators and concerns around possible duplications between the binary indicator for this Goal and Target 14 were noted.

14. One expert noted that he was also a member of the Informal Advisory Group on Technical and Scientific Cooperation and noted that that Group was considering what a possible binary indicator for Target 20 could be. The expert volunteered to help link the work of the two Groups.<sup>8</sup> It was also noted that a similar process or link could be made with the Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to receive their input on the indicators for Target 17.

15. Following the discussion on the binary indicators, the Expert Group agreed that the subgroups established under agenda item 3 to consider the metadata for the headline indicators would also address the questions for the binary indicators (see annex). It was agreed that the subgroups established under item 3 would develop initial proposals for the binary indicators and that these proposals would be shared with the entire Expert Group for its review. It was also agreed that the result of this process would be developed in a document for the consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.<sup>9</sup>

## **Item 5**

### **Other matters**

16. The Secretariat noted that a document for the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice related to planning monitoring and review would be made available for peer review and invited members of the Expert Group to participate in that review process. The Secretariat also noted that an online reporting tool for the submission of national targets would be made available for testing and invited members to participate in that process.

## **Item 6**

### **Closure of the meeting**

17. In closing the meeting, the Co-Chairs recognized that much of the work planned in the upcoming months would be conducted in subgroups and by email and urged the subgroups to begin their work as soon as possible. The Co-Chairs and the Secretariat stood ready to help support this work as needed. They concluded by thanking the members of the Expert Group for their dedication. The Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, as an ex officio participant in the meeting, also thanked the Co-Chairs for their efforts in guiding the work of the Expert Group.

---

<sup>8</sup> The binary indicator proposed in document CBD/SBSTTA/25/2 for Target 20 was developed by the Informal Advisory Group on Scientific and Technical Cooperation and reviewed by the Technical Expert Group on Indicators.

<sup>9</sup> See document [CBD/SBSTTA/25/2](#).

## Annex

### Indicator subgroups

<i>Goals/Targets</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
Group 1 - Co-facilitated by Jan Dušek (Czechia) and Steve Widdicombe (Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization).	
A, 4, 5, 8, 22, 23	<p><i>Headline:</i></p> <p>A.1 Red List of Ecosystems                      A.2 Extent of natural ecosystems                      A.3 Red List Index                      A.4 The proportion of populations within species with an effective population size &gt; 500                      5.1 Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels</p> <p><i>Binary:</i></p> <p>8.b Number of countries with nationally determined contributions, long-term strategies, national adaptation plans and adaptation communications that reflect biodiversity                      22.b 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                      23.b Number of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) guarantees women’s equal rights to land ownership and/or control</p>
Group 2 - Co-facilitated by Piers Dunstan (Australia) and Josefa Isabel Cariño Tauli (Global Youth Biodiversity Network)	
B, 9, 10, 11	<p><i>Headline:</i></p> <p>B.1 Services provided by ecosystems<sup>a</sup>                      9.1 Benefits from the sustainable use of wild species<sup>a</sup>                      9.2 Percentage of the population in traditional occupations<sup>a</sup>                      10.1 Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture                      10.2 Progress towards sustainable forest management</p> <p><i>Binary</i></p> <p>B.b: Number of countries with national constitution or legislation recognizing and implementing and monitoring a right to a healthy environment                      9.b: Number of countries with legal instruments to regulate the use of and trade in wild species, and respecting customary sustainable use by indigenous peoples and local communities</p>
Group 3 - Co-facilitated by Ntakadzeni Tshidada (South Africa) and Joji Carino (International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity).	
C, 13, 15, 17	<p><i>Headline:</i></p> <p>C.1 Indicator on monetary benefits received<sup>a</sup>                      C.2 Indicator on non-monetary benefits<sup>a</sup></p>

<i>Goals/Targets</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
	<p>15.1 Number of companies reporting on disclosures of risks, dependencies and impacts on biodiversity<sup>a</sup></p> <p><i>Binary:</i></p> <p>13.b: Number of countries that have operational legislative, administrative or policy frameworks which relate to Target 13</p> <p>15.b: Number of countries taking legal, administrative or policy measures to ensure that Target 15 is achieved</p> <p>17.b Number of countries with capacity and measures in place related to Target 17</p>
Group 4 - Co-facilitated by Jing Xu (China) and Emily Nicholson (International Union for Conservation of Nature).	
1, 2, 3, 12	<p><i>Headline:</i></p> <p>1.1 Percentage of land and sea area covered by biodiversity-inclusive spatial plans<sup>a</sup></p> <p>2.2 Area under restoration<sup>a</sup></p> <p>3.1 Coverage of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures</p> <p>12.1 Average share of the built-up area of cities that is green/blue space for public use for all</p> <p><i>Binary:</i></p> <p>1.b Number of countries using terrestrial and marine spatial planning to identify areas of high biodiversity importance in national development planning</p> <p>12.b Number of countries with urban sustainability plans referring to green and/or blue spatial management</p>
Group 5 - Co-facilitated by Andrea Donaldson (Jamaica) and Tim Hirsch (Global Biodiversity Information Facility)	
6, 7, 20, 21	<p><i>Headline:</i></p> <p>6.1 Rate of invasive alien species establishment</p> <p>7.1 Index of coastal eutrophication potential</p> <p>7.2 Pesticide environment concentration<sup>a</sup></p> <p>21.1 Indicator on biodiversity information for monitoring the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework</p> <p><i>Binary:</i></p> <p>6.b Number of countries adopting relevant national legislation and adequately resourcing the prevention or control of invasive alien species</p> <p>20.b Number of countries with policy frameworks related to Target 20</p>

<sup>a</sup> An agreed up-to-date methodology does not exist for this indicator, and the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework will work with partners to guide its development.