UN environment programme

Convention on Biological Diversity

Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
Second meeting
Online, 11 July 2023
Item 3 of the provisional agenda[*]
Proposed approach for the review of the metadata for the headline indicators

Proposed approach to reviewing the headline indicators and their associated metadata

Note by the Secretariat

I. Background

1. By its decision 15/5, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted the monitoring framework for the Kunming Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. The monitoring framework contains a set of headline indicators, which are at different levels of development. The present note sets out an approach for how the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework could consider the headline indicators, bearing in mind that the Expert Group has been requested to work primarily electronically and that its third meeting will be held in person, from 3 to 6 October 2023.

2. It is proposed that the following aspects of the terms of reference of the Expert Group be initially considered by subgroups before being considered by the Expert Group as a whole at its third meeting:

(a) Identify options to address critical gaps to improve the monitoring framework, in particular on headline indicators that do not have an existing methodology, and advise on their implementation at the national level;

(b) Identify gaps in terms of the operationalization of each headline indicator and the management of data flows and advise on implementation at the national level;

(c) Provide advice on existing capacity, gaps and needs in terms of capacity development, technology transfer and financing needs related to the monitoring of the global biodiversity framework;

(d) Support the identification of important aspects related to disaggregation and aggregation for each headline indicator, as applicable, including any methodological improvements as appropriate.

---

[*] CBD/IND/AHTEG/2023/2/1.

II. Objective

3.   A complete draft metadata sheet and additional contextual information will be made available for each indicator to support discussions at the third meeting.

III. Working methods

4.   Drafts of the metadata sheets are being prepared by the Secretariat, with the support of the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre and in consultation with experts (as described in the metadata). The initial drafts will be shared with the Expert Group in the second half of June. The format of the metadata is based on the Sustainable Development Goals format for indicator metadata.[1]

5.   The headline indicators identified in decision 15/5 have been divided into five subgroups on the basis of the scope of the goals and targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (see annex I). Members of the Expert Group have been assigned to the subgroups according to their expressions of interest in individual indicators and targets; however, the assignment is purely indicative, and experts are free to participate in any group that they wish. Indicators for Goal D and Targets 18 and 19 have not been included in a group at the present stage, as they will first be considered by the Technical Expert Group on Financial Reporting, in line with the workplan of that Group.

6.   The experts in each subgroup are invited to review their respective indicators collectively and answer the questions set out below. The work of each subgroup will be coordinated by two co-facilitators designated by the Expert Group Co-Chairs from the members of the subgroup. The co-facilitators will be tasked with providing updates at meetings of the Expert Group and helping to coordinate the work of the subgroups.

7.   In the interest of time and efficiency, the subgroups will work in parallel. They should start their work immediately after the present meeting and report at the following meeting of the Expert Group. Their work will be carried out primarily by email. However, each subgroup may want to hold an initial meeting to coordinate among its members; one of the Co-Chairs will, if possible, attend those meetings and monitor the work of each subgroup.

8.   The Secretariat will assist with logistical support, upon request, throughout the process. To facilitate the work of the subgroups, it will provide the available metadata for each indicator. A template to collect information on the status of the indicator and its metadata is provided in annex II.

IV. Outputs expected of the subgroups

9.   The headline indicators identified by the Conference of the Parties in decision 15/5 have reached different levels of development. Consequently, the information required for each indicator varies, as follows:

(a)   *For indicators with complete metadata*.[2] The subgroups will need to review the metadata for the indicators to ensure that they can be used by Parties and identify possible thematic or subject area disaggregations (e.g. with regard to gender, ecosystem type, ecosystem service threat or other) and capacity-building needs. This may require coordinating with the organizations or experts that have developed the indicators at the national or global levels;

---

[1] Drafts of the metadata were originally prepared and made available for the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (see https://www.post-2020indicators.org/).

[2] Indicators A.1 (Red List of Ecosystems), A.2 (extent of natural ecosystems), A.4 (proportion of populations within species with an effective population size > 500), 6.1 (rate of invasive alien species establishment) and 21.1 (indicator on biodiversity information for monitoring the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework).

(b)   *For Sustainable Development Goal indicators.*[3] Some indicators in the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework are the same as those used to monitor the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals. For those indicators, the metadata sheets have been copied from the metadata repository for the Sustainable Development Goal indicators. It is not possible for the Conference of the Parties to adjust the methodologies used for those indicators, as they were adopted by the General Assembly and changes could create a discrepancy with the reporting process adopted under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. For the national reporting process under the Convention, Parties will be invited to reuse the same data that they are reporting for measuring progress towards the 2030 Agenda (noting that, at the national level, Parties may report on those indicators on the basis of different methodologies). As for global aggregations, the Secretariat will pull the data from the Sustainable Development Goals database, which contains national data submitted or validated by countries. Consequently, for those indicators, the subgroups will need to review the possible thematic or subject area disaggregations of the indicators and any capacity-building needs. This may require coordinating with the organizations or experts that have developed the indicators at the national or global level;

(c)   *For indicators in development.*[4] The subgroups will need to review the metadata for the indicators to identify potential gaps in their development and propose options for making the indicators operational, including by directly modifying the metadata, drafting missing elements and coordinating with experts who may already be working on the metadata. Once the indicators are operational, the subgroups will need to determine what disaggregation is possible and what the likely capacity-building needs are.

10.   In reviewing the metadata, the Expert Group should also consider:

(a)   Whether and how gender perspectives may be reflected in the indicators;

(b)   Whether and how issues related to indigenous peoples and local communities may be reflected in the indicators (e.g. how indigenous peoples and local communities could participate in the calculation or validation of the indicator value, or how different knowledge systems could be reflected in the indicator metadata);

(c)   Whether there are any critical gaps with the indicators identified for the goals and targets being considered by the subgroup and, if there are, what the options for addressing those gaps are (e.g. by using component indicators).

V.   Timeline

11.   The subgroups will need to make their respective metadata sheets and the additional collected contextual information available to the Expert Group by early September, in preparation for its third meeting. If needed, an online meeting of the Expert Group will be held in September to take stock of progress ahead of the third meeting. During the third meeting, the co-facilitators will be invited, on the basis of the work carried out in the subgroups, provide presentations summarizing the information in the metadata sheets and identifying any outstanding issues, concerns or questions, which will serve as a basis for the Expert Group to discuss and agree on the next steps for each indicator.

---

[3] Indicators A.3 (Red List Index), 3.1 (coverage of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures), 5.1 (proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels), 7.1 (index of coastal eutrophication potential), 10.1 (proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture), 10.2 (progress towards sustainable forest management) and 12.1 (average share of the built-up area of cities that is green/blue space for public use for all).

[4] Indicators B.1 (services provided by ecosystems), C.1 (indicator on monetary benefits received), C.2 (indicator on non-monetary benefits), 1.1 (percentage of land and sea area covered by biodiversity-inclusive spatial plans), 2.2 (area under restoration), 7.2 (pesticide environment concentration), 9.1 (benefits from the sustainable use of wild species), 9.2 (percentage of the population in traditional occupations) and 15.1 (number of companies reporting on disclosures of risks, dependencies and impacts on biodiversity).

Annex I
Indicator subgroups and indicative composition

Goals/Targets	Indicators	Experts
Group 1		
A, 4, 5	A.1 Red List of Ecosystems	Alfred Oteng-Yeboah
	A.2 Extent of natural ecosystems	Andrea Donaldson
	A.3 Red List Index	Andy Gonzalez
	A.4 The proportion of populations within species with an effective population size > 500	Arturo Flores Martínez
		Belma Kalamujić Stroil
		Brett Painter
		Britta Hackenberg
		Cleoface Landry Mabessimo
		David Obura
		Egbuwalo Sikeade Oluwakemi
		Emily Nicholson
	5.1 Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels	Jan Dušek
		Julie Bélanger
		Lillian Chua Swee-lian
		Lucrezia Gorini
		Milena Bataković
		Maurizio Farhan Ferrari
		Muhammed Hakan Çakmak
		Rizwan Irshad
		Ruliyana Susanti
		Sara Vallecillo
		Salome Nozadze
		Steve Widdicombe
		Stuart Butchart
		Tiffany Straza
		Vasili Shakun
		Zsolt Molnár
Group 2		
B, 9, 10, 11	B.1 Services provided by ecosystems[a]	Andy Gonzalez
	9.1 Benefits from the sustainable use of wild species[a]	Arturo Flores Martínez
	9.2 Percentage of the population in traditional occupations[a]	Belma Kalamujić Stroil
	10.1 Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture	Brett Painter
	10.2 Progress towards sustainable forest management	Britta Hackenberg
		David Obura
		Emily Nicholson
		Jing Xu
		Josefa Isabel Cariño Tauli
		Julie Bélanger
		Lucrezia Gorini
		Macha Petronella Kemperman
		Marc Titus Cebreros
		Masabo Onesphore
		Maurizio Farhan Ferrari
		Muhammed Hakan Çakmak
		Piers Dunstan
		Sara Vallecillo

Goals/Targets	Indicators	Experts
		Tiffany Straza Zsolt Molnár
Group 3		
C, 13, 15	C.1 Indicator on monetary benefits received[a] C.2 Indicator on non-monetary benefits[a] 15.1 Number of companies reporting on disclosures of risks, dependencies and impacts on biodiversity[a]	Alberto Capra Amber Hartman Scholz Belma Kalamujić Stroil David Obura Joji Carino Julie Bélanger Lucrezia Gorini Macha Petronella Kemperman Marc Titus Cebreros Maurizio Farhan Ferrari Ntakadzeni Tshidada Odile Conchou Ryo Kohsaka Ruliyana Susanti Tiffany Straza Tim Hirsch
Group 4		
1, 2, 3, 12	1.1 Percentage of land and sea area covered by biodiversity-inclusive spatial plans[a] 2.2 Area under restoration[a] 3.1 Coverage of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures 12.1 Average share of the built-up area of cities that is green/blue space for public use for all	Andy Gonzalez Arturo Flores Martínez Andrea Donaldson Britta Hackenberg Cleoface Landry Mabessimo David Obura Emily Nicholson Geraldo Wilson Fernandes Jing Xu Julie Bélanger Lillian Chua Swee-lian Lucrezia Gorini Milena Bataković Maurizio Farhan Ferrari Ruliyana Susanti Ryo Kohsaka Salome Nozadze Sara Vallecillo Shanna Challenger Steve Widdicombe Stuart Butchart Tiffany Straza Vasili Shakun
Group 5		
6, 7, 21	6.1 Rate of invasive alien species establishment 7.1 Index of coastal eutrophication potential 7.2 Pesticide environment concentration[a]	Alberto Capra Andy Gonzalez Andrea Donaldson Arturo Flores Martínez Belma Kalamujić Stroil Brett Painter

Goals/Targets	Indicators	Experts
	21.1 Indicator on biodiversity information for monitoring the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework	Jan Dušek Julie Bélanger Lillian Chua Swee-lian Muhammed Hakan Çakmak Ntakadzeni Tshidada Steve Widdicombe Salome Nozadze Shanna Challenger Steve Widdicombe Stuart Butchart Tiffany Straza Tim Hirsch Vasili Shakun

[a] 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.

Annex II
Template for observations regarding the indicator metadata

Indicator	
Goal/Target	
Current status	
Next steps in terms of finalizing the metadata and operationalizing the indicator?	
Who needs to be involved in finalizing the indicator, and have they been consulted or contacted?	
Is testing at the national level needed?	
What is a realistic timeline for finalizing the metadata and operationalizing the indicator?	
What are possible thematic or subject area disaggregations?	
How could gender perspectives be reflected in the indicator?	
How could issues related to indigenous peoples and local communities be reflected in the indicator?	
Are there any critical gaps with regard to the indicators identified for the goals and targets being considered by the subgroup?	
Other issues to bring to the attention of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group	

_____