



Convention on Biological Diversity

Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice

Twenty-sixth meeting

Nairobi, 13–18 May 2024

Item 3 of the provisional agenda*

Monitoring Framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

Advice from the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework on the wording of the binary questions in the monitoring framework**

Note by the Secretariat

1. Pursuant to recommendation 25/1 of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (para. 6), the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators provided advice on the wording of the list of binary questions included in the same recommendation, for consideration by the Subsidiary Body.

I. Overall advice

2. The Expert Group recommends keeping the format for answers consistent across all questions using a combination of single- and multiple-choice answers, as detailed below. This approach will improve the consistency of the report compiled by Parties and simplify answering.

3. The Expert Group recommends rewording the text of answers from “Yes, fully”, “Yes, partially” and “No, but under development” to “Fully”, “Partially” and “Developing”, respectively.

II. Specific advice

Goal B

4. The Expert Group suggests removing the word “promoting” currently in brackets in the indicator text.

5. The Expert Group agrees with the comment on the need for a B3 question focused on the long-term nature of Goal B and recommends that it be focused on the monitoring of Goal B. For example:

“B.3 Does your country monitor the sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance, restoration and enhancement of nature’s contributions to people, including ecosystem functions and services?”

Target 1

6. The Expert Group recommends removing the option for “none” among the possible answers to question 1.2, as this option is equivalent to Parties not selecting any of the multiple-choice options.

* CBD/SBSTTA/26/1.

** The present document is being issued without formal editing.

7. The Expert Group suggests editing the answers to question 1.2 to be consistent with question 1.1, namely by changing the order of current answers (b) and (c) to “(c) For inland water spatial planning” and “(d) For marine spatial planning”.
8. The Expert Group recommends editing the final answer to question 1.2 to “For coastal and marine spatial planning” to remain consistent with 1.1.
9. The Expert Group further recommends editing the text of the indicator and question 1.1 to include the term “integrated” before “biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning” as is written in the target text.

Target 6

10. The Expert Group recommends to remove the term “significantly” from the indicator text, which does not impact the interpretation of the text, nor its associated questions, and avoids ambiguous language. The indicator focuses on the number of countries implementing measures and allocating resources, not on the outcome of these measures. The inclusion of the word “significantly” at the end of the sentence raises the issue of their effectiveness which is not directly relevant and induces ambiguity.
11. The current questions do not touch upon the allocating of resources mentioned in the indicator. As such, the Expert Group recommends adding a third question (6.3) asking about whether resources have been allocated to reduce the impact of invasive alien species. For example: “6.3 Has your country allocated resources to reduce the impact of alien invasive species?”
12. This question could have a simple “Yes/No” answer reflecting whether Parties have allocated resources, financial and/or human, for invasive alien species impact reduction. Alternatively, the mention of “allocating resources” could be removed from the indicator text.
13. The “(Select all that apply)” text in question 6.2 is not relevant and should be removed.

Target 8

14. The Expert Group recommends changing the set of answer to question 8.3 to correspond to the format of other questions from “No” to “Yes, fully”, where a partial answer corresponds to only climate change or ocean acidification and a complete answer corresponds to both. This change would keep the reporting consistent across questions for different targets.
15. The Expert Group further recommends combining the text of questions 8.4bis and 8.4ter into a question 8.5 on measures in place to minimize the negative impacts and foster the positive impacts of climate actions on biodiversity. This question would address a different part of Target 8 not currently covered in question 8.4 or any previous question. It would follow the four-answer scale from “No” to “Yes, fully”, and the text of the question would read “8.5 Are measures in place to minimize negative impacts and foster positive impacts of climate actions on biodiversity, including in nationally determined contributions?”

Target 9

16. For question 9.2, answers currently do not correspond to the rest of the indicators and are not equivalent to the wording used for other targets. The Expert Group suggests changing answers (c) “Yes, but not for all species or uses”, and (d) “Yes, for all species and uses” to (c) “Yes, partially” and (d) “Yes, fully”.
17. The Expert Group further recommends simplifying the language of question 9.2 to: “9.2 Does your country monitor the sustainable management and use of wild species?”
18. In addition, the Expert Group recommends changing the set of answers to question 9.3 to follow a multiple-choice format for each of the named categories with no answer being considered a no.
19. Furthermore, the Expert Group recommends against changing question 9.3 to the bis or alt options as these do not reflect the text of the indicator. However, the Expert Group recommends including the language on “other policy frameworks” from 9.3alt into 9.3 to allow for Parties who do not currently have ratified legislation to record progress in their answer to question 9.3.

Target 12

20. The Expert Group suggests changing answers (c) “Yes, for some urban areas”, and (d) “Yes, for all urban areas” to (c) “Yes, partially” and (d) “Yes, fully”. This change would improve the consistency of the report compiled by Parties and reduce confusion. In addition, the modified answers would better reflect the process towards Target 12, by focusing on delivering on the various elements contained in the target rather than on their geographic coverage.

Target 13

21. The Expert Group recommends adding a new answer “Not applicable” to questions 13.1 and 13.2. Under Article 6 of the Nagoya Protocol, countries are not required to regulate access to genetic resources and/or traditional knowledge and do not have to require benefit-sharing. The new answer is necessary for those Parties that have chosen not to regulate access to genetic resources and traditional knowledge.

22. The Expert Group recommends that the set of answers for 13.1 be changed to (a) “No”, (b) “No, but under development”, (c) “Yes, partially” and (d) “Yes, fully”. The response format for 13.1 is inconsistent with the rest of the binary indicators, mixing the scale and multiple-choice formats. The methodology to select the appropriate answer is outlined in the metadata and includes specific mentions of the three aspects of access and benefit-sharing.

23. The Expert Group recommends a Yes/No binary answer format with a “Not applicable” option for 13.2. Question 13.2 complements 13.1 by specifically asking about traditional knowledge. Using a scale answer in this context adds unnecessary complexity.

24. The Expert Group further recommends that question 13.4 be removed. Multilateral negotiations on digital sequence information are ongoing. Therefore, no agreement on digital sequence information exists and requiring that a policy and administrative framework be in place for digital sequence information goes beyond the current mandate of the Framework and this indicator.

Target 14

25. The word “policies” is currently used twice in question 14.1, once to define the question (i.e. “are there policies to”), the other as part of the list of items responding to these first “policies”. As such, the term is redundant and leads to confusion. The Expert Group recommends keeping the first “policies” as referring to the items later listed in the question that corresponds to the indicator. Therefore, the question would be asking whether policies exist to integrate the multiple values of biodiversity into these other elements, reflecting government action towards the integration of the multiple values of biodiversity.

26. The Expert Group recommends structuring the answers to question 14.2 along the implementation phases of the System of Economic Environmental Accounting Ecosystem Accounts process, that is, using a multiple choice of the type of accounts that have been compiled: ecosystem extent, ecosystem condition, ecosystem services flow (physical), ecosystem services flow (monetary), monetary ecosystem asset. Alternatively, the Expert Group recommends changing the set of answers to question 14.2 to correspond to the format of other questions from “No” to “Yes, fully”, where a partial answer corresponds to only monetary or non-monetary and a complete answer corresponds to both.

27. The Expert Group further recommends changing the set of answers to question 14.4 to correspond to the format of other questions from “No” to “Yes, fully”, where a partial answer corresponds to only the public or private sectors and a complete answer corresponds to both.

28. Note that the recommendations related to questions 14.2 and 14.4 make it easier for Parties to record partial progress as the option “Yes, partially” would be available, as for other multiple-choice questions.

Target 15

29. To improve clarity and consistency with the binary headline indicator, the Expert Group suggests modifying the wording of question 15.1 to read: “15.1 Has your country put in place legal, administrative or policy measures to ensure that large and transnational companies and financial institutions, monitor,

assess and transparently disclose their risks, dependencies and impacts on biodiversity, along their operations, supply and value chains, and portfolios?”

Target 16

30. The Expert Group recommends changing the set of answers to question 16.3 to correspond to the format of other questions, from “No” to “Yes, fully”, where a partial answer corresponds to only disaggregated by sector or by consumer group and a complete answer corresponds to both.

Target 17

31. The Expert Group refers to the report of the Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol and online discussion forum for detailed recommendations on Target 17.¹

32. In addition, the Expert Group recommends making all the answers to questions for the binary indicator for Target 17 consistent with the other single-choice indicator questions of the monitoring framework (i.e. “No/No, but under development/Yes, partially/Yes, fully”).

Target 20

33. The Expert Group recommends keeping the format of answers consistent for all questions and having question 20.5 use the four-answer format following the guidance in the metadata.

34. The Expert Group recommends removing answer (e) “Not applicable” from question 20.4 as all countries will need to assess their technology needs and the inclusion of indigenous and traditional technologies, if applicable, is specified in the question. The addition of indigenous peoples and local communities in this question requires that they be included in the assessment, not that the assessment only focus on them.

35. The Expert Group further recommends adding the following questions, in the light of section C, in the same format as question 20.3:

“20.x Has your country undertaken a national assessment of the capacity-building and development needs of women and girls?”

“20.y Has your country undertaken a national assessment of the capacity-building and development needs of children and youth?”

“20.z Has your country undertaken a national assessment of the capacity-building and development needs of people with disabilities?”

36. Alternatively, question 20.3 could use a multiple-choice answer format with each of the aforementioned categories and indigenous peoples and local communities.

Target 22

37. The Expert Group recommends against removing questions 22.3, 22.4 and 22.5 as these questions allow to track progress regarding whether the funding (Target 19) and capacity-building efforts of Parties (Target 20) are in fact being directed towards Target 22. Without these questions, other indicators will not have the necessary resolution to understand if the needs of the groups covered by Target 22 are being supported adequately. That is, these questions track progress along the processes required to achieve Target 22 and enable conditions for decision-making.

38. The Expert Group recommends the addition of the words “the following rights of” in question 22.1 (b) before “indigenous peoples and local communities”. The sentence as it stands is missing this context in relation to the word “Respect” and the intent would be better reflected with these additions.

39. The Expert Group recommends that Parties be asked to provide a justification in the comments box when choosing “Not applicable” as the answer to questions 22.1 and 22.5.

¹ CBD/SBSTTA/26/INF/13.

40. Question 22.1 (d) repeats itself by listing the various groups to whom it is addressed both in the text of the question and in the answer. The Expert Group recommends removing these groups from the text and rephrasing to: “22.1 (d) Ensure public access to information related to biodiversity for the following?”
41. The Expert Group recommends simplifying question 22.3 to a binary “Yes/No” answer on the availability of financial resources to support the frameworks rather than detailing the origin of funds. Such details can be provided voluntarily in the comments section of the question.
42. The Expert Group further recommends rewording question 22.1 (b) to: “Respect the rights and cultures of indigenous peoples and local communities?”

Target 23

43. The Expert Group suggests reducing the list of questions from seven to five because the binary indicator for Target 23 has many questions, some of which are not well aligned with the intention of the indicator and others that are too similar.
44. Questions 23.3 and 23.7 as currently worded are too similar to each other and both refer to the same element in the indicator, namely that gender be explicitly considered in the progress towards the goals of the Framework, specifically through the national biodiversity action plan or any other biodiversity-related political process. Therefore, questions 23.3 and 23.7 should be merged into one question. A possible wording for the new question would be: “23.3 Does your country explicitly recognise and consider gender in its implementation of the Global Biodiversity Framework through its national reports or national biodiversity strategy action plan?”
45. The focus of Target 23 and of indicator 23 is not on capacity-building and the indicator is not concerned with the process and status of the integration of gender, but rather whether gender is being considered and financially supported. Moreover, Target 20 is already focused on capacity-building. As such, the Expert Group recommends to remove question 23.5 from the list for Target 23.
46. Therefore, only questions 23.1, 23.2, 23.3 as updated, 23.4 and 23.6 would be required to compile this indicator.
47. The Expert Group further recommends that answers to question 23.4 be changed to “Yes/No”. The indicator is concerned with whether financial resources have been allocated, not where they come from. The option to specify the source of the financial resources can be left to the comments section in the report.
48. Alternatively, the Expert Group recommends removing questions 23.4 and 23.5 and updating the set of answers to question 23.7 to correspond to all other sets of answers for Target 23.
-