



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General  
11 October 2023

English only

**ADVANCE UNEDITED  
VERSION**

---

**Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on  
Indicators for the Kunming-Montreal  
Global Biodiversity Framework  
Third meeting**  
Montreal, Canada, 3–6 October 2023

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

#### **Background**

1. At its fifteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties adopted the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework ([decision 15/5](#)). In the same decision, it also decided to establish an Ad hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG), with a time-bound mandate until the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP-16), to advise on the further operationalization of the monitoring framework.
2. Pursuant to this decision, the Executive Secretary, through [notification No. 2023-001](#), invited Parties and observers to submit the name of one or more expert(s) who could be considered to participate in the AHTEG. In response to this invitation, 242 nominations were received, 126 experts were nominated by 63 Parties and other Governments and 116 experts were nominated by 87 observer organizations. The list of selected experts of the AHTEG, including 30 from Parties and 15 from observers, was prepared in consultation with the Bureau of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA), taking into account all the considerations as described in notification 2023-001.
3. The AHTEG has been established for the period up to COP-16 and is primarily working remotely. The first meeting of the AHTEG was conducted online on 2 May 2023 and the second meeting was conducted online on 11 July 2023.
4. During the first meeting of the Expert Group, held online on 2 May 2023, Maria Cecilia Londoño Murcia (Colombia) and James Williams (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) were nominated, further to advice from the SBSTTA Chair, and elected as Co-Chairs of the Expert Group. The Expert Group adopted a workplan for the period up to the twenty-sixth meeting of the SBSTTA. The Terms of Reference of the Expert Group, which are contained in annex II to decision 15/5, comprise four items of work. In accordance with its workplan, the Expert Group decided to focus on item (a) during the first half of its term and on items (b), (c) and (d) during the second half.
5. After the first meeting, the Secretariat, in collaboration with the Expert Group, convened an online discussion forum to facilitate the sharing of views on the monitoring framework and provide a platform for discussion threads related to the work of the Group.
6. The Expert Group agreed to establish subgroups to work on specific sets of indicators before its next meeting and to select co-facilitators to guide the work of each subgroup. The subgroups were

tasked with: (a) reviewing the binary indicators assigned to them and providing final wording for the global indicators derived from binary responses, for review and adoption by the Group through online communication; and (b) preparing suggested revisions and proposing a way forward for each headline indicator assigned to them, for further consideration at the third meeting. The list of proposed global indicators derived from binary responses, along with proposed wording for the questions to be included in national reports for deriving the binary indicators and guidance on their use, was developed by the subgroup, in consultation with other groups, such as the Informal Advisory Group on Technical and Scientific Cooperation. The AHTEG then reviewed these proposals and produced a revised list of global indicators derived from binary responses which was provided to the twenty-fifth meeting of the SBSTTA for its consideration.

7. This report provides the key outcomes of the third meeting of the AHTEG held in person, in Montreal, from 3 to 6 October 2023.

## **Item 1**

### **Opening of the meeting**

8. The workshop was opened at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, 3 October 2023, by Mr. James Williams of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Ms. Maria Cecilia Londoño of Colombia, the Co-Chairs of the AHTEG.

9. David Cooper, Acting Executive Secretary of the Convention of Biological Diversity, and Mr. Hesiquio Benítez, SBSTTA Chair, provided opening remarks.

10. Mr. Cooper highlighted the significance of the monitoring framework in the context of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and acknowledged the widespread interest in this topic and the work of the AHTEG. He recognized the substantial dedication of participants and the importance of their contributions to the implementation of the Convention and wished everyone productive discussions during the week and throughout the remainder of the AHTEG's programme of work.

11. Mr. Benítez thanked the AHTEG for the work it has accomplished so far. He highlighted the progress in the work on the global indicators collated from binary responses, provided to SBSTTA-25 for its consideration. He reiterated the mandate of the AHTEG, in particular its important role in the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, and the tight timeline for the AHTEG to achieve its mandate prior to SBSTTA-26. He emphasized that the role of the AHTEG is to provide technical advice, but not to negotiate on issues with divergent views.

## **Item 2**

### **Organizational matters**

#### *Adoption of the agenda and organization of work*

12. The Co-Chairs described the proposed organization of work and the alignment of the agenda and organization of work with the terms of reference of the AHTEG. They also presented the agenda for the meeting in the context of the broader programme of work of the AHTEG. The Co-Chairs noted that the focus of the AHTEG is to advance indicators which currently do not have an available methodology and fill the gaps in the operationalization of these indicators through the work on the metadata.

13. The AHTEG adopted the agenda as presented; however, during the course of the meeting, the Group decided to move the presentation on the Online Reporting Tool to the afternoon of Day 1.

14. The Co-Chairs recognized the work of the co-facilitators and the sub-groups and expressed their expectation that the subgroups would continue the work on the metadata after the meeting. They further expressed that the specific expectations of the subgroups could be further elaborated during the meeting.

15. The Co-Chairs of the AHTEG and the SBSTTA Chair shared information on how the work of the AHTEG will be presented to SBSTTA-25. In particular, the AHTEG Co-Chairs will be invited to give an oral report to complement the official document of the AHTEG ([CBD/SBSTTA/25/2](#)). The report of the third meeting of the AHTEG will also be made available online. Participants also noted that the final report of the AHTEG will be presented to the twenty-sixth meeting of the SBSTTA for its consideration.

### Item 3

#### Stocktake of progress to date

##### *Discussion on the reporting back on indicators*

16. Jan Dušek presented the progress of subgroup 1. He highlighted that the group has met three times online since its establishment. He also described the online working methodology for the group which has included extensive online comments on draft metadata documents by experts in the subgroup. Jan presented the main challenges in terms of the headline indicators addressed by the subgroup. Some of the main challenges include:

(a) For A.1, on the Red List of Ecosystems, the methodology has been developed by IUCN and there is existing work to progress this indicator. The methodological approach to this indicator is aligned and complements with the UN System of Environmental Economic Accounts and the approach proposed for the indicator A.2 on the extent of natural ecosystems. However, it would be important to identify what would be reported for this indicator as many assessments included in the Red List of Ecosystems do not include all ecosystems and a time series is not available for analyzing trends over time;

(b) For A.2, Extent of natural ecosystems, a main issue is defining natural versus unnatural. Participants discussed that definition of natural and unnatural will be very difficult in the national context and the delineation of semi-natural as being natural or unnatural; however, the rationale for this indicator is to describe ecosystem types that should be maintained and preserved and thus the AHTEG could recommend a specific ecosystem typology for reporting to use across the indicators. The important aspect of this indicator would be to track ecosystem loss or transformation over time as well as the outcomes of ecological restoration;

(c) For A.3, the Red List Index, the index is already operational and available for many taxonomic groups; however, there are concerns on the ability of the index to capture change as it happens. Additionally, the Red List is currently biased by a focus on better-known taxonomic groups which creates a taxonomic and geographic bias. The Red List database and methodology can be used to produce indicators for specific taxa or types of species;

(d) For A.4, the proportion of populations within species with an effective population size > 500, there was uncertainty on how best to select a meaningful set of species for this indicator and whether it should be a random stratified sample. There is some concern regarding potential bias for this indicator.

(e) For 5.1, proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels, this is an SDG indicator; however, there are significant gaps in using this indicator to assess the scope of Target 5. It would be useful to discuss how to assess Target 5 to better cover the scope of the target. Additionally, the concept of sustainability is defined as exploited to the point just before it becomes unsustainable.

17. Josefa Isabel Cariño Tauli presented the work of subgroup 2. This group met a number of times online and worked online to comment on documents. However, the group did not consider the two SDG indicators related to Target 10 in any detail.

(a) For B.1, services provided by ecosystems, there is a need to determine which classification would be most useful as the SEEA-EA, CICES and IPBES all have classifications. There are a number of organizations and tools which could be involved in the operationalization of

this indicator. Testing is needed to operationalize this indicator. This indicator could employ a tiered approach based on the availability of data, representative ecosystem service types or applicability at the national level. There is a need to integrate diverse values of biodiversity, including IPLC or gender issues, in the indicator. This indicator will require technical skills for its implementation. This indicator does not include elements related to sustainability or long-term trends.

(b) For 9.1, on the benefits from the sustainable use of wild species, this indicator is related to Goal B. This target specifically mentions vulnerable groups which are not well captured in the current methodology.

(c) For 9.2, on the percentage of the population in traditional occupations, this indicator is being considered by the twelfth meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j), which will be held in November 2023, and the AHTEG will need to take into account the discussion on this indicator under Article 8(j).

18. Ntakadzeni Tshidada presented the work of subgroup 3. This group met two times to discuss the binary indicators; however, it did not discuss the indicators on Goal C (C.1, Indicator on monetary benefits received and C.2, Indicator on non-monetary benefits) or on Target 15 (15.1, number of companies reporting on disclosures of risks, dependencies and impacts on biodiversity), and thus these indicators would need to be discussed in detail during the meeting. Some of the issues highlighted for these indicators include:

(a) For the Goal C indicators, the Secretariat shared information on the upcoming work on these indicators, including the recent issuance of [notification 2023-103](#), which included a survey on indicators on access and benefit-sharing for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. The survey will be used to collect experiences on collection of national data on benefit-sharing and prepare an analysis which can inform the future work of the AHTEG. On Day 3 of the meeting, Amber Scholz, from the Leibniz Institute DSMZ-German Collection of Microorganisms and Cell Cultures, presented work commissioned by the Secretariat, with support from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, to produce a study on ABS indicators, which will include an analysis of the results of the survey, among other sources.

(b) For 15.1, the Secretariat noted the link between Target 15 and the ongoing work of the Task Force on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD) and the IPBES assessment of business and biodiversity; however, additional work on this indicator will be needed for it to be operational. Furthermore, the IPBES assessment on business and biodiversity is in an early stage of preparation. A participant, who is also a TNFD member, mentioned that the framework was launched in the last month. TNFD uses the word “nature” and not “biodiversity”. An issue with this indicator is what entity would be responsible for counting the number of companies that are disclosing information and, while legislation may exist in some countries, this would need to be defined in other countries.

19. Emily Nicholson presented the work of subgroup 4. This group met online twice to discuss the headline indicators. The group assigned indicators to individual people who worked to progress the work on a particular indicator. The comments from the group were then compiled and discussed with the rest of the group.

(a) For 1.1, on percent of land and seas covered by biodiversity-inclusive spatial plans, this indicator does not exist and there is no organization or group that is working on the indicator. This indicator would require development, clear definitions, potential data sources and methodologies. This Target is also covered by the headline indicators A.1 and A.2 and a binary indicator;

(b) For 2.2, on area under restoration, there is a monitoring taskforce under the FAO which is developing this indicator under the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration which has been mandated by the UN General Assembly. There is currently little data in the database; however, good progress is being made in relation to this work and, as countries enter data in the database, more data will become available. The subgroup has noted that some of the terms will require additional

definitions for restoration activities and outcomes, and alignment with ecosystem classifications used in indicators A.1 and A.2;

(c) For 3.1, on coverage of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, this is a well-established indicator; however, the main challenge will be to implement some of the relevant disaggregations needed for the interpretation of this Target. The inclusion of other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) in this indicator will require work, however this work is progressing;

(d) For 12.1, on the average share of the built-up area of cities that is green/blue space for public use for all, this is an SDG indicator (although the SDG metric refers to open space in general, not specifically blue and green). However, this indicator only includes 94 countries and most cities within countries are not covered (only a single city was assessed for many of the 94 countries). There is therefore a challenge for this indicator in terms of expansion of geographic coverage.

20. Tim Hirsch and Andrea Donaldson presented the work of subgroup 5. The group held 5 online meetings. Mr. Hirsch shared the experiences of the group in conducting their work, including the linkage between the invasive alien species binary indicator and a similar SDG indicator on invasive alien species. The subgroup worked to align these two data collection streams.

(a) For 6.1, on the rate of invasive alien species establishment, there is related ongoing work being conducted under GEO BON. Metadata was developed in collaboration with this group. The metadata is based on a recent methodological advancement which was recently published as a pre-print in Conservation Letters. This indicator is progressing. The indicator does not specifically address issues related to impacts or eradication;

(b) For 21.1, indicator on biodiversity information for monitoring the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, including traditional knowledge, for management, this indicator does not currently exist, but a metadata proposal developed by GEO BON and the Secretariat scopes out information which could be included in this indicator. The indicator was proposed to include coverage in space and time of available data, quantity and scope of active biodiversity monitoring activities and traditional knowledge. This indicator still needs additional work, including considering incorporating other aspects of biodiversity knowledge. In order to progress this indicator, the subgroup, with GEO BON, will hold a workshop on 9 October 2023 to discuss a way forward for the indicator;

(c) For the indicators on Target 7, it is worth noting that there is not an indicator on plastic pollution. On 7.1, on index of coastal eutrophication potential, this is an SDG indicator; however, there are challenges in terms of the water quality parameters and there is a lack of data. This indicator also does not capture areas beyond national jurisdiction. For 7.2, on pesticide environment concentration, there is not an international entity which is developing an indicator on pesticides. A collaboration with FAO could provide a way to progress this indicator which could be explored by the Secretariat. Testing of this indicator would be needed in order to ensure that it captures the impact on biodiversity.

*Discussion of key issues arising as a result of the overview*

21. After the group presentations on their progress to date, the AHTEG discussed a number of cross-cutting issues. The Co-Chairs noted that in the metadata there has been some inclusion of how to define key terms in the methodology. Participants discussed the need for a glossary which could be used to define terms and how a glossary for the monitoring framework could be developed in the context of the metadata.

22. Participants noted that the purpose of the metadata is for the Parties and thus the metadata should be specific and provide guidance for Parties on how to interpret and apply the methodology, including what information would be needed for national reporting and what may be useful for policy

analysis. Participants discussed the need for clarity on the measurement unit for each indicator in the relevant metadata (it is included implicitly but could be more explicit).

23. The Co-Chairs also brought up the issues of how change and trends are tracked over time and of how indices are used in the monitoring framework. Should the full index be used or should the AHTEG recommend using a relevant subset of the information in an index? Participants discussed the importance that indicator changes were genuine changes and not the results of better information or knowledge.

24. Participants discussed the linkages between some of the different indicators. In particular, the relationship between ecosystem action across different targets and the advantages of using a common disaggregation of ecosystem types across different targets (for example, the IUCN Global Ecosystem Typology could be applied across the Framework).

25. Participants discussed how to link with other groups that are working on specific indicators. In some cases, there are groups that have been coordinated by the Secretariat, including, for example, the expert group on financial reporting (which is working on Goal D and Target 18 and 19 indicators), the biosafety liaison group (which could be requested to assist with Target 17), the technical and scientific cooperation informal advisory group (which has provided assistance and could provide further advice on Target 20), and the Working Group on Article 8(j) (which is working on indicators related to IPLCs and traditional knowledge). In other cases, there are relevant groups or organizations, including, for example, the UN Committee on Environmental Economic Accounting, GEO BON, IUCN or the Task Force on Nature-related Financial Disclosures, which are coordinated by others, but which are doing work relevant to the indicators. In some cases, there is not a group working on an indicator, but there is an organization that the AHTEG may approach to invite additional support. For example, FAO may be in a position to provide support on the headline indicator on pesticides.

26. Participants also discussed how to better link with IPBES and the work on indicators which was conducted in the context of the IPBES Global Assessment on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, and how to link with the future work of IPBES on monitoring. The Secretariat noted that the IPBES assessment on monitoring, which is highly related to the implementation of the monitoring framework, is planned to be undertaken by 2026. This assessment would inform the global review of collective progress towards the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. Its final outcomes, however, would not be available to the AHTEG as the AHTEG is expected to conclude its work by COP-16. On Day 3 of the meeting, David Obura, IPBES Chair, updated the AHTEG on the upcoming work of IPBES. He described that IPBES would take findings from the AHTEG into account in its upcoming work, but that IPBES does not have specific indicators which have been adopted for use.

#### *Disaggregation discussion*

27. Participants noted that not all indicators can be disaggregated by IPLCs, gender and age; however, for some indicators this will allow for better policy monitoring. Participants discussed that there could be guidance across the monitoring framework on IPLCs, gender and other considerations to take into account in the development of monitoring priorities, monitoring approaches and interpretation of the indicators, in light of Section C of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

28. Participants noted that some indicators, particularly those related to ecosystem services, could be disaggregated by users and that it is important to have in mind the use of the indicators for better defining the disaggregation. There is a trade-off between the level of disaggregation that will increase the use of an indicator versus the efforts of Parties for reporting the indicator.

29. Participants noted that it is important to not make the reporting too complicated. There is a need to be clear on what needs to be disaggregated for the purpose of biodiversity conservation, and

bear in mind that disaggregation will create an additional reporting burden for Parties. Participants noted that proposed disaggregations should focus on what is feasible and practical.

30. Participants discussed that it may be too early to determine the disaggregations for some indicators that have not yet been developed. However, there may be some value to looking at types of disaggregations as they could help to inform the development of specific indicators. Participants agreed that there should be a linkage between the proposed disaggregations and the language of the corresponding target. There should be a clear policy application for proposing disaggregations, recognizing the need to minimize the reporting burden for Parties.

31. In addition to disaggregation, participants highlighted the importance of understanding the reliability of the indicators in order to use the data for understanding national or global trends and their policy implications.

#### *Data gaps*

32. Participants highlighted the need for better communicating the difference and complementarity between headline and binary indicators, as binary indicators should not be seen as a replacement of the headline indicators. Binary indicators are more focused on the follow-up of actions while headline indicators are more focused on impacts.

33. Participants noted that there are gaps in terms of implementing the Headline indicators, including gaps on the taxonomic groups covered, the geographic coverage and data coming from different data sources (such as data flows from community-based monitoring systems).

34. Participants noted that there are also gaps in terms of the coverage of the Headline indicators related to the elements of the different targets, which could be addressed by component and complementary indicators. Participants noted that the AHTEG should review the overall monitoring framework, including the headline, binary, component and complementary indicators, in order to provide advice on the implementation of the monitoring framework. Participants highlighted that, in some cases, the global indicators from binary responses may be seen as a way to collect data in cases where Headline indicators do not exist whereas, in other cases, the binary responses may provide robust information on the target over time.

35. Participants highlighted that there are different interpretations on the mandate of the AHTEG as outlined in the paragraph on the gaps in the terms of the reference of the AHTEG. The Terms of the Reference of the AHTEG states the group should “*Support the work 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. Attention should be paid to fill gaps under Goals B, C and D and Targets 2, 13 and 14 to 22, given the imbalance in available headline indicators and their interlinkages across goals and targets of the Framework.*” Participants discussed the need to clarify if Parties would like to propose additional Headline indicators for the Targets that currently don’t have them or if Parties would use the list of binary, component and complementary to fill gaps. The inclusion of additional Headline indicators in the monitoring framework would require guidance from SBSTTA, and potentially a decision by the Conference of the Parties, and clarification from SBSTTA or a continuation and expansion of the mandate of the AHTEG to COP-17.

## **Items 4 and 5**

### **Discussion on headline indicators and issues arising from the indicator subgroups and discussion on the further use of the online discussion forum on the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework**

36. Agenda items 4 and 5 in the annotated agenda were discussed as a single item, under the guidance of the Co-Chairs. The majority of the discussions were held in small breakout group sessions described as world café working groups in the annotated agenda. The structure of this

approach was that the AHTEG was divided into three working groups on 4 October and into two working groups on 5 October. Each working group discussed each indicator and was led by a moderator. The moderators were as follows:

- Brett Painter moderated the discussions on 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 > 500; and 5.1 Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels;
- Shanna Challenger moderated the discussions on B.1 Services provided by ecosystems; 9.1 Benefits from the sustainable use of wild species; 9.2 Percentage of the population in traditional occupations; 10.1 Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture; 10.2 Progress towards sustainable forest management;
- Stuart Butchart moderated the discussions on 1.1 Percentage of land and sea area covered by biodiversity-inclusive spatial plans; 2.2 Area under restoration; 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;
- Amber Hartman Scholz moderated the discussions on C.1 Indicator on monetary benefits received; C.2 Indicator on non-monetary benefits; 15.1 Number of companies reporting on disclosures of risks, dependencies and impacts on biodiversity;
- Andrew Gonzalez moderated the discussions on 6.1 Rate of invasive alien species establishment; 7.1 Index of coastal eutrophication potential; 7.2 Pesticide environment concentration; 21.1 Indicator on biodiversity information for monitoring the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

37. The working groups worked to produce a summary related to each indicator. These summaries are presented in annex I.

*Capacity-building discussion*

38. A representative from UNEP-WCMC presented the plans for a capacity-building survey to assess the capacity needs of countries in terms of implementing the monitoring framework. The survey will ask questions for each indicator on the specific capacity needs. The survey will be administered in January 2024 and the results would be prepared before the final meeting of the AHTEG. Participants provided guidance for the further development of this survey. This included:

- How information is collected, and which agencies and the types of agencies are involved in the data value chain;
- How targets without a Headline indicator are captured in the survey;
- Linkage between the survey and the binary indicators;
- Timing of the survey should be considered as, while a survey in January 2024 will be useful, there will also be a need to assess capacity needs over time;
- Include a section on disaggregation as knowing if countries have the capacity to do so will be useful for making a decision on the disaggregations;
- Survey will need to include a narrative that clarifies the status of each indicator;
- The survey addresses only the capacity of the countries to compile indicators, not to use them, as it was presented. Ensure that the survey is clearly communicated in that sense.

39. Participants agreed that, in the context of reviewing each indicator, potential linkages with relevant groups or organizations should be considered. Participants also discussed the use of the online discussion forum as a way to find out which countries and partners are working on which indicators.



40. Participants agreed to continuing discussing capacity-building needs and spatial and temporal data gaps in future meetings.

41. Participants suggested that the AHTEG conduct a second review of the survey in the next virtual meeting in order to make sure that the survey supports the work of the AHTEG on this matter.

## Items 6

### Discussion on the online reporting tool for the national reports under the Convention

42. The Secretariat presented the Online Reporting Tool (ORT) functionality and explained that the tool reflects the template for submission of national targets and their alignment with the goals and targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework ([decision 15/6](#)). When using the tool, Parties will be requested to link their national targets to the corresponding global goal or target and the corresponding headline and binary indicators will be automatically linked to that national target. The Secretariat noted that APIs for specific indicators are being developed by UNEP-WCMC which countries would be able to use.

43. Participants asked questions regarding the setting of national targets aligned with the global targets (decision 15/6), as some Parties may not have national targets for all the global targets and, in such instances, would have difficulty providing information on all Targets and potentially on the agreed Headline indicators.

44. Participants suggested that key disaggregations could be included in the national reporting template as part of the data submission component of the template, and these could be prepopulated where global datasets exist, for use by Parties as appropriate.

45. Some participants noted the linkage between the technical requirements for collecting indicator data and the template adopted at COP-15. Several participants had questions related to the template and expressed that the Secretariat will need to work on additional guidance to add clarity to the process.

46. Participants also noted the value of making the reporting process as simple and easy as possible so that countries can automatically use the data from different data sources.

## Item 7

### Next steps / Recommendations

47. The AHTEG decided to hold its next two online meetings in December 2023 and in January 2024. The AHTEG requested the Secretariat to identify dates for these meetings. The next in-person meeting of the AHTEG will be in Cambridge, United Kingdom, from 12 to 15 March 2024.

48. The AHTEG took note of their work plan agreed in the first meeting and the progress that has been made on the different aspects of the Terms of Reference. The AHTEG has agreed that the Group is on track to undertake work related to all parts of its Terms of Reference; however, members of the AHTEG agreed that there is still a significant amount of work remaining, particularly in providing advice on operationalizing the Headline indicators (particularly those marked as 1, 2 or 3 in annex I) and that significant investment may be required to operationalize these indicators in all countries.

49. The AHTEG agreed that the final report of the AHTEG for SBSTTA-26 should include a section on conclusions and reflections, in addition to the content proposed in SBSTTA/25/2.<sup>1</sup> The AHTEG noted that the metadata would include an assessment of remaining gaps in terms of the

---

<sup>1</sup> These include: (a) A list of disaggregations for each headline indicator; (b) A review of the component and complementary indicators, in the form of a summary table, with a view to keeping those indicators under review; (c) Final metadata for each headline indicator, including disaggregations; (d) Questions to be used in national reports for the construction of global-level indicators from binary indicators; (e) An analysis of opportunities for filling temporal and spatial data gaps, and advice on capacity-development, technology transfer and financing needs.

methodology, data flows and use of each indicator; however, an overall assessment could also be captured in a conclusions and reflections section.

50. The AHTEG agreed to provide advice to the Secretariat on the data collection template component of the Online Reporting Tool. Some members also stated that they would be interested in providing advice when the tool is pilot-tested next year.

51. The AHTEG compiled comments, questions and notes on specific indicators which can be used to further develop the metadata for each indicator. The AHTEG agreed on a path forward for each headline indicator as shown in Annex I and identified members to continue this work. The AHTEG stressed that, in the context of reviewing each indicator potential, linkages with relevant groups or organizations should be considered. The AHTEG decided that it will share these notes as relevant with organizations working on the underlying methodologies for the indicators as per annex I. The AHTEG also agreed that, in some cases, members of the AHTEG will need to meet with relevant groups or organizations to discuss methodological issues (as described in detail in annex I).

52. The AHTEG also noted that there are some cross-cutting issues which should be considered for all Headline indicators as the metadata are further developed. The following cross-cutting issues were noted:

(a) The AHTEG identified up to six indicators for which the information could potentially be disaggregated by gender: B.1; 9.1; C.1; C.2; 10.1; 12.1; and 15.1; however, some additional development of the indicators is needed to include gender. The AHTEG noted that, for many indicators, gender was not a possible disaggregation by data layer; however, the AHTEG recognized that processes for deciding priorities and implementation of monitoring and assessment activities, and the management activities under assessment, are intended to be inclusive as defined in Section C and Target 23 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework;

(b) The AHTEG identified up to 15 indicators for which the information could potentially be disaggregated by IPLCs: A.1, A.2, A.3, B.1, 9.1, C.1, C.2, 1.1, 2.2, 3.1, 7.1, 10.1, 12.1, 15.1 and 21.1 and, for some of these, if spatial data layers are provided, disaggregations are possible for later analysis at global or regional level. For many indicators, there was not a possible disaggregation by data layer for Indigenous Peoples and local communities (IPLCs) or Indigenous and Traditional Territories (ITTs). However, the AHTEG recognized that processes for deciding priorities and implementation of monitoring and assessment activities, and the management activities under assessment, are intended to be inclusive, as defined in Section C and Target 22 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. Moreover, Indigenous data sovereignty and free, prior and informed consent must be respected in the indicator development and monitoring processes;

(c) The AHTEG identified at least 6 indicators for which the information could potentially be disaggregated by age or group which would be relevant for children and youth: B.1, 9.1, 1.1, 15.1, 12.1 and 21.1. For many indicators, disaggregation by age is not possible. However, the AHTEG recognized that processes for deciding priorities and implementation of monitoring and assessment activities, and the management activities under assessment, are intended to be inclusive as defined in Section C and Target 22 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. Intergenerational equity is identified as a cross-cutting consideration in the Framework. This has implications for the monitoring framework when considering usefulness for assessing long-term trends and for modelling and scenarios (with respect to assessing implications for future generations), inclusiveness of methodologies, disaggregation, identifying differentiated and intersectional impacts, respecting the rights of children, and potentially assessing contributions of children and youth;

(d) The AHTEG identified at least 10 headline indicators where a consistent approach to disaggregating by ecosystem would be beneficial: A.1, A.2, A.3, B.1, 1.1, 2.2, 3.1, 6.1, 7.1 and 9.1. The AHTEG is mindful of balancing reporting burdens with the information gains for understanding links between actions (e.g. indicator 2.2 on area under restoration) and outcomes (e.g. indicator A.2

on the extent of natural ecosystems and A.1 on threat status). The AHTEG recommends using the Global Ecosystem Typology for consistency across goals and targets, indicators and sectors. The next steps are to work with IUCN to develop guidance for application of the typology under diverse circumstances of data availability and capacity, and to identify the appropriate level of reporting for each indicator;

(e) The AHTEG agreed that the development of guidance on a human rights based approach for monitoring in accordance with Section C would be useful.

53. The AHTEG decided that the final report should outline a suggested process to allow the Secretariat, in collaboration with UNEP-WCMC and others, to update the metadata during the time up to 2030 to take into account methodological updates from the organizations working on underlying methodologies. This process would need to include liaising with relevant organizations working on specific indicators.

54. The AHTEG agreed to use the online discussion forum to ask specific questions which can assist the further development of the Headline indicators. The AHTEG determined specific members of the Group who will post questions on the forum in order to stimulate this discussion.

55. The AHTEG decided that, in order to assess gaps and to review the component and complementary indicators, an assessment the coverage of the different aspects of each goal and target across the monitoring framework would be worked on by members of the Group with the aim to complete the analysis and share it for discussion during the final meeting in March 2024.

56. The AHTEG took note of the planned work on capacity-building which is planned by UNEP-WCMC, in collaboration with the Secretariat. This work includes a survey to Parties on capacity-building needs and an analysis of the results which will be prepared by UNEP-WCMC, in collaboration with the Secretariat. The AHTEG agreed that the analysis of the capacity needs survey will be useful for the work of the AHTEG in completing item 1d on assessing capacity needs. The AHTEG agreed to provided feedback to UNEP-WCMC on the survey via remote communication.

57. The AHTEG noted that there may be a need for further reflection on the need for continuing to review the effectiveness of the monitoring framework over time. The AHTEG discussed that such a review may be useful after COP-16 and it could take into account reporting on the Headline indicators in the national reporting process, the global review of collective progress towards the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, and the IPBES monitoring assessment which will be completed by 2026.

58. Within the AHTEG, there were different views on the possibility of including additional Headline indicators in the monitoring framework and at what stage in the process additional Headline indicators may be introduced.

## **Item 8**

### **Other matters**

59. There were no other matters discussed.

## **Item 9**

### **Adoption of the report**

60. In accordance with established practice, the meeting Co-Chairs were asked to finalize the report of the meeting, with the assistance of the Secretariat, and to make the final report available for forthcoming processes.

## **Item 10**

### **Closure of the meeting**

61. The SBSTTA Chair and the Co-Chairs of the AHTEG provided closing remarks and thanked the participants and organizers for contributing to the fruitful conclusion of the meeting and

expressed the hope that the meeting results could inform forthcoming processes, including those in relation to SBSTTA-26.

62. The meeting closed at 5 p.m. on Friday, 6 October 2023.

## Annex I

### **Summary of the next steps for the development of Headline indicators for the Goals and Targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework**

1. The table below summarizes the next steps for developing the Headline indicators for each Goal and Target. For each indicator, a member of the AHTEG agreed to represent the AHTEG and take the lead in following up with the next steps of that indicator. The AHTEG decided that the names of the specific volunteers would not be made public in this report. The Secretariat can liaise with the appropriate person in order to respond to specific questions from Parties. In addition to the next steps highlighted in the table below, representatives of the AHTEG will use the online forum as a way to seek additional information on specific indicators and their application.
2. For each of the headline indicators, the AHTEG compiled comments and feedback on the methodology to be shared with those organizations developing the indicator and/or its methods. These comments are not included in this report as they represent interim work conducted by the AHTEG which will be used to further develop the methodologies, in particular for the headline indicators without a methodology.
3. To provide a general overview of the state of development of each indicator, the AHTEG categorized each into one of five broad categories representing the trajectory from the start of development of methods through to application by all countries. These categories are necessarily broad and somewhat subjective, and are given here simply to provide an overall illustration of relative progress and the current potential for implementation by Parties.

Goal/ Target	Headline or binary Indicator	Category of development/implementation <sup>2</sup>	Next steps to be led by a representative of the AHTEG	Organization developing /maintaining the indicator/ methodology <sup>3</sup>
A	A.1 Red List of Ecosystems	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop recommendations on the level of ecosystem typology required for global reporting and national reporting in collaboration with IUCN.</li> <li>Finalise the specific indicators for national reporting that would be derived from the underlying Red List of Ecosystems assessments.</li> <li>Discuss with IUCN the need for guidance for using the Red List of Ecosystems to track changes in ecosystem status.</li> </ul>	IUCN
	A.2 Extent of natural ecosystems	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop recommendations on the ecosystem typology to be used for national reporting; this should be aligned with indicator A.1 Red list of ecosystems.</li> <li>Develop in the metadata a method for deriving an indicator from an underlying geospatial dataset on extent, in collaboration with UNSD.</li> <li>Provide guidance on the national reporting of the indicator, including through identifying a global reference dataset which can be used by countries who would prefer to use a global dataset<sup>4</sup>.</li> </ul>	UNSD
	A.3 Red List Index	5 (SDG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss with IUCN the potential to update guidance on national application of the RLI.</li> <li>Explain in metadata how different Red List Index disaggregations can provide information relevant for other goals and targets.</li> </ul>	IUCN
	A.4 The proportion of populations within species with an effective population size > 500	3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide feedback to GEOBON on comments related to methodology and sampling approach, including on how the indicator could be aggregated to the global level.</li> <li>Work with GEOBON to further develop the metadata and methodology for this indicator.</li> <li>Explore possibility of using modelling and simulations to test assumptions underpinning the indicator.</li> </ul>	GEOBON
B	B.1 Services provided by ecosystems	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide feedback to UNSD on the metadata and invite UNSD to update the metadata, including in consultation with relevant organizations (IPBES, UNEP-WCMC, World Bank, and others), noting that there are issues related to national</li> </ul>	UNSD

<sup>2</sup> 1. Methods not yet developed, and a process needs to be established to develop these; 2. Methods not yet developed, but a process is underway to develop them, led by one or more organisations, to develop them; 3. Methods developed (or partially developed) and tested/piloted, but data not yet widely available (and/or collection not yet underway). (Indicator/Methodology maintained by an organization(s)); 4. Methods established, data being compiled, and indicator operational in at least some countries, but further investment in methods ongoing and/or further (data collection required).; 5. Methods established, data being compiled and accessible, and indicator operational for most/all countries. (Indicator/methodology maintained by an organization); SDG: The indicator aligns with or is identical to a defined indicator for the Sustainable Development Goals

<sup>3</sup> For the indicators marked as 1, the AHTEG has suggested an organization that might be involved in initiating the work. For the indicators marked as 2-5, the organization that has initiated a process or has a process related to the development of the methodology for the indicator is highlighted.

<sup>4</sup>The Group on Earth Observations (GEO) is currently working on global ecosystem extent product which aligns with the SEEA and the IUCN typology which could be explored.

Goal/ Target	Headline or binary Indicator	Category of development/implementat ion <sup>2</sup>	Next steps to be led by a representative of the AHTEG	Organization developing /maintaining the indicator/ methodology <sup>3</sup>
			<p>identification of specific ecosystem services, indicator units for these services, aggregation to the global level and other issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with UNSD to co-convene a webinar between the AHTEG members and the UN Committee on Environmental Economic Accounting Technical Committee and other key experts and organizations in order to consult and gather additional recommendations on this indicator.</li> <li>• On the basis of the webinar, pose further questions to online forum for wider input to receive input from Parties, Indigenous peoples and local communities, stakeholders and relevant organizations.</li> <li>• As there are binary indicator(s) related to this for Goal B and Target 14, explore the use of these questions as a short-term/temporary solution to monitor progress until the headline indicator can be operationalized.</li> </ul>	
	B.b Number of countries with policies or action plans for implementing and monitoring the maintenance and enhancement of ecosystem functions and services.		SBSTTA 25/2	
	C.1 Indicator on monetary benefits received	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide feedback on the metadata to the team commissioned by SCBD working on a study related to developing a methodology for this indicator.</li> <li>• Work with the team commissioned by the SCBD to make recommendations on the methodology for this indicator, noting that a notification was issued by the Secretariat (2023-102) to conduct a survey on the use of ABS indicators which will provide an input for this work.</li> </ul>	SCBD
	C.2 Indicator on non-monetary benefits	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide feedback on the metadata to the team commissioned by SCBD working on a study related to developing a methodology for this indicator.</li> <li>• Work with the team commissioned by the SCBD to make recommendations on the methodology for this indicator, noting that a notification was issued by the Secretariat (2023-102) to conduct a survey on the use of ABS indicators which will provide an input for this work.</li> </ul>	SCBD
D	D.1 International public funding, including official development assistance (ODA) for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be first discussed by the Expert Group on Financial Reporting which was established in notification 2023-067.</li> </ul>	
	D.2 Domestic public funding on conservation and sustainable use of		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be first discussed by the Expert Group on Financial Reporting which was established in notification 2023-067.</li> </ul>	

Goal/Target	Headline or binary Indicator	Category of development/implementation <sup>2</sup>	Next steps to be led by a representative of the AHTEG	Organization developing /maintaining the indicator/ methodology <sup>3</sup>
	biodiversity and ecosystems			
	D.3 Private funding (domestic and international) on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be first discussed by the Expert Group on Financial Reporting which was established in notification 2023-067.</li> </ul>	
1	A.1 Red List of Ecosystems	See above		
	A.2 Extent of natural ecosystems	See above		
	1.1 Percentage of land and sea area covered by biodiversity-inclusive spatial plans	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a suggested approach for establishing a process to develop methods and define key terms to operationalise indicator, including identifying organisation(s) to lead development of methods or extend existing indicators (e.g. SDGs). Explore with IOC-UNESCO and UNEP whether additional questions or criteria can be added to their survey on marine spatial plans.</li> <li>As there is a related binary indicator, explore the use of the binary questions as a short-term/temporary solution to monitor progress until the headline indicator can be operationalized.</li> </ul>	An organization(s) that can lead a process for this indicator will need to be identified.
	1.b Number of countries using participatory, biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning or effective management processes to address land and sea use change.			SBSTTA 25/2
2	2.2 Area under restoration	2-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide feedback to FAO on the metadata and underlying methodology, including the need to define key terms, categorising ‘under restoration’ and ‘restoration types’, and for ecosystem-level reporting.</li> <li>Work with FAO to further develop the metadata for this indicator, including the methodology for national reporting and global aggregation of the indicator.</li> </ul>	FAO
3	3.1 Coverage of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures	4-5 <sup>5</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development of methods for disaggregation by effectiveness, governance type, inland waters and ecosystem types (other disaggregations (including SDG indicators) are already operational in all countries).</li> <li>After SBSTTA and the working group on 8j, provide reflections on the potential relevance of ITTs outside PAs and OECMs.</li> </ul>	UNEP-WCMC, IUCN, BirdLife International
4	A.3 Red List Index	See above		

<sup>5</sup> While this indicator is well developed, certain important disaggregations may not be developed yet.



Goal/Target	Headline or binary Indicator	Category of development/implementation <sup>2</sup>	Next steps to be led by a representative of the AHTEG	Organization developing /maintaining the indicator/ methodology <sup>3</sup>
	A.4 The proportion of populations within species with an effective population size > 500	See above		
5	5.1 Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels	5 <sup>6</sup> (SDG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss with FAO the possibility of deriving different disaggregations (e.g. fish stocks does not include terrestrial) and improving the data availability including at the national level.</li> </ul>	FAO
6	6.1. Rate of invasive species establishment	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide feedback to GEOBON on the metadata, in particular, questions about practicability of compiling data at national level, especially regarding survey effort, and invite GEOBON to update metadata accordingly.</li> <li>Work with GEOBON to further develop the indicator metadata, including more detail on methods.</li> </ul>	GEOBON
	6.b Number of countries adopting relevant national legislation and allocating resources to reduce the impact of invasive alien species significantly.			SBSTTA 25/2
7	7.1 Index of coastal eutrophication potential	4 (SDG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss comments on the metadata with UNEP and ask about options for disaggregation using existing information.</li> </ul>	UNEP
	7.2 Pesticide environment concentration	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach FAO to provide technical support for an inclusive process to develop the methodology and metadata for this indicator.</li> <li>If an inclusive process is initiated, work with FAO and others to develop the methodology and metadata for this indicator.</li> </ul>	Potentially FAO
8	8.b Number of countries with agreed action plans on the impact of climate change and ocean acidification on biodiversity that minimize negative impacts and foster positive ones.			SBSTTA 25/2
9	9.1 Benefits from the sustainable use of wild species	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This indicator is currently linked to the development of B.1, the metadata will be assessed in more detail after B.1 has progressed.</li> </ul>	Potentially UNSD
	9.2 Percentage of the population in traditional occupations	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This indicator will be first considered by the Working Group on Article 8(j). Taking into account the discussion by the Working Group on 8(j), provide feedback and work with ILO to further develop the existing methodology, including related to disaggregations.</li> </ul>	Working Group on 8j, ILO

<sup>6</sup>This indicator only refers to marine stocks; if terrestrial fish stocks were included, then this indicator would not be ranked as a 5.

Goal/Target	Headline or binary Indicator	Category of development/implementation <sup>2</sup>	Next steps to be led by a representative of the AHTEG	Organization developing /maintaining the indicator/ methodology <sup>3</sup>
	9.b Number of countries with policies that sustainably manage the use of and trade in wild species and respect customary sustainable use by indigenous peoples and local communities			SBSTTA 25/2
10	10.1 Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture	4 (SDG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work with FAO to promote the submission of national data through the SDG process in order to improve data coverage.</li> </ul>	FAO
	10.2 Progress towards sustainable forest management	5 (SDG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In collaboration with FAO, update the existing metadata to reflect the full SDG indicator 15.2.1 metadata.</li> <li>Provide feedback to FAO on challenges and potential opportunities relate to collecting data on this SDG indicator.</li> </ul>	FAO
11	B.1 Services provided by ecosystems	See above		
12	12.1 Average share of the built-up area of cities that is green/blue space for public use for all	4 (SDG) <sup>7</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explore with UN-Habitat whether additional fields could be added to SDG indicator.</li> <li>Determine the suitability for using the SDG indicator to provide data on 12.1. If the SDG indicator cannot be used directly, consider alternate options, including collecting information that may be requested through national report templates to complement the SDG indicator.</li> </ul>	UN-Habitat
	12.b Number of countries with urban sustainability plans referring to green or blue spatial management.			SBSTTA 25/2
13	C.1 Indicator on monetary benefits received	See above		
	C.2 Indicator on non-monetary benefits	See above		
	13.b Number of countries that have taken effective legal, policy, administrative and capacity-building measures at all levels, as appropriate, to ensure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits.			SBSTTA 25/2
14	14.b Number of countries with national targets for integrating biodiversity values into policies, regulations, planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts at all levels, ensuring that biodiversity values are mainstreamed across all sectors and integrated into assessments of environmental impacts.			SBSTTA 25/2
15	15.1 Number of companies reporting on disclosures of	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a suggested way forward for a process for developing a methodology to be operationalised for how to collect information on the number of businesses (companies and financial institutions) reporting on disclosures of risks,</li> </ul>	The AHTEG recommends SCBD could initiate the development, in

<sup>7</sup>UN-Habitat supports reporting of an SDG indicator which refers to ‘open’ space, not ‘green/ blue’. If the SDG is not used, then a process does not yet exist for this indicator.

Goal/ Target	Headline or binary Indicator	Category of development/implementat ion <sup>2</sup>	Next steps to be led by a representative of the AHTEG	Organization developing /maintaining the indicator/ methodology <sup>3</sup>
	risks, dependencies and impacts on biodiversity		dependencies and impacts on biodiversity, taking into account the work of TNFD on this topic. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In order to initiate the development of a process, request the Secretariat, subject to available resources, to conduct a study to<sup>8</sup> collect data on existing frameworks/tools; appropriate scope for which companies and financial institutions can be included in the count; good practices and other information.</li> <li>• On the basis of the above, provide recommendations for the further development of the methodology and metadata.</li> </ul>	consultation with TNFD and others.
	15.b Number of countries taking legal, administrative or policy measures aimed at progressively reducing negative impacts on biodiversity, increasing positive impacts, reducing biodiversity-related risks to business and financial institutions and promoting actions to ensure sustainable patterns of production.			SBSTTA 25/2
16	16.b Number of countries developing, adopting or implementing policy instruments aimed at encouraging and enabling people to make sustainable consumption choices.			SBSTTA 25/2
17	17.b Number of countries that have taken action to implement biosafety measures as set out in Article 8(g) of the Convention and measures for the handling of biotechnology and the distribution of its benefits as set out in Article 19.			SBSTTA 25/2
18	18.1 Positive incentives in place to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be first discussed by the Expert Group on Financial Reporting which was established in notification 2023-067.</li> </ul>	
	18.2 Value of subsidies and other incentives harmful to biodiversity that have been eliminated, phased out or reformed		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be first discussed by the Expert Group on Financial Reporting which was established in notification 2023-067.</li> </ul>	
19	D.1 International public funding, including official development assistance (ODA) for conservation and sustainable	See above		

Goal/ Target	Headline or binary Indicator	Category of development/implementat ion <sup>2</sup>	Next steps to be led by a representative of the AHTEG	Organization developing /maintaining the indicator/ methodology <sup>3</sup>
	use of biodiversity and ecosystems			
	D.2 Domestic public funding on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems	See above		
	D.3 Private funding (domestic and international) on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems	See above		
20	20.b Number of countries that have taken significant action to strengthen capacity-building and development, access to and transfer of technology, and to promote the development of and access to innovation and technical and scientific cooperation.			SBSTTA 25/2
21	21.1 Indicator on biodiversity information for the monitoring the global biodiversity framework	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Share feedback on the draft metadata with the process which has been initiated by GEOBON in collaboration with the SCBD to develop the scope and methodology, the first meeting will be on 9 October 2023 and aims to provide a starting point for further discussions with relevant stakeholders in coming months.</li> </ul>	GEOBON, SCBD
22	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.			SBSTTA 25/2
23	23.b Number of countries with frameworks to ensure that all women and girls have equal opportunity and capacity to contribute to the three objectives of the Convention.			SBSTTA 25/2