



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: Limited

12 August 2026

Original: English

Subsidiary Body on Implementation

Seventh meeting

Nairobi, 4–12 August 2026

Agenda item 5

Digital sequence information on genetic resources

Digital sequence information on genetic resources

Draft recommendation submitted by the Chair

The Subsidiary Body on Implementation,

Recalling the sovereign rights of States over their natural resources,

Recalling also its decisions [15/9](#) of 19 December 2022 and [16/2](#) of 1 November 2024, in particular paragraphs 23 and 28 of the annex to decision [16/2](#), by which the fund is to be administered in line with decisions of the Conference of the Parties and the Multilateral Mechanism for the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits from the Use of Digital Sequence Information on Genetic Resources, including the Cali Fund, is to operate under the authority and guidance of and be accountable to the Conference of the Parties, and paragraph 28 of and enclosure IV to the annex to decision 16/2, by which the Steering Committee was established by the Conference of the Parties with a specified composition and with a chair to be designated from among the members of the Committee representing Parties,

1. *Notes* that the “Standard memorandum of understanding for the Cali Fund for the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits arising from the Use of Digital Sequence Information on Genetic Resources using Pass-through Fund Management” among participating United Nations entities (United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Environment Programme and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity) and the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office of the United Nations regarding the operational aspects of the Cali Fund for the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits arising from the Use of Digital Sequence Information on Genetic Resources, together with its annexes, was concluded and signed on 25 February 2025, prior to the Conference of the Parties;

2. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to facilitate an online discussion on the issue referred to in paragraph 1 above with the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office, the United Nations partners, the Steering Committee of the Multilateral Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, that will be open to all, and to make the relevant materials and documents available;

3. *Recommends* that, at its seventeenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties considers a possible appropriate course of action regarding the memorandum of understanding and its annexes, as well as all related governance, administrative and operational documents and arrangements, including those developed or agreed upon by the Steering Committee, including its report, in relation to and in line with the distinctive characteristics of the Cali Fund as a benefit-sharing fund and with the governance arrangements in accordance with decision [16/2](#), while ensuring transparency to the Parties;

4. *Recommends* that, at its seventeenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties adopt elements of a decision along the following lines:

The Conference of the Parties,

Recalling decisions [15/9](#) of 19 December 2022, in particular its paragraph 13, and [16/2](#) of 1 November 2024,

[1. *Recognizes* the potential value of exploring proportionate pathways that could complement the sectoral approach established in decision [16/2](#) by addressing potential asymmetries affecting users making limited or initial use of digital sequence information on genetic resources, in particular in developing countries, the remaining portfolios of which complies with applicable national access and benefit-sharing requirements, if applicable, [and without prejudice to obligations arising from existing national access and benefit-sharing frameworks, and] mutually agreed terms, while avoiding unintended barriers to the responsible adoption and use of digital sequence information;]

[1.Alt *Recognizes* the asymmetries among users, including those making limited or initial use of digital sequence information on genetic resources, and the potential value of exploring proportionate pathways that could complement the sectoral approach established in decision [16/2](#);

[2. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, to [commission a study][compile relevant information] on potential additional modalities [to explore potential contribution pathways, including][, including a proportionate pathway for entities making limited or initial use of digital sequence information on genetic resources] to enable entities to calculate their contributions to the Cali Fund on the basis of the products or services [in their portfolios developed [directly or indirectly]] using digital sequence information on genetic resources within the scope to of the Multilateral Mechanism[, including on potential interaction with national access and benefit-sharing frameworks], and to analyse and evaluate the feasibility, practicality, efficiency and legal and technical challenges of contribution pathways, including [on potential interaction with national access and benefit-sharing frameworks,][their interaction with national access and benefit-sharing frameworks, their implications for the overall contributor base and predictability of contributions and revenue generation for the Cali Fund,] [an assessment of the potential impact of the total level of contributions to the Cali Fund,] [equity implications, and the interests of developing country Parties, in particular the least developing countries and small island developing States, and Parties with economies in transition];]

[2.Alt *Establishes*, subject to the availability of resources, [an ad hoc open-ended working group on benefit-sharing from the use of digital sequence information on genetic resources] to further develop the Multilateral Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, through [options for] a products- and services-based modality providing a proportionate pathway for companies with limited use of digital sequence information, complementary to the sectoral approach, according to the terms of reference contained in annex [X], and to make recommendations to the Conference of the Parties for consideration at its eighteenth meeting;]

[3. *Considers*, at its [eighteenth][nineteenth] meeting, without prejudging the outcome of the first review of the effectiveness of the Multilateral Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, and in the light of the outcomes and recommendations resulting from the first review of effectiveness of the Multilateral Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, the potential additional modalities referred to in paragraph 2;]

4. [Urges][Calls upon] Parties, and invites other Governments, relevant organizations and stakeholders, including the private sector, to organize participatory activities and partnerships, as appropriate, to encourage private sector engagement and contributions to

the Cali Fund and non-monetary benefit-sharing [consistent with decision [16/2](#) and without prejudice to applicable national access and benefit-sharing measures];

5. [Requests][*Strongly encourages*] Parties, and invites other Governments and relevant organizations, to support the work of the Steering Committee of the Multilateral Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, and the Secretariat of the Convention acting as the interim Secretariat of the Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, through financial support and [formal and] informal activities, [including capacity-building, technical assistance, awareness-raising and information-sharing,] such as workshops on the operationalization of the Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, and related items [and to support the effective participation in the work of the Committee of members from developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States];

[6. *Reaffirms* that the governance, institutional arrangements and operational modalities of the Multilateral Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, remain under the authority of the Conference of the Parties, and requests the Subsidiary Body on Implementation to review their consistency with decision [16/2](#) and other relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties periodically, and to make recommendations, as appropriate, to the Conference of the Parties];

[7. *Decides* that future members of the Steering Committee shall be nominated by the respective regional groups and constituencies;

8. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to facilitate the nomination process accordingly];

9. *Invites*, with the aim to make digital sequence information on genetic resources publicly available and accessible in a transparent and accountable manner [, consistent with sovereign rights of all Parties over the genetic resources and the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities][to all Parties, consistent with the principles of open access to data]:

(a) Indigenous peoples and local communities, including women and youth among them, [with the support of and, where relevant, in collaboration with Parties, and, as appropriate, digital sequence information on genetic resources database managers, the scientific community, users of digital sequence information on genetic resources, relevant organizations and initiatives, to support participatory workshops with the aim to develop their self-led educational material][to contribute, in consultation and collaboration with Parties, as appropriate, to the development of educational material under a Party-driven process] for the use of database operators, scientific and research institutions, the Secretariat and other stakeholders, as relevant, on the management and governance of data linked to indigenous peoples and local communities, including women and youth within those communities, and their traditional knowledge, including consideration of and alignment with the principles of findability, accessibility, interoperability and reusability (FAIR) and of collective benefit, authority to control, responsibility ethics (CARE) principles, for, inter alia, providing guidance for scientific publications on research using digital sequence information on genetic resources[, consistent with national legislation and circumstances];

[(b) [Database managers and users to develop and progressively implement][Parties and other Governments funding, sponsoring and hosting digital sequence information on genetic resources databases to ensure that entities operating such databases and users in their jurisdictions take measures to develop and progressively implement, in accordance with paragraphs 11 and 12 of decision [16/2](#)]:

(i) [Interoperable and] standardized metadata and good practices that support improved accessibility, transparency and accountability in databases hosting digital sequence information on genetic resources, including, as appropriate, [and where available,] provenance [and country of origin] information [and

information on the country of origin of the biological material or genetic resources from which the sequence was derived];

- (ii) Declarations relating to lawful submission of digital sequence information, where applicable[, including reference to relevant information or documentation supporting such declarations, in accordance with national legislation];
- (iii) [Standardized] [fields or metadata for submitters to provide information on] [relevant] [rights and] permissions information, including free, prior and informed consent[, in accordance with national circumstances];
- (iv) [Interoperable metadata standards;]
- (v) Alignment with the CARE, FAIR and TRUST (transparency, responsibility, user focus, sustainability and technology) principles, as well as the recommendations set out in section III of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization *Recommendation on Open Science*.]

[(b Alt.) Organizations hosting databases that make digital sequence information on genetic resources publicly available to share information with the Executive Secretary by the eighteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties concerning their implementation of paragraph 10 of the annex to decision [16/2](#);]

[(b Alt. bis) Parties and other Governments funding, sponsoring or hosting sequence databases to share information on the actions that they have taken to ensure that entities operating [such][those] databases [ensure the effective implementation of the Multilateral Mechanism, and that users in their jurisdictions take measures to develop and] progressively implement paragraphs 11 and 12 of the annex to decision [16/2](#);]

[(c) The exploration of practical approaches for improving [accountability and] transparency to all Parties regarding the submission and use of digital sequence information on genetic resources, while maintaining open access and taking into account existing database practices [and applicable national legislation and measures];]

[10. *Invites* Parties and relevant organizations and stakeholders in a position to do so to provide capacity-building, technical assistance, technology transfer[, voluntary and mutually agreed terms] and financial support for the work outlined in subparagraph 9 (a) and (b) above;]

11. *Invites* the various actors referenced in paragraph 9 above to inform the Secretariat of relevant work undertaken and its results;

[12. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, to ensure that the findings and recommendations arising from the study on tools and models, such as databases, for making digital sequence information on genetic resources publicly available and accessible in a transparent and accountable manner¹ are subject to peer review, allowing Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities, database operators and relevant experts to provide comments, and to submit the finalized study and recommendation for review by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at a meeting held before the eighteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its eighteenth meeting, [before informing future policy development];]

13. *Also request* that the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources:

(a) Request and collect the information mentioned in paragraph 11 above for dissemination through the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention and the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House;

¹ [CBD/SBI/7/INF/15](#).

(b) Issue a call for information on other platforms and clearing houses outside of the Convention and its Protocols to collaborate on the dissemination of those educational materials;

[

14. [Adopts the][Takes note of the proposed] review methodology contained in the annex to the present decision;

15. Requests that the Executive Secretary, in consultation with the Steering Committee, and in line with the review methodology and subject to the availability of resources:

(a) Develop and disseminate a survey available in all official languages of the United Nations to collect relevant data and information from Parties, other Governments, indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth organizations and other relevant stakeholders and organizations, including the scientific community, database managers and the private sector, in order to inform the first review of the effectiveness of the Multilateral Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, and the development of surveys for future reviews;

(b) Commission a review report containing: (a) an analysis of data and information submitted pursuant to subparagraph 15 (a) above that is in line with the pillars and governance assessment of the Multilateral Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, information from the global report on collective progress in the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework² and other readily available sources, as relevant; and (b) recommendations for improving the effectiveness of the Multilateral Mechanism, including the Cali Fund;

(c) Submit the review report to the Steering Committee to give it the opportunity to share its views and give any recommendations that it may have thereon, and submit the report and the recommendations of the Committee to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation;

16. Invites the actors concerned to respond to the survey mentioned in paragraph 15 (a) above;

17. Requests that, at a meeting held before the eighteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation review the views and recommendations of the Steering Committee on the review report, if any, and, as relevant, submit a recommendation for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its eighteenth meeting.

]

[Annex

Review methodology of effectiveness of the Multilateral Mechanism for the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits from the Use of Digital Sequence Information on Genetic Resources, including the Cali Fund*

I. Conceptual framework of the review methodology

1. For the Multilateral Mechanism for the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits from the Use of Digital Sequence Information on Genetic Resources, including the Cali Fund, to succeed, five enabling conditions (EC1–EC5) must be in place in the ecosystem in which the Mechanism operates.

² Decision [15/4](#), annex.

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.

They are treated as structural preconditions: failures in enabling conditions require different policy responses than failures in mechanism design. The five conditions are:

- (a) Industry clarity on contribution conditions (EC1);
- (b) A commercially viable business case (EC2);
- (c) Legal certainty for contributors and providers (EC3);
- (d) Functional identified or designated receiving entities (EC4);
- (e) Effective governance with sustained political commitment (EC5).

2. The review assesses the Multilateral Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, through six evaluation pillars (P1–P6) and a governance assessment (G1). P1 covers [resource mobilisation][monetary contributions] and distribution; P2 covers contribution levels, trigger design, efficiency and administrative costs; P3 covers non-monetary benefits, [including open access to digital sequence information on genetic resources][in particular benefits arising from the use of digital sequence information on genetic resources]; P4 cover the Mechanism’s coherence with other mechanism, including contributions to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and complementarity with national and international access and benefit-sharing frameworks ; and P5 covers the rights [of the][, open access obligations and research impacts relating to][, obligations in relation to open access] indigenous peoples and local communities [and the impact of the utilization of the digital sequence information derived from the genetic resources]. G1 assesses the Mechanism’s governance against [six][seven] indicators: decision-making inclusivity, transparency, management response quality, institutional coherence, fiduciary integrity, [and] governance setup progress [improvements in data governance including consistency with findability, accessibility, interoperability and reusability (FAIR), of collective benefits, authority to control, responsibility and ethics (CARE) and of transparency, responsibility, user-focus, sustainability and technology (TRUST), as well as the recommendations set out in section III of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization *Recommendation on Open Science*.

3. The following four assumptions reflect the design of the Mechanism as established by decisions of the Conference of the Parties. The evaluation works within their constraints.

4. **Assumption 1 — [Decoupling from traceability (decision 15/9, para. 5)][Monetary payments are calculated for the use of digital sequence information on genetic resources in accordance with the scope of the Multilateral Mechanism].** [The Mechanism does not require proof that a specific digital sequence information on genetic resources was used by a specific contributor.] Also, all rights under the Nagoya Protocol and other instruments are preserved (decision 15/9, para. 11; decision [16/2](#), para. 27). The assessment focuses on whether the Mechanism generates intended [monetary] flows and [whether] outcomes at the system level [are consistent with decision 16/2][, not whether individual contributions are traceable to specific uses].

5. **Assumption 2 — Multilateral attribution through contribution-plausibility (decision 15/9, para. 5).** The mechanism establishes sectors in which it is plausible that the economic activity is reliant on the use of digital sequence information on genetic resources. This contribution-plausibility framework is the principal analytical method for Pillar 1 and Pillar 2 findings. The approach for this review methodology was aligned with that of comparable mechanisms: three-level assessment structure and evaluability-update-first approach from the Green Climate Fund; financial reporting and tiered data-access model from the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund; equity and non-monetary benefit assessment from the Benefit-sharing Fund of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. The rating scale and compliance-based logic of the Green Climate Fund project log-frames is incompatible with the Cali Fund’s voluntary design, and so only the three-level assessment structure (performance, design and operational) and the evaluability-update-first approach were deemed applicable to this methodology. The Agreement under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction and the World Health

Organization's Pandemic Agreement annex on Pathogen Access and Benefit Sharing are relevant as boundary instruments for the part of Pillar 4 on coherence with other international instruments and contribution stacking risk, but currently do not have applicable evaluation methodologies.

6. **Assumption 3 — Since the enabling conditions enumerated in paragraph 1 are structural preconditions and not mechanism failures, even a well-designed mechanism will underperform if enabling conditions are absent.** Each condition represents a distinct failure mode requiring a different policy response, and the number of Parties implementing paragraph 13³ of the annex to decision 16/2 measured by the time of the review by the Conference of the Parties at their eighteenth meeting [is][as well as actions taken by the databases to promote accountability and transparency in making digital sequence information on genetic resources publicly accessible and available are] the most important leading signal for this first review. The review therefore must first establish which enabling conditions were in place when the mechanism operated. If enabling conditions fall short, low performance will not signal a design flaw requiring the Conference of the Parties to change the Multilateral Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, but rather a precondition failure or short coming, requiring diplomatic, legal and/or capacity-building responses. The evaluability update must therefore include an enabling-condition diagnostic before any pillar findings are presented. The Secretariat should develop:

(a) A survey to gather data for the enabling conditions 1 and 2 on industry clarity on contribution conditions and on a commercially viable business case, respectively;

(b) A tracker tool for the countries which did put in place measures administrative, policy or legislative measures to incentivize users' contributions;

[(b bis) A tracker tool for actions taken by countries, not just to incentivize users' contributions, but also to ensure databases are facilitating access to digital sequence information on genetic resources only in compliance with national laws of provider countries;]

(c) [A protocol to address the risk of contribution stacking][Assess whether there exist any risks of stacking of obligations];

(d) A readiness assessment for the enabling condition 4 on the designation of institutions to receive contribution for indigenous peoples and local communities and their readiness [including whether operational arrangements enable access through the full range of funding pathways, including direct access];

[(d bis) A tracker tool for the actions taken by databases for promoting enabling condition 6 (EC6);]

(e) Qualitative protocols for the enabling condition 5 on effective governance with sustained political commitment.

7. **Assumption 4 — Phased operationalization and modularity.** The methodology is adopted before the Mechanism is fully operational. The allocation formula, contribution thresholds, database interface measures and governance structures are still being finalized, some of which will be presented by the Steering Committee to the Conference of the Parties at its seventeenth meeting. The methodology is therefore modular: elements whose evaluability depends on a finalised design feature are classified as modality-contingent and flagged as “not yet evaluable”.

8. Three limitations are assumed by this methodology as they cannot be remedied by improved data collection:

(a) Attribution[: outcomes cannot be attributed to specific digital sequence information on genetic resources, contributor or country of origin (decision 15/9, para. 5). The review cannot satisfy

³ “13. Parties and non-Parties are invited to take administrative, policy or legislative measures, consistent with national legislation, to incentivize users in their jurisdiction to contribute to the global fund in line with the modalities of the multilateral mechanism.”

demands for bilateral origin-benefit linkages][is limited to the declarations by the contributors and verification of the same is not possible until databases and other tools making digital sequence information on genetic resources publicly accessible improve upon accountability and transparency];

[(b) Political questions: whether the trigger, thresholds or allocation formula are “fair” in an absolute sense is a political question for the Parties. The review only assesses performance against the criteria in paragraph 9 of decision 15/9;]

(c) Party requests: The allocation formula, thresholds and rates of contribution are set through separate processes decided by the Parties. The review can only assess whether adopted rates are generating the intended flows and whether thresholds appear to be a barrier to uptake (enabling condition 2).

II. Review framework

9. Table 1 contains elements evaluable at the eighteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, either fully or conditionally. Elements marked † are conditional on specific decisions or actions at, or immediately following, the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties such as the adoption of the allocation formula, the adoption of the manual of operations, and the launch of a survey or tracker. Table 2 contains elements that are not evaluable at the eighteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties regardless of the outcome of the seventeenth meeting's outcomes, primarily because operational conditions or external instruments are not in place.

Table 1

Consolidated review framework — elements fully or conditionally evaluable at the eighteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties

<i>Pillar/Element</i>	<i>Data status</i>	<i>Data source</i>	<i>Evaluability</i>
P1 — Monetary contribution and distribution [and governance]			
Contributions are received from the users of DSI, including those identified by the Parties (Enclosure I of decision 16/2)	Existing (MPTFO)	MPTFO financial report ¹ [cost and administrative burden where sufficient data is available]	Fully evaluable; feeds KMGBF Target 13 indicators
Total contributions received ([volume][amount], number, sector, [including vis-à-vis indicative rates in 16/2])			
Distribution by region and recipient type †	Existing (MPTFO) — formula modality-contingent	MPTFO allocation data	Basic distributional data evaluable now; full evaluation requires adopted allocation formula. Conditional on adoption of allocation formula at COP-17[;feeds KMGBF Target 13 indicators]
Disbursement rate	Existing (MPTFO)	MPTFO financial report	Fully evaluable
Allocation process compliance (including transparency, accountability, gender-responsiveness)	Existing (Fund Secretariat)	Secretariat narrative report ⁵	Fully evaluable
Governance setup progress — G1.vi (leading element) (see G1 below) †	Existing (Fund Secretariat)	Cali Fund Annual Report ⁵ ; report of the Steering Committee to the Conference of the Parties; Steering Committee meeting minutes; manual of operations (once adopted)	Fully evaluable; if the manual of operations is adopted by COP-17, G1.vi will be evaluable in full. Conditional on adoption of manual of operations at COP-17

¹ MPTFO financial report + Fund Secretariat narrative report = Cali Fund annual report.

<i>Pillar/Element</i>	<i>Data status</i>	<i>Data source</i>	<i>Evaluability</i>
P2 — [Contribution levels], trigger design, efficiency and costs			
EC1 — contributor awareness, understanding [and clarity] [and] operational effectiveness of contribution conditions † [including the assessment of the effectiveness and suitability of the trigger for monetary contribution as outlined in decision 16/2]	To develop (survey)	Contributor/stakeholder survey; including national reporting on Target 13; [Distinguish between entities that were unaware, that were aware but found conditions uncertain, and that were aware but did not contribute]	Evaluable in survey launched soon after COP-17 complemented by data on actual contribution, and contribution patterns; interim results possible before COP-18. Conditional on Secretariat launching survey post-COP-17
EC2 — business-case perception of contribution thresholds†	To develop (survey)	Contributor/stakeholder survey, [Competent National Authority/CBD National Focal Point, as appropriate] complemented by data on entities meeting the threshold, contributing entities and contributions received	Evaluable if survey launched soon after COP-17; interim results possible before COP-18. Conditional on Secretariat launching survey post-COP-17, effect on contribution threshold on participation and contribution level
EC3 — [value proposition and incentive for provider and user, including recognition of certificate]			
P3 — Non-monetary benefits [arising from the use of DSI]			
(whole row bracketed) [Open] access to DSI — [consistent with FAIR, CARE and UNESCO principles compliance][principles compliance, as well as UNESCO recommendations, CARE principles]	Existing (databases)	Database operator voluntary reports	Fully evaluable if reports made available

<i>Pillar/Element</i>	<i>Data status</i>	<i>Data source</i>	<i>Evaluability</i>
Capacity-building - <i>could be considered for table 2</i>		[Report of the technical centres under the long-term strategic framework for capacity building and development of the CBD]	
Technology transfer			
P4 — Mechanism's coherence with other mechanism, including contributions to the KMGBF and complementarity with national and international ABS frameworks			
EC3(a) — national incentivization measures (ABS discharge) †	To develop (Party notification)	Party notification on national ABS measures including DSI; Secretariat §13 tracker	Evaluable if tracker is launched and Party notification issued immediately after COP-17. Conditional on Secretariat launching tracker and COP-17 authorising Party notification.
[[National measures] [Progress/measures/ actions (ref 16/2 , annex para 10)] that fund, sponsor or host databases within national jurisdiction, including accountability and transparency that align with DSI decision, as per decisions 16/2 , para 11 and 15/9]			
Impact on research and innovation – <i>could be considered for table 2</i>		Report from databases	
EC3(c) — provider confidence (national ABS alignment)	To develop (assessment)	Party national reports/PMRR; Party notification	Partially evaluable through Party notification only; results considered interim given early stage of the Mechanism. Monitor in subsequent cycles, including on the perception of a voluntary extension of the mechanism
Coherence with NBSAPs and national DSI/ABS measures	Existing (CBD)	PMRR/Secretariat	Partially evaluable at COP 18 (interim results only given the early stage of the Mechanism). Monitor in subsequent cycles.

<i>Pillar/Element</i>	<i>Data status</i>	<i>Data source</i>	<i>Evaluability</i>
P5 — Rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, [open access and research impacts] [and the impact of utilisation of DSI on genetic resources on them]			
<i>All elements</i>	—	—	<i>No P5 elements evaluable at COP-18. All P5 elements in table 2</i>
G1 — Governance Assessment			
G1.i — Decision-making inclusivity †	Interim (Secretariat)	SC meeting minutes; manual of operations (once adopted)	Fully evaluable; manual of operations (if adopted at COP-17) adds allocation formula governance
G1.ii — Transparency and timeliness of documentation	Interim (Secretariat)	Secretariat periodic report, [including timely availability of decisions, meeting documents and relevant financial documents]	Fully evaluable
G1.iii — Quality of management response †	Existing (SC)	SC management response; manual of operations (once adopted)	Fully evaluable from COP-18; manual of operations (if adopted at COP-17) adds allocation governance
G1.iv — Institutional coherence (SC / Fund Secretariat / MPTFO)	Existing (Secretariat)	Secretariat periodic report [including clarity of mandate, role, responsibility of Steering Committee, MPTFO,]	Fully evaluable
G1.v — Fiduciary and financial integrity	Existing (MPTFO)	MPTFO annual report; MPTFO processes	Fully evaluable
G1.vi — Governance [effectiveness and accountability][setup progress] [(most important leading element)] †	Existing (Secretariat)	SC meeting minutes; Cali Fund annual reports; Manual of Operations (once adopted)	Fully evaluable; if the manual of operations is adopted at COP-17, governance setup evaluable in full

<i>Pillar/Element</i>	<i>Data status</i>	<i>Data source</i>	<i>Evaluability</i>
EC1–EC5 — Enabling-condition diagnostic (cross-cutting summary)			
EC1 — Industry clarity (see P2 above)	To develop (survey)	Contributor/stakeholder survey	See P2 above †
EC2 — Business-case fit for both users and providers (<i>adapt sections in text, 6(b) and 11 (a)</i>) (see P2 above)	To develop (survey)	Contributor/stakeholder survey	See P2 above †
EC3 — Legal certainty (see P4 above and table 2)	See P4 in table 2	See P4 in table 2	EC3(a) and (c) see P4 above; EC3(b) see table 2
EC4 — Institutional readiness of indigenous peoples and local communities (see Table 2)	To develop (assessment)	Consultation of indigenous peoples and local communities; Party reports	See table 2
EC5 — Governance quality (see G1 above)	Existing (qualitative)	Secretariat; SC meeting minutes	See G1 above
<i>Colour coding:</i> green = existing data available; amber = data to be developed, instrument not yet in place, or evaluation conditional on a COP-17 decision; grey = cross-reference rows. <i>Abbreviations:</i> ABS, access and benefit-sharing; COP, Conference of the Parties; EC, enabling condition; MPTFO, Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office; SC, Steering Committee.			

Table 2

Consolidated review framework — elements not yet evaluable at the eighteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties

<i>Pillar/Element</i>	<i>Data status</i>	<i>Data source</i>	<i>Evaluability</i>
P2 — Contribution levels, trigger design, efficiency and costs			
Transaction costs and administrative burden	To develop (study)	SC-commissioned study	Evaluable at a future COP; requires dedicated study

<i>Pillar/Element</i>	<i>Data status</i>	<i>Data source</i>	<i>Evaluability</i>
P3 — Non-monetary benefits			
[Volume and type][Type, extent and recipient] of non-monetary benefits (<i>Secretariat cross check language with capacity-building document and proposes: “NMBS assessment as aligned with the GBF monitoring framework methodology for C.2”</i>)	To develop (reporting)	Database operator reports in table 1; contributor/stakeholder survey	Partially evaluable; typology and survey to be developed; with particular consideration of non-monetary benefits for indigenous peoples and local communities fully evaluable at a future COP; [extent includes the total amount and where it goes]
P4 — Mechanism’s coherence with other mechanism, including contributions to the KMGBF and complementarity with national and international ABS frameworks			
Biodiversity impact of funded activities	To develop	Secretariat; Party reports	Not yet evaluable; qualitative contribution assessment possible at a future COP.
Contribution to KMGBF Goal C/Target 13 binary indicator	Not yet evaluable	KMGBF monitoring report/PMRR	Not yet evaluable; no DSI-specific information in KMGBF Goal C/Target 13 at the moment; PMRR does not contain allocation formula data. Evaluable at a future COP.
Alignment with PMRR reporting cycles	Not yet evaluable	PMRR/Secretariat	Not yet evaluable: PMRR does not yet contain allocation formula data. Evaluable at a future COP.
EC3(b) — [contribution][obligation]-stacking risk][interactions and synergies between the operations of the Multilateral Mechanism and other multilateral access and benefit-sharing instruments] (ITPGRFA, BBNJ, WHO PABS)	To develop (protocol)	Secretariat stacking risk protocol	Not yet evaluable: Other international instruments have yet to decide whether and how to deal with the sharing of benefits from the use of digital sequence information on genetic resources within their scope. Evaluable at a future COP.
P5 — Indigenous peoples and local communities’ rights, open access and research impacts			
EC4 —Institutional readiness of indigenous peoples and local	To develop (assessment)	Consultation of indigenous peoples and local communities; Party reports	[Partially][Not yet] evaluable: Cali Fund operations not fully started. Evaluable at a future COP.

<i>Pillar/Element</i>	<i>Data status</i>	<i>Data source</i>	<i>Evaluability</i>
communities and entity designation – <i>could be considered for table 1</i>			
Benefits received by indigenous peoples and local communities and their identified or designated entities	Existing / to develop	MPTFO allocation data; consultation of indigenous peoples and local communities	Partially evaluable for factors (o) and (q) through survey or Party notification; results considered interim. Monitor in subsequent cycles.
Non-hindrance of research and innovation, including on new technologies	To develop (study)	SC study; research community consultation	Not yet evaluable: Cali Fund operations not fully started. Evaluable at a future COP.
<i>Colour coding:</i> green = existing data available; amber = data to be developed, instrument not yet in place, or evaluation conditional on a COP-17 decision; grey = cross-reference rows. Enclosure VI of decision 16/2 factors and OECD-DAC evaluation criteria are referenced in the element-level assessment records maintained by the Secretariat. <i>Abbreviations:</i> ABS, access and benefit-sharing; CBD, BBNJ, Agreement under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction; Convention on Biological Diversity; COP, Conference of the Parties; EC, enabling condition; ITPGRFA, International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture; MPTFO, Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office; PMRR, planning, monitoring, reporting and review; Steering Committee; WHO PABS, World Health Organization — Pathogen Access and Benefit-Sharing System.			

III. Methodological approach, consultation and quality assurance

10. The Steering Committee will have the oversight of this review. Data for the review is classified under three confidentiality tiers (public, restricted, sensitive) and collected through four minimum reporting templates:

- (a) MPTFO annual financial report,
- (b) Fund Secretariat annual narrative report,
- (c) Parties reporting on national implementation through a notification, and
- (d) Voluntary reporting by databases and tools on digital sequence information on genetic resources reports including on alignment with FAIR (findability, accessibility, interoperability and reuse of digital assets) and CARE (collective benefit, authority to control, responsibility, ethics) principles.

11. In addition, stakeholder consultations — including a structured questionnaire to Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities, database operators and contributors, as well as targeted consultations with indigenous peoples and local communities — will generate analytically usable evidence. Draft findings should be circulated [to stakeholders] for a comment period with all substantive comments recorded.

A. Independence and quality assurance

12. Analytical work is conducted by functionally independent evaluators free from conflicts of interest with the Steering Committee and its Secretariat, the Secretariat of the Convention, and the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office.

13. Additionally, draft findings are subject to peer review.

B. Structure of the report

14. The review report should comprise five sections:

- (a) Executive summary;
- (b) Evaluability update;
- (c) Findings by category of pillar and G1, each presented as:
 - (i) Evidence;
 - (ii) Finding;
 - (iii) Conclusion;
 - (iv) Recommendation;
- (d) Cross-cutting findings (equity, coherence, sustainability, enabling conditions); and
- (e) Proposed adjustments (major or minor)

15. Additionally, the report should contain four annexes: A: data tables; B: consultation synthesis; C: management response and D: peer review record.

C. Steering Committee response to the assessment

16. The management response is the recommendation of the Steering Committee in the report itself. Each recommendation is accepted, accepted with modification, or declined with reasons. Every accepted recommendation carries [an][a proposed] action plan entry specifying the action, responsible body, timeline and resource implications; recommendations of major revisions must be

brought to the Conference of the Parties for endorsement. A report of the implementation status of these action plans should be presented ahead of the subsequent review cycle.⁵

D. Follow-up to the report

17. Since the implementation status of the action plan from the previous review should be presented ahead of the subsequent review cycle, recommendations should be recorded as: completed on time / completed late / partially completed / not yet commenced, accompanied by an explanation for any delay and a revised timeline where appropriate. If an action in the plan is not completed with adequate explanation, it should be treated as an implementation failure and should be reported in the cross-cutting findings section of the next review report under G1.iii (quality of management response). The management response is a living document: the Steering Committee may update it between cycles to reflect changing circumstances but must report those changes to the Conference of the Parties, along with their reasons and consequences.

III. Governance, roles and responsibilities

18. The Conference of the Parties, [once a methodology is adopted,] will review [its][the final] report. The Steering Committee, as the governing body of the Multilateral Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, should [have oversight][drive] of the methodology development, data collection, and produce the final report. It should then prepare a proposal for management's response; note that the Committee is itself subject to governance assessment under G1, which is managed through the independence requirement in section II.A.

19. The [Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, currently acting as the interim] Fund Secretariat, [drives][supports] the methodology development, prepares submissions, coordinates data collection and compiles the resulting data.

20. The two mandates of the Conference of the Parties and its Secretariat, and of the Steering Committee and its interim Secretariat are distinct even while some staff might serve both entities. The circularity risk — that the Secretariat both prepares data and assists in interpreting it — is managed through the same independence provisions in section II.A: evaluators must independently verify Secretariat-supplied data against primary sources where possible, and the peer review record (as noted in para. 11 above) must document any data quality concerns raised.

21. The Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office will provide financial records through their public reporting obligations, contribution logs, disbursement data, audit reports and certified financial statements.

22. Parties will submit data as part of the planning, monitoring, reporting and review of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. Parties will also [be invited to] submit data on administrative, policy or legislative measures and incentivization of users in their jurisdiction. Finally, Parties will review draft findings as part of the review process.

23. Indigenous peoples and local communities will be consulted on CARE-compliant data handling, provide evidence on benefits received and review sensitive-tier passages.

24. Database operators [should][will be invited to] supply interface measure reports, access statistics and annual provenance data quality assessments.

25. Last, the private sector contributors [should][will be invited to] provide survey responses and inputs during consultation.

]

⁵ Steering Committee — the governing body of the Cali Fund, responsible for oversight, allocation decisions and management responses.