



Twenty-sixth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA-26)

*13–18 May, 2024
Nairobi, Kenya*

AGENDA ITEM 3: MONITORING FRAMEWORK FOR THE KUNMING-MONTREAL GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

DATE: 13MAY2024

Statement on behalf of the **International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB)** delivered by **Anne Samante**, from the Mainyoito Pastoralists Integrated Development Organization (MPIDO)

Madam Co-chair,

I am speaking on behalf of IIFB.

We believe that strong and abiding partnerships between CBD Parties and Indigenous Peoples and local communities is the bedrock for successful GBF implementation.

As peoples, we reaffirm our rights to self-determination and to own, control and manage our ancestral lands and territories, waters and other resources. Our lands and territories are at the core of our existence and are linked to our survival and our knowledge systems and cultures, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem management. We are the land and the land is us.

A new wave of land grabbing is now taking place, including for energy transition, mining, top-down conservation, digitisation and carbon markets. These threats must be urgently addressed, including through effective monitoring in partnership with Indigenous Peoples and local communities, upholding the principles of FPIC and data sharing agreements.

We welcome the AHTEG report on the monitoring framework, including incorporation of essential traditional knowledge indicators and the inter-linkages made between the AHTEG's work and that of the Working Group on Art 8j towards operationalizing the traditional knowledge indicators.

We also acknowledge the AHTEG's work on taking into consideration Section C of the Framework, pointing out that further work will be needed to fill those gaps.

We underline the significant work undertaken to develop the metadata sheets on the indicators on land use change and land tenure in the indigenous and traditional territories of Indigenous Peoples and local communities and the finding that these meet the identified criteria for headline indicators.

IIFB puts forward some proposals for SBSTTA/26/2 and SBSTTA/26/2/Add.1.



Twenty-sixth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA-26)

13–18 May, 2024

Nairobi, Kenya

In Annex 1, we propose two additions, based on the Technical and Scientific Review of the TK indicators:

1. Adopt the indicator on land tenure and land use change in the traditional territories of indigenous peoples and local communities as a headline indicator for Target 22.

2. Include the indicator **PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION AT ALL LEVELS** as a component indicator for Target 3.

In part IV of SBSTTA/26/2, Recommendations to COP-16, IIFB has text proposals in the following paragraphs:

1(d).bis: to welcome the technical and scientific review of the TK indicators;

3.bis: to adopt the land use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous peoples and local communities as a headline indicator for Target 22;

13: to add “**INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES**”;

15: to add “**COMMUNITY-BASED MONITORING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS (CBMIS)**”;

16.bis: SBI to review implementation of Section C of the GBF;

18: to add “**CBMIS**”;

19: to add “**LOCAL ASSESSMENTS**”

22: to add “**ON IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION C IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE GLOBAL REVIEW**”;

23(a): to add “**ON OPERATIONALISATION OF SECTION C**”;

23(b).bis: the CBD Secretariat to identify options and potential collaborators to address gaps identified by the AHTEG, including the development of the headline indicators 1.1 and 9.1.

On the binary indicators, IIFB has text proposals on Target 9 and 22 and in paragraph 3 in the annex to SBSTTA/25/REC/1.

The text proposals are contained in our written submission to the Secretariat. We seek Parties’ support to these proposals and a successful monitoring framework.



Twenty-sixth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA-26)

13–18 May, 2024

Nairobi, Kenya

PROPOSED ADDITIONAL TEXT (to be submitted to the Secretariat)

In SBSTTA/26/2 Part IV Recommendation

1(D).BIS WELCOMES THE TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC REVIEW ON THE TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE INDICATORS CARRIED OUT BY THE CBD SECRETARIAT UNDER UNDER THE JOINT PROGRAMME ON THE LINKS BETWEEN BIOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY (CBD/SBSTTA/26/INF/11)

3.BIS TAKES NOTE THAT THE TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE INDICATOR ON LAND USE CHANGE AND LAND TENURE IN THE TRADITIONAL TERRITORIES OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR HEADLINE INDICATORS, AND ADOPTS THIS INDICATOR AS A HEADLINE INDICATOR FOR TARGET 22, AS RECOMMENDED BY THE TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC REVIEW OF THE TK INDICATORS (26/INF/11);

13 *Urges* Parties and other Governments to invest in and strengthen their national monitoring systems, involving all relevant national institutions, **INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES** and stakeholders in a participatory manner, and collaborating with relevant international organizations and initiatives, in particular to facilitate the reporting of indicators in the seventh national report due in February 2026;

15 *Requests* the Global Environment Facility to provide financial resources for the development and implementation of national monitoring systems to support the efforts of recipient countries **AND COMMUNITY-BASED MONITORING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS**.

6.BIS *REQUESTS* THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION, AT A MEETING PRIOR TO THE SEVENTEENTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES, TO REVIEW THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION C WITHIN THE MONITORING FRAMEWORK AND CONSIDER HOW TO ADDRESS ANY TECHNICAL OR CAPACITY GAPS;

18. *Encourages* Parties and other Governments in a position to do so, as well as relevant organizations, to consider providing resources to contribute to the global monitoring systems, standards and datasets that support Parties, **AND TO COMMUNITY-BASED MONITORING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS**, in implementing the monitoring framework

19. *Encourages* Parties and other Governments, and invites other organizations to coordinate and cooperate, including in supporting Parties in strengthening national monitoring systems and in support for **LOCAL**, national, regional and global assessments;



Twenty-sixth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA-26)

13–18 May, 2024

Nairobi, Kenya

22. *Decides* to review the implementation of the monitoring framework, including the functioning and effectiveness of the headline, binary, component, complementary and national indicators **AS WELL AS THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION C**, in conjunction with the global review of collective progress in the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework to be conducted at the seventeenth and nineteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

Paragraph 23:

(a) To support methodological work on the indicators **AND ON OPERATIONALIZATION OF SECTION C**, including through working with the organizations mentioned in annex II to update the metadata, as necessary, and to share information with Parties on these updates on an ongoing basis

B.BIS TO IDENTIFY OPTIONS AND POTENTIAL COLLABORATORS TO ADDRESS GAPS IDENTIFIED BY THE AHTEG, INCLUDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HEADLINE INDICATORS 1.1 AND 9.1,

On the Binary Indicators

Paragraph 3 in the annex to SBSTTA/25/REC/1

Paragraph 3(c) Whether a country should be categorized as landlocked ~~or as having indigenous peoples~~ is based on a single yes or no question in the national reporting template. For countries that are landlocked ~~or countries that do not have indigenous peoples~~, questions on those topics should not be requested from them and will not count towards the computation of the indicator.

Rationale: All questions regarding Indigenous Peoples and local communities apply to all countries. The Convention recognizes Indigenous Peoples as well as local communities embodying traditional lifestyles for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. All countries have local communities, and should not be exempt from answering questions about them, even if they do not have Indigenous Peoples.

In relation to binary question 9.3, IIFB proposes to retain 9.3 bis

9.3 bis Does your country monitor the social, economic and environmental benefits for people, in particular groups in vulnerable situations and those most dependent on biodiversity?

In relation to binary question 9.4, IIFB proposes to resolve the bracketed text as follows:

~~{Is} {Does} your country {have legal instruments or {relevant}{other} policy frameworks} {implementing a plan} to {protect and encourage}{promote} the customary sustainable use of {wild species} {biodiversity}, {ensuring respect for the customary sustainable use} by indigenous peoples and local communities}~~ for example, **THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION**



Twenty-sixth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA-26)

13–18 May, 2024

Nairobi, Kenya

OF the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity [or other relevant initiatives]?

In relation to Target 22, IIFB proposes the following:

SUGGESTION FOR ALT INDICATOR TEXT: “NUMBER OF COUNTRIES PROMOTING (I) REPRESENTATION AND PARTICIPATION OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES, LOCAL COMMUNITIES, WOMEN, GIRLS, CHILDREN, YOUTH AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES IN DECISION-MAKING RELATED TO BIODIVERSITY; (II) ACCESS TO INFORMATION RELATED TO BIODIVERSITY; (III) ACCESS TO JUSTICE RELATED TO BIODIVERSITY; (IV) RESPECT FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES’ AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES’ CULTURES AND RIGHTS TO LANDS, TERRITORIES, RESOURCES AND TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE; AND (V) THE PROTECTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL HUMAN RIGHTS DEFENDERS”

Rationale: To be more readable and easier to identify the different elements covered. We exclude descriptors to reflect the limitations of the indicator in assessing quality and outcome. “Promoting” can better reflect the process focus of the indicator (vs. “ensuring” which indicates outcomes, but which the binary indicator cannot assess).