**Unnayan Onneshan on monitoring framework and indicators**

**The monitoring framework is very unbalanced**. A major concern for indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth is that here are no headline indicators for Targets 22 and 23. This is a major gap that needs to be urgently addressed by the AHTEG and SBSTTA.  We would like to remind the AHTEG that its mandate includes (emphasis is added): *“The Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators will work:*

*i)*                  *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 the goals and targets****of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework;”*

As Decision CBD/COP/DEC/15/5 implies, the monitoring framework is not finalised yet, para 3 states *“Also decides to consider a review of the monitoring framework in order to finish its development at its sixteenth meeting, and thereafter keep the monitoring framework under review, as appropriate;”*. As the discussions related to the drafting of targets and indicators overlapped, meaningful indicators for targets 22 and 23 weren’t sufficiently discussed at COP 15. The AHTEG should therefore explore meaningful options for all targets, including T22 and T23, particularly to monitor aspects of rights to land and resources of IPLCs and full, effective and equitable participation of IPLCs, women, youth and persons with disabilities.

**2.   Cross cutting nature of IPLC, women and youth issues**. Section C of the K-MGBF clearly states that the K-MGBF Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, including its Vision, Mission, Goals and Targets, is to be understood, acted upon, implemented, reported and evaluated, consistent with the following (considerations, each with their own paragraph), *inter-alia*: *Contribution and rights of indigenous peoples and local communities; Different value systems; Whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach; Right to development; Human rights-based approach; Gender, Inter-generational equity.*Section C must be fully taken into account in the development of indicators*.*The AHTEG and SBSTTA should consider:

How can issues related to Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, women, inter-generational equity and human rights-based approach be reflected in the headline indicators?

The Bonn expert meeting on indicators held in 2022 proposed that the headline indicators for Targets 22 and 23 (as there were two proposed headline indicators for those targets at that time) be considered as linked to indicators for all Goals and Targets, particularly for Targets 1, 2, 3 and 8. The work done by the Bonn expert meeting should be taken into account and built on, e.g. as part of the disaggregation of headline indicators.  This would provide a much better balanced and holistic monitoring framework, addressing the gaps identified at COP-15.

3.    **Community-based monitoring and information systems (CBMIS) and citizen science** can play a very important role in monitoring the implementation of the K-MGBF. Decision COP-15/5 (in paragraph 6) invites Parties and relevant organisations to support CBMIS and citizen science and their contributions to the monitoring of the K-MGBF. The AHTEG and SBSTTA should address how best can CBMIS and citizen science be integrated as a cross cutting methodology.