

Q&A document

GEF-EAS Webinar 6 - Developing a monitoring action plan and identifying national data and monitoring system needs

EN session 1

- 1. It's really good to participate in this webinar. I've gained some insights, but maybe you can suggest more literature or good examples of national monitoring frameworks to review and discuss with someone about their experiences? It can help us. However, the biggest problem I recognize is capacity, money, and the organization of biodiversity monitoring, because it's extensive. It involves hundreds, thousands of points in the process, and there's a lot of data. Also, a big question is how to not only collect the data, but also store and analyze it. Perhaps you can suggest some good examples of software to collect and analyze such data.**

Philip: Examples of monitoring frameworks vary across different countries and their levels of monitoring capacity. I can't provide a specific example to share directly with you, but it's something we can explore in the guidance. One country that stands out, although in a different context, is South Africa. They have developed an advanced system for monitoring, indicators, data production, and reporting. Learning from their experiences and adapting their approach could be valuable. You rightly acknowledge that monitoring is costly, especially for comprehensive efforts. It involves not only the technical work of producing indicators but also generating the necessary data and making investments in that process. This is why, in the suggested steps, we include the identification of costs needed for actions. As you develop the action plan, part of it involves seeking funds for implementation. The revised NBSAP should encompass costing and resource mobilization, supported by the Early Action Support Project and BIOFIN. We hope that by having a monitoring system plan that clearly outlines your needs for indicators, data, capacity, and associated costs, it becomes easier to justify the required funding. This includes potential sources within the country and external support. This work aims to raise the profile and clarity of the investment required in monitoring systems.

Jillian: South Africa serves as a noteworthy example when considering effective monitoring systems. However, it's essential to recognize the diversity of monitoring approaches. Biodiversity observation networks play a crucial role in collecting raw biodiversity data on the ground. For insights on establishing such networks, Gabon's Biodiversity Observation Network, affiliated with the Group on Earth Observation, has a valuable program called "Gabon in a Box." This program offers practical advice on building on-the-ground data collection. Looking at Columbia, particularly the success of the Humboldt Institute, provides a compelling example of a fully realized approach. Canada is currently developing a system, emphasizing decentralization with statewide and provincial-level components feeding into the national level. This decentralized model is worth exploring for countries with similar structures. For a comprehensive monitoring system spanning various indicators, Germany has undertaken significant efforts. Uganda has made strides in monitoring biodiversity through diverse ecosystem-based assessments. There are numerous

successful experiences worldwide, catering to different needs. A parallel project, facilitated by WCMC and funded by Germany, aims to create matchmaking opportunities. This initiative seeks to identify the diverse capacity needs of countries and share experiences across regions.

- 2. Are you considering organizing a new webinar or a similar event focused on the indicators mentioned in the monitoring framework for the Global Biodiversity Framework? Given the extensive list of indicators, having additional guidance on methodologies would be highly beneficial. I'm inquiring whether there are plans for specific webinars or guidelines explaining the methodologies behind these indicators. Currently, I'm conducting research through the internet to understand concepts like the red list of ecosystems and other related topics. In Indonesia, we are actively engaging in matchmaking efforts to align our indicators with the WCMC standards and the headline indicators. While we acknowledge the presence of standard indicators from WCMC, we encounter challenges when attempting to delve deeper into the metadata, especially concerning the required data variables for specific headline indicators. It would be immensely beneficial to have more comprehensive resources or initiatives that provide in-depth insights into each national headline indicator, including details on metadata, methodology, and any formulas involved in generating the results for these headline indicators. This, in my opinion, would greatly enhance our understanding and implementation of the monitoring framework.**

Jillian: We have conducted extensive training sessions, and I'd like to pass it back to Philip. WCMC has several projects aimed at offering assistance with the monitoring framework, and we're furnishing guidance through them. Numerous opportunities are available.

Philip: In addition to the guidance materials that we are currently working on and seeking your feedback for, we will embark on additional projects to provide technical assistance for countries in enhancing their monitoring capabilities. We are collaborating with UNEP, UNDP, and the CBD Secretariat on these initiatives, and they are currently in the initial stages of establishment. Additionally, addressing an earlier question, there is a need to assist countries in comprehending the indicators within the monitoring framework better. Many are seeking metadata on the indicators, including the methodology for each. However, they have encountered challenges in finding all the necessary information.

Jillian: The available metadata can be accessed on a website named [Post-2020indicators.com](https://post-2020indicators.com). It's worth noting that we are in the process of changing the name of this website. While we acknowledge the need for improvement, it currently provides some metadata. However, it's essential to recognize that the AHTEG is still in the process of developing some metadata, and as a result, the information is not yet complete. We anticipate having a more comprehensive version of the metadata available by 2026. Unfortunately, this means that for specific indicators you may have identified as lacking, a complete set of information will not be ready until that time.

- 3. Regarding the headline indicators for Decision 15.5, is there any guidance on whether we should use the headline indicators as they are? Our national indicators are quite similar to the headline indicators. Should we utilize the headline indicators for the national one, or incorporate our sub-indicators alongside the global indicators? For example, in global target number two, you have identified a mistake concerning the extent of natural ecosystems. This is likely related to the restoration aspect. In our national indicators, we also address a similar aspect that requires data variables more closely related to the extent of natural ecosystems. Specifically, the indicator mentions the number of restoration efforts in Indonesia, which is analogous to the global target. We use a kind of proxy to align with the headline indicators. Is this approach appropriate, considering the similarity between headline and national indicators?**

Jillian: In terms of the restoration aspect, the data should originate from the national system. Especially in the initial round of national reporting, considering that the methodologies for headline indicators are still in development and may not be fully operational in most countries. Sharing the information you currently have and highlighting any challenges in compiling headline indicators would be valuable. Over time, there will be a need to enhance capacity for statistical standards to facilitate comparisons with neighboring countries and support the development of regional strategies. It's essential to recognize that building this capacity will be a gradual process and may not happen overnight.

- 4. For targets involving restoration, determining the baseline can be challenging, especially when aiming to restore areas to their original state. The difficulty lies in restoring degraded areas to their pristine condition. Therefore, the question arises: what baseline should be utilized to assess the success of conservation efforts and determine when an area has genuinely been restored?**

Jillian: Regarding the management of national-level progress, the decision on choosing the baseline is entirely yours. It depends on the point from which you want to track progress. For the Global Biodiversity Framework, the baseline is set at 2020 to monitor progress towards the framework's goals. However, for restoration, it's a unique case since we don't consider all existing land as natural. Instead, we identify the percentage of degraded land as the denominator for tracking progress. It adds some complexity to this specific indicator. Still, at the national level, you have the flexibility to choose any baseline that suits your preferences.

EN session 2

- 1. How much of the national monitoring system will be implemented as part of the early actions, and how much will be implemented as part of subsequent implementation actions?**

Philip: The timetable for the completion of the GEF 7 - Early Action Support project is set for February 2025. This allows us the remainder of this year and the next for the implementation of the GEF Early Action Support project. Component 2 involves developing a monitoring system plan. The request is to create a plan for a monitoring system, not to immediately implement it. The monitoring system plan will depend on the progress of revising NBSAPs, defining actions, and determining indicators using the monitoring framework. It should also identify gaps and plan to fill them. The actual implementation of the monitoring system plan will be in the subsequent stage, possibly supported by international assistance, such as funding from the eighth project or other projects in collaboration with WCMC.

Including a section on monitoring in the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan document is advisable, as well as incorporating information from the monitoring action plan. However, the timeline for this process may vary among different countries, depending on the stages of defining targets, revising NBSAPs, and producing an action plan with a monitoring component.

- 2. According to what I've heard and understood, Parties are required to submit their targets, aligning with the GBF by COP 16. Additionally, if possible, the revised NBSAP should also be submitted. There are ongoing discussions about the binary targets in the headline, and indicators are expected to be ready by COP16. The challenge is reconciling our targets with the indicators, as highlighted. The presentation emphasizes the development of targets, and national targets are deemed as the primary targets. However, the indicators for these targets are expected to be ready by COP 16 only. The question arises: when should we revise our numbers, considering the headline indicators will be ready by COP 16? In a previous discussion, it was emphasized that using the headline global targets for revision and aligning with national targets is mandatory. It was also mentioned that countries should use their targets if headline targets are not available. If we were to wait for the headline targets, set to be ready by COP 16, how effectively can we reconcile our operational and national targets in the aligning process?**

Jillian: The concept is that the NBSAPs, particularly the national targets, will undergo revision by COP 16, within the next year. Countries are advised to utilize indicators during the revision process to assess biodiversity status and inform the revision. However, the decisions can only be based on the currently available data. Examining the target template, it doesn't suggest identifying indicators during the NBSAP development process; rather, it emphasizes monitoring the NBSAP over time. National reports serve as one means of monitoring the NBSAP. The focus over the next decade is to ensure the NBSAP stays on track by monitoring actions and progress through indicators. Even if the specific indicators are not available, countries can still declare their intent to use them. For example, in the case of the restoration indicator, a country may commit to using it despite lacking current data. When assessing progress towards the NBSAP in four years, having the indicator data by then would provide insight into the NBSAP's implementation. In essence, the key message is to use the available data, align national targets swiftly by next year, and progressively incorporate more data into the planning process.

3. This implies that we can utilize national data for indicators without necessarily waiting for global health indicators. Is my understanding correct?

Philip: Yes, initially, as the headline indicators become available, it's advisable to use them. However, in the interim, it's acceptable to utilize national indicators and data. That's why, in our recommendations for the monitoring system action plan, we suggest identifying the current available data and headline indicators, as well as other indicators in the monitoring framework that could be utilized. Assess the development status of each indicator for every target and create a plan for developing additional indicators to measure future targets. This approach is what we are recommending. If feasible, estimate the cost of this plan, as it could be incorporated into future work.

4. I have a question regarding the resources available for implementing the monitoring system. Specifically, I am referring to financial resources and human resources. I would like to inquire about the sources of funding and the human resources allocated for the implementation of the monitoring system.

Philip: Our resources are typically available for the implementation of your monitoring action plan. This may be part of your international support, including funding for the revision of your NBSAP and the production of the revised NBSAP in consultation with stakeholders. Some of this funding is also allocated for the creation of your seventh national report to the CPD, which is integral to implementing the monitoring framework. In the monitoring action plan, we recommend including an identification of the costs associated with producing the indicators and conducting monitoring. It's essential to identify potential resources for these costs, both from national sources through national resource mobilization and from international support. This aligns with component 4 of the actual support project, focusing on cost monitoring and NBSAPs, supported particularly by UNDP and BIOFIN.

Jillian: There is existing data that can be utilized to develop the indicators outlined in the monitoring framework. Data sources include GBIF, remote sensing, and information collected through various national initiatives. The initial step in creating the monitoring action plan is to identify what data is already available and assess how it can be used to compile different indicators. It's acknowledged that there are data gaps in these sources, with uneven collection of observation data worldwide. This initial assessment provides insight into the available data for indicator creation and highlights areas where additional data collection may be necessary.

During the last webinar, the Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Networks (GEOBON) was mentioned. GEOBON plays a crucial role in consolidating raw data to facilitate future indicator creation. Global data based on different models and systems is also accessible, such as the UNEP-WCMC Target Tracker or UN Biodiversity Lab. While some data is available, there is a need to identify gaps and address them. As Philip mentioned, there is hope for future resources to support this effort, potentially through the GEF and other projects.

SP session

- 1. Within the GBF monitoring framework, is it possible to implement pilot projects? Can pilot projects be carried out?**

Roberto: Yes, you can use pilot projects, especially concerning the information you provide. It depends on the indicator. As we know, there are several indicators that are not well-developed, and the capacity varies among the Parties. So, if you are collecting information, the first option that Jillian mentioned in her presentation is that countries can report their own national data. We do not expect a perfect indicator or data, but any information that can serve as a foundation and then be complemented. This also helps identify options and opportunities to support capacity and the development of the necessary data and information for the reporting and monitoring process.

- 2. What part of the National Surveillance or Monitoring System will be implemented as part of the initial measures? In other words, in this first stage, what part will be part of the subsequent implementation actions?**

Philip: I believe the question refers to the scheduling or sequence of activities for the Early Support Project in relation to the calendar each country will follow to develop and update its National Biodiversity Strategy. Component 2 of this project requests country that decide to work on this component to produce an action plan for its monitoring system. However, it's important to understand this as an action plan, but not necessarily to implement monitoring actions during this period. In the draft guidance, we have suggested developing a plan that identifies the current situation regarding goals, indicators, and capacity, and then creating an action plan to develop new indicators using the monitoring framework. Each country may have its own distinct activity calendar based on its procedures and government steps for updating its National Biodiversity Strategy and the system. Therefore, the monitoring system planning should align and coincide with this national schedule. It's a phased process.

- 3. As part of the Early Actions, we are developing a needs assessment to implement the headline indicators. We have encountered concerns and difficulties regarding indicators that still lack a methodology or are not yet defined. How is this being addressed, and what recommendations are being provided to identify the needs of an indicator that is not entirely established? On one hand, the primary needs are financing and personnel. Once these needs are identified, which are clear and common to all countries, the monitoring plan states that it must include a financing plan. However, securing financing is also a challenge. What support or recommendations are available to obtain this funding? Which entity will provide mechanisms to continue or implement these indicators at the national level?**

Philip: The monitoring framework is currently in development, and the expert group responsible for creating the framework is in the middle of their work. Consequently, not all information about the indicators is available yet, and as communicated by the CBD Secretariat, it might not be until

COP 16 that much of the information about the indicators and the data explaining their methodologies becomes accessible. Even then, there may still be gaps in the framework due to various reasons. However, we anticipate that there will be more information on the available indicators in the coming months. Our center is collaborating with the CBD Secretariat to find ways to provide more information about the indicators, but we also need to respect the process of the expert group's work in this regard. We understand that it can be frustrating not to have more information about the indicators to comprehend them. In this situation, we believe we should work with what we have today. Therefore, we suggest progressing with the formulation of new objectives for your national strategy and identifying indicators for these objectives. Evaluate the national indicators you already have and explore the possibilities of using indicators in the monitoring framework. This process will likely identify cases where there are needs for additional indicators that cannot be met yet. In the monitoring system action plan, we propose identifying, for each national objective, the available and desired indicators, considering the headline indicators framework, etc., and creating an action plan for developing these indicators. This could be a process lasting over a year, aligning with the national objective definition process and the definition of indicators to measure progress.

Philip: Regarding financing, it is indeed essential to have funding and experienced, trained personnel to produce the indicators and implement a monitoring system. In the guidance team draft that we are providing, we suggest using an indicator specification template. This template encompasses the technical definition of the indicator, its methodology, and the necessary capacities to produce the indicator. This includes skilled individuals to handle the technical aspects, work with data, produce indicator results, and communicate them. It also involves an indicator and monitoring system required for organizing the collection and primary data gathering to feed the indicator, covering biodiversity data or other aspects within the global framework. This indicator specification template includes sections to guide the definition of these elements. We propose identifying the necessary activities to produce the indicators, estimating the costs, and determining the institutional organization needed for this. Afterward, consolidate this information in your monitoring action plan document. This allows you to communicate and justify the indicators you wish to have or already possess, what is required to produce these indicators (including costs), and possibly identify potential funding sources. The financing aspect is addressed in the Early Action Support project, specifically in its component 4, supported by UNDP and BIOFIN, among others. The plan is expected to include a definition of the costs involved in monitoring. Therefore, one step is to identify the necessary costs and then seek funding, devising a resource mobilization plan, whether from national or international sources. Having a document that clearly outlines the needs and costs, such as a monitoring plan, facilitates the process of obtaining the necessary funding.

Cassandra: Regarding the last point that Philip mentioned about component four of the Early Action Support Project for aligning national strategies and action plans with the global framework, we already have a webinar that took place earlier this year. You can enter the Learning for Nature website using [this link](#) and review all the content of this initial webinar on biodiversity financing with our BIOFIN colleagues. It was introductory, and we will have a series of webinars on this

topic at the beginning of next year, which I believe aligns well with having addressed monitoring first.

- 4. From Ecuador, we have somewhat similar doubts and with the answers we have received, we maintain these doubts because maybe we, at the national level, are misunderstanding the process of this Early Action Support initiative, and the updating of national strategies and action plans. We understood that the work we are doing, aligning these documents with the new Global Biodiversity Framework, was precisely to have these updated tools so that the country could better work towards achieving not only this global framework, but also the SDGs. So, the fact that the guidelines to identify or prioritize national indicators based on global indicators are not ready doesn't concern us, because that is the process we are in now, for example, in Ecuador. It has been a bit complex to work on both components 1 and 2 simultaneously due to time constraints imposed by the initiative, but we see that one feeds into the other, and if one lacks information, so does the other. Therefore, we will work based on that, perhaps making assumptions or using the indicators we already had as a country, trying to align ourselves with the overall objectives or the new general targets of the new Global Biodiversity Framework, without having a specific alignment towards specific indicators. I understood that the indicators are suggested. Does it mean that the country can choose to work on one or another indicator, or is it necessary to work on all global indicators, and the country has to build the other indicators? Also, in the context of reporting, three reporting options to the CBD were mentioned. Does it mean we have to work on all three, or can the country choose which reporting option to provide according to its situation, data collection, data availability, and capacities? Is what we are doing under this NBSAP initiative specifically for an initial action to have the National Strategy and Action Plan updated in line with the new global framework, or are we also thinking about reporting? In that sense, indeed, as Philip said, that takes much more time.**

Philip: Regarding your question about the ambition of your work to update your national strategy, I believe it is crucial for each country to undertake this update based on its specific needs and priorities, while aligning with the new global biodiversity framework, its goals, and monitoring framework. The aim is to ensure that national strategies contribute to achieving the Global Framework's objectives. As I understood it, there is a need to produce the seventh national reports to the Convention on Biological Diversity, scheduled for 2026, during COP. For these national reports, the decision of COP15 and the recommendation from the Convention's Secretariat suggest using indicators from the framework of each country, if feasible. This involves utilizing existing indicators with established methodologies that can be calculated at the national level using acceptable data. These primary indicators should be used, if possible. However, countries have the flexibility to incorporate additional indicators to complement the core ones. It's crucial not to conflate the reporting timeline with the schedule for updating the national strategy, which should follow the country's own work cycle.

Roberto: The decision 15/6 urges parties to use headline indicators and the three options mentioned. The first option, for example, is the index. The Red List Index exactly. It has a global option where one can extract data themselves. This first option involves using existing global data. The second option is for parties to provide their own data. The third option is the one that says if we can't use this indicator, what are the reasons why one can't use it? Here, you can mention the capacity you have, the level of development you are at, as the colleague from Peru mentioned, there are several indicators for which there is no capacity, no methodology, and one cannot decide at the moment how to use them, so there is flexibility. In theory, if you adopt the headline indicators, other indicators, including national indicators, are optional, and this is for global-level monitoring.

- 5. We are currently conducting an analysis of the monitoring structure of the current National Biodiversity Strategy. But I wanted to know if you have identified any exemplary cases globally or in Latin America that we can use as an aspirational example of how the system should look, either based on the process you are currently undergoing or on the monitoring system itself, for example, regarding Goal A. This is more to extract lessons learned.**

Philip: I don't have a document at hand that I can share as an exemplary case. Unfortunately, in the subregion, we are familiar with the colleagues from the Humboldt Institute in Colombia. Colombia has made significant progress in developing a biodiversity monitoring system, and there are other institutions in the country that contribute to marine issues, such as the Amazon Center, which has created information gathering and communication systems. So, the Colombian experience is interesting and useful for learning about both technical and institutional monitoring systems. Obviously, this needs adaptation to each situation, and the colleagues at Humboldt would be willing to share their experience. In Mexico, CONABIO has also developed comprehensive biodiversity monitoring systems. In other parts of the world, South Africa is an example where the South African National Biodiversity Institute has an advanced system for data, indicators, analysis, and maps on species and ecosystems, supporting policy formation. However, it's worth noting that in these examples, there is a national institution responsible for developing biodiversity information to support policy, requiring a certain level of investment and capacity for such an institute. This may not be suitable for every country, and different models and ways of organizing a monitoring system need consideration, perhaps based on sectors of interest. Nonetheless, we can learn from the capabilities of other countries.

- 6. I have been asked for collaboration to initiate the updating process, especially the establishment of the new monitoring system aligned with the adjusted strategy to the new framework. My intention is to share that the Ministry of Environment, with the support of the UNDP, has started the review of the decision framework and compared it with our National Biodiversity Strategy, approved and published in 2016. We have conducted an initial assessment, evaluating our ambitious and powerful strategy by aligning it with the new framework. This process has been challenging, considering the tight timelines due to the ongoing change in government in Ecuador. First, we examined the current state of our National**

Biodiversity Strategy and then reviewed the national monitoring process, which involves collaboration among various institutions, public and private. While the collaborative efforts partially fulfilled the vision of the National Plan, we identified discrepancies. Now, in the evaluation phase, we are scrutinizing how we monitor and track our current strategy, which comprises 19 policy objectives, 24 national targets, and action plans with impact indicators. It aligns with the Aichi Targets, and we are comparing it with the new framework. We are seeking observations and feedback to improve our process. We are currently analyzing the alignment with the Aichi Targets, facing certain complications as a perfect 1-to-1 alignment is challenging. We are particularly struggling with the alignment of goals provided in the common framework with the binary headline indicators. We are prioritizing efforts to assess the alignment, comparing current national goals and indicators with the framework's suggested ones. Additionally, we are evaluating the real national capacity for reporting, considering reliable data sources for periodic reporting. We are grappling with the challenge of achieving impactful biodiversity results by 2030 with the limited time available. We have two main challenges: understanding the alignment between goals and headline indicators, and receiving feedback on the prioritization process. We are exploring how much our existing goals align with the new framework and considering the available institutional capacity for effective reporting. The feedback received in this session will be valuable for addressing these challenges.

Philip: Well, on one hand, I understand your difficulty in aligning your current integrators with the monitoring framework because unfortunately, there isn't much information on the integrators in this monitoring framework. During the coming year, there will be more information available, and I hope that our center can be part of providing this information. So, my personal suggestion is, first, seek to update your national objectives to align with and contribute to the global framework. However, ensure these national objectives are suitable for your own situation and country's priorities. I believe it's essential to strike a balance between your national situation, priorities, and the demands of the global framework. Having defined your national goal or objective, then look into how to measure it, how to have indicators for this. I agree with Diego Colina that the work of components 1 and 2 of this Early Action Support Project will likely run parallel, defining a goal and identifying indicators to measure the national goal. As we suggest in the guidance document we'll share with you, the process involves identifying the current indicators and monitoring systems you have for each goal or topic that the goal covers. Then, examine the monitoring and indicator framework to see if these indicators can be used. Based on this analysis, create an action plan for the realization of these indicators. This action plan might say that at this moment, we don't have the necessary information to define the indicator, but we know that, for example, for the second goal of the global framework on ecosystem restoration; we might say that currently, we don't have a defined national indicator for ecosystem restoration, but we will create a plan to have such an indicator by 2025. By then, we'll also have more information about the global framework and the monitoring framework and its headline indicators. So, for this component 2 of the Early Action Project, your monitoring system action plan could state that for each national goal, this is our current situation, this is our intention on how to define the goals and their indicators. And at

this point, it becomes the action plan. This action plan will also include capacity development needs, securing financing, and we hope that this template will be helpful.

Roberto: I believe the work of the indicator experts is to fine-tune to the framework. The idea is to provide the necessary information, the data needed to produce headline indicators. If one knows the goal or objective, for example, the provision of ecosystem services, technically, there may not be a methodology; but if one has information on certain services in their current monitoring system, they can identify whether there is capacity, lack of capacity, or potential for development, depending on the situation. So, by March 2024, they should know the production not only of headline indicators, but also of the binary indicators they are currently working on. As Philip mentioned at the beginning, the level of development varies significantly depending on the indicators, but efforts are being made to improve and redefine these indicators to make alignment easier and national capacity feasible.

FR session

- 1. It is worth noting that while Decision 15/16, which frames the monitoring framework, was adopted at COP15, the current list of indicators still has limitations. Work is ongoing to address these limitations, such as indicators without a calculation methodology and those not applicable to all parties. For instance, the binary responses have two positive and two negative options but lack a category to indicate that the indicator is not relevant to the country. My main concern is interoperability. I want to inquire about how to effectively integrate the GBF monitoring framework into existing national monitoring systems. I stress the need to integrate it without duplication, allowing for the streamlining of data collection and reporting processes. It's crucial to ensure that GBF monitoring indicators are appropriately considered in sectoral strategies. Additionally, I would like to ask about the guide's availability. Is it specific to the GBF monitoring framework or is it a general guide for national monitoring systems?**

Justine interpreting for Philip: Indeed, the indicators are not yet complete. In the context of these indicators, our suggestion in the guide presented today, which is still under development and will be further elaborated in the coming days, is that Parties should first identify the indicators they currently have. Then, they should examine the monitoring framework to identify key indicators and determine if there are global or national indicators that could be useful. Afterward, these identified indicators should be integrated into the national report. As explained by Philippe, Component 2 specifically involves creating a document outlining the objectives or targets that have been identified or modified, along with determining which indicators could be used for this purpose. Naturally, some indicators are still in the process of development. It's an ongoing work.

Jillian: The monitoring framework has been tailored to be nationally relevant. As countries examine this framework and its indicators, they can identify indicators that contribute to national policy making. While some indicators are still under development, they were adopted because

parties deemed them crucial for national policymaking. As countries progress in establishing their monitoring systems, the monitoring framework is expected to be a valuable tool.

2. Regarding national capacity building, are you planning a strategy to support national teams in their ongoing work, or is your support limited to the webinar series that you are currently organizing?

Justine interpreting for Philip: The guide presented today is part of the support for capacity building. This guide, still in draft form, will soon be available for countries and stakeholders to review, provide comments or suggestions on its sections, and identify any missing topics. In partnership with UNDP, UNEP, and the CBD Secretariat, UN Environment World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) leads Component 2 of the GEF Action Support Project. Planned actions for the next year include another series of webinars, possible workshops, and the initiation of a project to offer more substantial technical support to countries, supported by the German Federal Government's Climate Initiative (IKI). These initiatives aim to provide countries with increased resources and support. As mentioned by my colleague Philippe, you are encouraged to send your action plans or any questions for assistance by email: philip.Bubb@unep-wcmc.org. While support may be somewhat limited due to the involvement of various stakeholders, the team is committed to doing its best to assist.

Justine interpreting for Philip: There is no single definition for what constitutes a monitoring framework, and it is up to each country to develop one that suits its specific needs and situation. Some subjects may be easier to address than others, and there may be areas where you already have well-established data and processes. The recommendation is to start by developing those subjects, review the GBF, and create a plan for how to develop indicators based on those areas where you already have a well-established process. Additionally, Parties should adhere to their own timeline and schedule, ensuring that the process aligns with your national context to meet your spanb requirements.

RUS session

- 1. I serve as the project manager for the EAS project in Uzbekistan. Our project is structured around four key components. The first focuses on aligning our national goals and existing NBSAPs with the GBF. By September 2024, we aim to propose new target programs for Uzbekistan that align with the GBF to the CBD Secretariat. The second component focuses on the monitoring system. Despite having a national strategy action plan in place until 2028, preliminary consultations with the government indicate the need for revisions to meet 2030 goals. It's currently unclear whether we'll revise our targets only by September 2024. Consequently, the monitoring system must be designed based on these targets. In essence, we need to establish our national targets now and subsequently develop a monitoring system to track task implementation and changes in target indicators. We have a comprehensive set of legislative acts that outlines our entire monitoring system.**

This system can be categorized into two components: monitoring biodiversity itself, and monitoring the implementation of government decisions. Currently, our project is in the phase of evaluating the existing monitoring system in Uzbekistan, assessing its alignment with the global program. The second aspect involves providing recommendations to enhance this system. Today, the speaker highlighted the imminent need to develop indicators for a goal that hasn't been clearly defined yet. This poses a challenge, as the creation of an effective indicator system and its corresponding monitoring framework involves institutional considerations, such as identifying responsible Parties and securing sponsorship for data provision. Financial and legal reinforcement is crucial, necessitating a regulatory framework to delineate responsibilities for collecting, analyzing, storing, and providing data. This raises the question of whether we might be moving too quickly in defining the national monitoring system without having new national targets officially approved.

Philip: I agree in one way that it is not possible to define all the indicators and the monitoring system right now, because the national targets are not yet finalized and the monitoring framework and its headline indicators are still in development. Our guidance materials consider this situation where the targets are still being defined and the monitoring framework is still being developed. What the Early Action Support project is calling for is actually creating a monitoring system action plan. So, it's a document outlining how you will develop your monitoring system. It doesn't mean you have to decide all the details of your monitoring system now. It's a plan that recognizes that for the next year or whatever time frame you have in your country, you're going to be defining targets and indicators for those targets. It's a step-by-step guide for developing your monitoring system as things progress.

So, in this plan, we recommend having a section dedicated to your monitoring system action plan. Each national target should have its own section. For well-established targets like protected areas, where you may already have indicators and a monitoring system, figure out how to incorporate headline indicators and other relevant ones into your monitoring framework. Make a plan for including these in your national reports and future needs. For other sub-targets, especially those newly introduced in the Global Biodiversity Framework, or those not well-established in your country, you might need to create new targets and develop indicators and a monitoring system for them. This will require additional work plans, and depending on your country's timetable and development process, you might set a timeframe, maybe a year or more, to collaborate with stakeholders and define these targets.

The monitoring framework is still under development, with gaps in indicators and limited information on methods. Therefore, our suggestion is to work with the information currently at your disposal. Make a plan based on what's available in your country and the existing monitoring framework. Then, in the coming months or next year, update the plan as more information becomes available for monitoring in the framework.

- 2. I am the national coordinator of the EAS project in Tajikistan. Currently, we are implementing two prioritized components of the project, namely Component 1 and Component 4. However, recognizing the interconnectedness of all four components, I'm interested in understanding to what extent the information shared in today's webinar can directly contribute to the implementation of the first component, specifically in formulating updated goals and developing key sections of our strategy. In alignment with our colleague from Uzbekistan, I acknowledge that the existing legislation in our countries, including Tajikistan, already addresses various aspects of environmental monitoring. This might explain our decision not to implement Component 2 so far. I would appreciate guidance on how we can leverage the information presented today to enhance our efforts in the first and fourth components.**

Philip: Executing the project is a process tailored to your country's needs and decisions on how to proceed with the EAS project rest with you. You can collaborate with the UNDP or UNEP Project manager to hash out the specifics of working with different components. As for integrating the work on Component 2 into Component 1, Component 1 revolves around aligning your targets with the Global Biodiversity Framework. It makes sense to concurrently address how you'll measure these targets using indicators, considering the monitoring framework. The guidance for Component 1 touches on this aspect. As a preliminary step, when developing your targets, consider identifying the indicators that will gauge their achievement—similar to what Component 2 is accomplishing. Account for the monitoring framework in this process. Component 2 involves creating a monitoring system action plan, evaluating your current national indicators and monitoring infrastructure, and determining future needs. If you prefer not to delve into producing an action plan at this stage, that decision aligns with what you believe is best for your situation.

3. What sources of funding might be available for a monitoring system?

Philip: It's crucial to incorporate your monitoring system plan and its associated costs into the NBSAP activities, ensuring a clear understanding of the financial requirements. International support, such as that from the EAS project, can aid in planning and executing your monitoring system. Component 2 involves creating a National Monitoring System Action Plan, a tailored document reflecting national needs and circumstances. This plan outlines the current indicators and monitoring systems, identifies gaps for new targets and indicators, and proposes strategies to fill those gaps. Costing details, specifying the financial resources required, are an integral part of this plan. Consider integrating this monitoring system action plan as a chapter or annex in your NBSAPs if it aligns with your timetable. Component 4 of the EAS project, led by UNDP and the BIOFIN team, focuses on costing actions and identifying potential funding sources. Aligning your monitoring system action plan, complete with costs and funding possibilities, with this component's work is advisable. While future guidance may delve into linking monitoring and resource mobilization, the goal is to have a comprehensive package within your updated NBSAP. This package can then be presented to your country, government, and donors, outlining your biodiversity strategy, monitoring approach, required resources, and capacity needs. This holistic presentation may enhance your chances of securing the necessary funding.

- 4. For COP 16, countries are expected to report on their national targets aligned with the Global Biodiversity Framework, including the headline indicators they intend to use. Meeting this deadline is indeed a significant challenge given the limited timeframe.**

Jillian Campbell suggested in her presentation that countries should use a reporting template. While there's advice to report as much as possible by COP 16, it's more important not to rush the process. Instead, focus on gathering information, consulting with stakeholders, and reaching agreements on national targets and indicators based on your country's circumstances. Taking the time to do this thoroughly is considered more important than trying to meet the COP 16 deadline quickly.