

Annex to Landry, J., Kok, M., Immerzeel, R., (2024). A purpose-oriented, multi-stakeholder and multi-evidence-based biodiversity global review: rationale, modalities & gaps. *Policy Brief*, N°03/24, IDDRI

TABLE. Building blocks of the biodiversity global review's multidimensional approach and their challenges

Component of the multidimensional approach	Current definition (in the Treaty, COP Decisions and SBI/4/L.6)	Gaps and challenges for COP16
<p>The GBF monitoring framework—despite being in a different COP decision (decision 15/5)—comprises the indicators supporting many components of the approach.</p>	<p>The GBF monitoring framework is composed of groups of indicators: headline indicators, capturing the overall scope of the goals and targets to be used for planning and tracking progress; global level indicators collated from binary yes/no responses; component and complementarity (optional) indicators (decision 15/5). Decision 15/6 urges all parties to use headline indicators in relevant planning processes, and requests all Parties to use headline indicators and provide responses on binary questions in their national reports, supplemented by optional indicators.</p>	<p>The monitoring framework should be finalized at COP16. Challenges and opportunities include: filling indicator gaps, ensuring clarity and coherence across monitoring levels, and securing the necessary resources for a robust monitoring and reporting system.</p>
<p>NBSAPs/national targets embody the planning exercise which should support the alignment of national strategies and actions with the global goals and targets. These are foundational nation-level and serve as core document for biodiversity planning, policy and action at the national level.</p>	<p>Each Party shall develop biodiversity national strategies, plans or programmes or adapt existing strategies, plans or programmes which shall reflect the measures set out in the Convention (article 6). COP15 requests Parties to revise and update their NBSAPs by COP16 to communicate national targets reflecting all goals and targets of the GBF, with adopted guidance.</p>	<p>As of mid-September 2024, only about 20 NBSAPs have been submitted to the CBD Secretariat, which represents a small fraction of the 196 Parties to the CBD. Similarly, 63 countries have submitted their national targets through the online reporting tool (ORT). These targets are essential for the global analysis. There are concerns that many NBSAPs and national targets submitted so far may not be fully aligned with the GBF's ambitious goals.</p>
<p>National reports represent the CBD tool for reporting on the implementation, its successes and challenges. These reports feed into global review processes, providing national-level data and insights.</p>	<p>Each Party shall report on measures which it has taken for the implementation of the Convention and their effectiveness in meeting the objectives of the Convention (article 26). COP15 requests Parties to submit their 7th and 8th reports by February 2026 and June 2029 to enable the preparation of global reviews, and adopted guidelines.</p>	<p>One of the critical tasks for COP16 will be finalizing the reporting template that Parties will use to submit their national reports. This template is essential for ensuring consistency and comparability across countries. The submission deadlines for the 7th and 8th National Reports pose significant challenges. The 7th report is due in February 2026, and it will play a pivotal role in the global review process that will take place at COP17. The timeline for these submissions is tight which could delay critical data needed for the global review. The 8th report, due in June 2029, will serve as the basis for the final review of the GBF's 2030 targets.</p>
<p>The global analysis represents the aggregation of the national targets, thus the "global" planning exercise. This provides a view of the collective ambition towards the GBF, and it can form the "backbone"—or basis—of the global review</p>	<p>The global analysis of information in NBSAPs, including national targets, is intended to assess the contribution towards the GBF considered by the COP16 and at each subsequent COP.</p>	<p>With uneven submission rates of national targets and varying levels of detail and alignment with the GBF, the global analysis may suffer from data gaps and inconsistencies. These challenges could undermine the robustness of the analysis, making it difficult for the CBD Secretariat to provide an accurate assessment. How this analysis will be integrated into the larger review process remains an area of negotiation.</p>
<p>The global review of collective progress aims to review the state of implementation and inform the COP</p>	<p>The global review of collective progress in the implementation of the GBF (including the means of implementation) will culminate with decision(s) at COP17 and COP19. Its focus is still under negotiation.</p>	<p>The adoption of modalities, inputs, and procedures for the global review remains uncertain, with several parts of the text still in brackets. The review's scope, how data will be collected and integrated, and the overall process are yet to be finalized. There are ongoing debates about how comprehensive the review should be and whether it will primarily track progress or also aim to identify solutions and corrective measures. This question of scope is critical, as it will determine whether the review acts merely as a reporting mechanism or a tool for enhancing accountability and facilitating further action.</p>
<p>The voluntary peer review is an optional mechanism that is available for countries wishing an in-depth country-by-country review.</p>	<p>The VPR was introduced at COP12 as a pilot for reviewing the implementation of NBSAPs, to help Parties to improve their capacities and subsequently provide mutual learning.</p>	<p>Since its introduction, only a few countries have participated in the VPR pilot phase, including Uganda, Sri Lanka, and Montenegro, with Ethiopia and India testing the methodology. Given its voluntary nature, the success of the VPR depends on the willingness of Parties to undergo this detailed review. Encouraging broader participation remains a challenge, as many countries may be reluctant due to capacity constraints or concerns about scrutiny. Scaling this process will require additional resources and stronger incentives for countries to participate voluntarily (Ulloa <i>et al.</i>, 2018)</p>

The open-ended forum for voluntary country reviews is also a review mechanism which is based on a "self-reporting" process and a mutual learning exercise (dialogue). It is a platform for sharing experiences, best practices and lessons learned among Parties and other stakeholders.

The open-ended forum is aimed at supporting the review of implementation of the Convention and related plans with a view to facilitating the exchange of information and experience among Parties (COP13). The forum is based on a voluntary submission of reports. The Secretariat has been piloting this forum, offering a space for exchanges on the elaboration of NBSAPs in 2023-2024, with regional and subregional dialogues.

One of the key tasks for COP16 will be finalizing the operational guidelines for the open-ended forum. This forum is designed to facilitate voluntary reviews and exchanges of best practices among Parties. The framework for how the forum will operate (who can participate, how often it will meet, and how it will integrate with other CBD review mechanisms) remains undecided

There are questions about how the forum will complement existing review processes, such as the global review. Ensuring these different mechanisms work in harmony without creating redundancies or confusion will be a significant challenge.

There are ongoing discussions about how inclusive the forum will be for non-state actors, indigenous groups, and other stakeholders. The forum's scope and how it will feed into the global review process will need to be clarified at COP16.

Information on non-State actor commitments towards the Framework, with a template to harmonize the submission of commitments to the GBF. This input is crucial for understanding the full scope of actions being taken and integrating non-state efforts into the global agenda.

The objective is to support a mechanism for tracking commitments of non-State actors in a harmonized way.

COP16 must finalize the template for submitting non-state actor commitments, which will be crucial for tracking their contributions towards the GBF's targets. However, discussions are ongoing about whether these commitments should primarily be integrated into NBSAPs and national reports and/or through a separate, complementary submission platform. This decision will influence how non-state actors' actions are recorded and monitored alongside government efforts. One key challenge is avoiding double-counting of non-state actor commitments that may already be reflected in NBSAPs.
