

Meeting Report

24/02/2026

Second Expert Workshop on Traditional Knowledge Indicators 29 – 31 January 2026

1. Context and primary objectives of the meeting

The Second Expert Workshop on Traditional Knowledge Indicators was co-hosted by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Secretariat, Forest Peoples Programme (FPP) and the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) between 29th – 31st January 2026. The central aim of the workshop was to build understanding of the factors enabling or preventing countries from taking steps towards the use of the adopted indicators of the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGBF)¹ and the inclusive approach to the KMGBF monitoring set out in KMGBF Section C. To achieve this aim, the workshop set out the following objectives:

- To share experiences from CBD Parties², Indigenous Peoples and local communities on the use of rights-based and Traditional Knowledge (TK) indicators, and contributions to 7th National Reports³ to the CBD.
- To provide updates on the status, methodological development, and data availability for TK and rights-based indicators, informed by recent pilot use cases.
- To strengthen understanding of rights-based approaches, Community Based Monitoring and Information Systems (CBMIS), and Indigenous and local knowledge in biodiversity monitoring, including their integration into national monitoring systems and reporting.
- To identify good practices, support needs, and mechanisms to link community-level data with national monitoring and reporting frameworks, including engagement with national focal points.
- To discuss next steps to advance rights-based monitoring.

2. Key insights, messages and conclusions

- Methodologies for the five rights-based indicators considered in this workshop are fully operational; however, theoretical developments and guidance to facilitate their use are needed for the component indicators on linguistic diversity and participation. Among the seven countries represented in the present workshop, validated national data were not available for these indicators due to a range of identified challenges.
- Indigenous and local communities have existing methods, some sophisticated, for biodiversity monitoring, but the knowledge and data generated through community biodiversity monitoring and information systems may not be known or align neatly with national monitoring and reporting systems, creating a missed opportunity for leveraging data from all sources.
- The participants from different countries shared their plans, progress and experiences with regard to the assessed KMGBF rights-based indicators (see Box 1).
- Participants identified a range of institutional, practical and methodological needs to advance rights-based monitoring.
- Rights-based monitoring concerns not only *what* information and data are used but also *how* monitoring takes place. Data disaggregation is vital for monitoring rights-based implementation of the KMGBF.

¹ [Decision 15/5](#), hereinafter referred to as the monitoring framework

² <https://www.cbd.int/information/parties.shtml>

³ <https://www.cbd.int/reports>

- Taking a rights-based approach when monitoring helps to deliver the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGBF) in line with the global vision and commitment.

Box 1: Summary of use of the examined rights-based indicators

In **Colombia**, the National Commission on Indigenous Territories (CNTI) work alongside the Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt⁴ to develop geographic information systems (GIS) that combine Indigenous data and government data to evidence biodiversity trends on Indigenous lands and territories. This work contributes to Headline Indicator 22.1⁵ of the monitoring framework (“*Land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous peoples and local communities*”).

Finland formally defined traditional occupations of the Sámi people, encompassing reindeer herding, fishing, hunting, handicrafts, foraging, and tourism based on traditional occupations. Proxy data are available for three of these occupations, but national data cannot be disaggregated by ethnicity, thereby limiting some contextualized approaches to reporting progress towards KMGBF Target 9, using headline indicator 9.2 of the monitoring framework (“*Percentage of the population in traditional occupations*”). The Sámi Parliament has some additional data, yet it is not possible at present to identify how many of the Sámi engage in at least one traditional occupation or a metric of the importance of traditional occupations. With regard to the other indicators:

- Finland can address an element of Headline Indicator 22.1 by calculating Headline Indicator A.2 (“*Extent of natural ecosystems*”) separately for the Sámi Homeland.

Kenya is using Headline Indicator 22.1, with the indicator highlighting intersections between land governance, biodiversity monitoring and the rights of Indigenous Peoples. A national process is underway working across government ministries and with local communities to identify and collate data sources for the indicator and, in future, to align land use change and land tenure data with other systems for biodiversity monitoring. With regard to the other indicators:

- No structured reporting mechanism is currently in place in Kenya for Headline Indicator 9.2. Relevant data may exist within national statistical systems, but formal technical assessment is still required.
- Gender considerations are integrated within broader NBSAP alignment processes; however, a dedicated monitoring framework specific to indicator 23.CT.2 (Indicator on national implementation of the Gender Plan of Action) has not yet been established in Kenya.
- 21.CT.3 (Index of Linguistic diversity) and 21.CT.2 (Respect and safeguards for traditional knowledge): Kenya has policy and legal provisions recognizing cultural rights and traditional knowledge, but these are not currently monitored through CBD-aligned indicator frameworks.

The Philippine Association for Intercultural Development (PAFID) have been using participatory mapping to generate evidence on trends in traditional occupations and livelihoods, trends in Indigenous languages, and trends in biodiversity on the lands and territories managed by Indigenous Peoples: with a clear indication that areas where traditional occupations are practiced align with areas of enhanced biodiversity. This is used as a contribution to Headline indicator 9.2. The organization “Partners for Indigenous Knowledge Philippines” is collecting data on traditional occupations which can be gender-disaggregated, but this data often covers a few small spatial areas in the **Philippines** and is therefore not representative of the whole country.

⁴ <https://www.humboldt.org.co/>

⁵ <https://www.gbf-indicators.org/metadata/headline/22-1>

Table of Contents

1. Context and primary objectives of the meeting	1
2. Key insights, messages and conclusions	1
3. Summary of the workshop proceedings	3
Introduction and Welcome	3
Session 1: Setting the scene	4
Session 2: Key considerations regarding rights-based indicators	5
Session 3: Land tenure and land use indicator: introduction from the indicator experts	5
Session 3 continued: Country experiences on linking local data to the national level for indicator 22.1	6
Session 4: Experiences with monitoring traditional occupations and youth-responsive monitoring	8
Session 5: Traditional Occupations	9
Session 6: Gender considerations in rights-based monitoring and GPA indicator	10
Session 6 guided group exercise on gender-responsive monitoring	11
Session 7: Youth-responsive monitoring	12
Session 8: Indicator on linguistic diversity	14
Session 9: Gaps in rights-based monitoring and entry points for increasing uptake of TK and rights-based indicators	14
Session 10: Approaches and options for further operationalization of rights-based indicators	15
2. Contact persons related to the outcome of the meeting	16
3. Annexes	16
Annex 1: List of workshop participants	16
Annex 2: Workshop agenda	17
Annex 3: Summary of the status of the indicator: Index of Linguistic Diversity	18

3. Summary of the workshop proceedings

Introduction and Welcome

Melissa de Kock, Deputy Director of UNEP-WCMC, Olivier Rukundo, Head of the Peoples and Biodiversity Unit at the CBD Secretariat, and Maurizio Farhan Ferrari, Senior Policy Advisor at Forest Peoples Programme, welcomed participants and introduced the workshop. Key messages included:

- The 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP17) to the CBD will be a key stock-taking moment to understand progress towards the implementation of the KMGBF, yet there is a major lack of data to measure progress. The present workshop could directly inform the deliberations at the CBD Subsidiary Bodies on implementation (SBI) and on scientific, technical and technological advice (SBSTTA) as well as COP17.

- While evidence shows that rights-based approaches can work to strengthen biodiversity management and monitoring, this evidence base needs to be expanded, made accessible, and better linked to policy, including honest reflection on trade-offs or what has not worked.
- The KMGBF calls for a whole of government, whole-of-society approach, integrating the knowledge of Indigenous Peoples (IP) and local communities (LC), socio-ecological data, and qualitative experiences and examples from the ground.
- Gender, justice, and intergenerational equity are central to rights-based conservation and biodiversity management, and producing practical evidence is crucial to showing how equitable approaches work in practice.

Participants responded to an opening question, “What does monitoring mean to you?”, with answers such as:

- “We monitor what we value, and we value what we monitor.”
- “Monitoring means keeping an eye on something that matters. Ideally, we can do that with common indicators in a systematic way and use this data together to guide policy and decision making.”
- “Local groups may not know everything about the KMGBF, but they have their actions. The information from the national level doesn’t always reach the local people. Monitoring is being done by local groups, hearing, observing and saying ‘this is what the government has committed to, what are we doing?’”
- Monitoring is a practical action serving to connect people with biodiversity and its management.
- Monitoring makes the invisible visible.
- Monitoring supports transparency, compliance, and accountability.

Session 1: Setting the scene

Céire Booth, Lead of the Focal Initiative on Nature, Gender & Rights at UNEP-WCMC, opened by outlining the mandates for rights-based monitoring and introduced the four TK indicators and the Gender Plan of Action indicator. Ayesha Wijesekera, Programme Officer at UNEP-WCMC, provided an overview of the monitoring framework and its categories of indicators.

Maurizio Farhan Ferrari, FPP, provided an overview of the history of the four TK indicators⁶ from COP7 to COP13, highlighting the Indigenous-led process to shape the indicators. Mr. Farhan Ferrari presented an overview of Decision 12/12⁷ on Article 8(j) and related provisions and Decision 15/5⁸ on the monitoring framework, which includes support for CBMIS and citizen science. Examples of CBMIS from the Transformative Pathways project were shared, followed by an overview of data sources such as Local Biodiversity Outlooks⁹ (LBO) and the Indigenous Navigator¹⁰. The steps to further operationalize TK indicators were outlined, with reference to the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB) working group on indicators, technical discussions at CBD Subsidiary Body on Article 8(j) and Other Provisions of the Convention Related to Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (SB8j) and SBSTTA, the possible application of the Indigenous Navigator’s Biodiversity Module, and potential collaboration with technical working groups and interested Parties.

Olivier Rukundo, CBD Secretariat, highlighted the relevance of the present workshop discussions for ongoing deliberations under the CBD. Mr. Rukundo shared updates on the establishment of the SB8j and the related programme of work, noting that the SB8j will be advising on the inclusion of TK within the upcoming Global Report on Progress Towards the Implementation of the KMGBF. Based on an analysis conducted by the CBD Secretariat for SBI-6, 58 CBD Parties had submitted National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPS), with 76% of those mentioning IPLCs. A third of these Parties reference the engagement and participation of IPLCs, and very few reference Section C. Mr. Rukundo concluded by highlighting COP17 as a key opportunity to strengthen reporting using TK and using the TK indicators.

⁶ Adopted as Headline Indicator [9.2 Percentage of the population in traditional occupations](#); [Headline Indicator 22.1 Land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous peoples and local communities](#); Indicator 21.CT.3 Index of Linguistic Diversity; and 21.CT.2 Participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in decision-making related to the implementation of the CBD at all levels

⁷ <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-12/cop-12-dec-12-en.pdf>

⁸ <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-15/cop-15-dec-05-en.pdf>

⁹ <https://localbiodiversityoutlooks.net/>

¹⁰ <https://indigenousnavigator.org/>

Session 2: Key considerations regarding rights-based indicators

Olivier Rukundo, CBD Secretariat, facilitated the session on understanding considerations regarding rights-based indicators, including the traditional knowledge indicators, for the implementation of the KMGBF (addressing [CBD/COP/16/31](#), [CBD/CP/16/15](#), and [CBD/COP/12/12](#)).

Maurizio Farhan Ferrari, FPP, provided context of the KMGBF and the Convention more broadly, demonstrating how traditional and local knowledge is relevant across the work of the CBD. The TK indicators are cross-cutting for all the targets in the KMGBF, and the concept of whole-of-society participation is relevant to all the targets of the KMGBF.

Tiffany Straza, Lead of the Focal Initiative on International Conventions and Policy at UNEP-WCMC, set out the global policy context, including the mechanism that CBD Parties agreed in relation to the implementation and monitoring the KMGBF considering rights: KMGBF Section C includes cross-cutting considerations.

Flavio Affinito, consultant to the CBD Secretariat, described the current status of indicator use by Parties in their national target submissions and what the global report on progress towards the KMGBF will cover, including information on the use of indicators. Mr. Affinito expressed the need to assess and understand what progress is being made on the Goals and Targets of the KMGBF, to better understand the barriers and approaches affecting progress, noting that relatively few Parties have indicated that they plan to use the rights-based indicators.

Robie Halip, Right Energy Partnership with Indigenous Peoples and Coordinator of the Indigenous Peoples' Major Group for Sustainable Development, presented considerations for a rights-based approach to data collection and management from the perspective of Indigenous Peoples' rights. Ms. Halip explained that key concerns are (1) misrepresentation of Indigenous data by governments and other actors and (2) the invisibility of Indigenous Peoples in mainstream monitoring processes. She framed Indigenous-led monitoring as a space and a mechanism for intergenerational knowledge sharing, meaning that the process is just as important as the data that comes out of the monitoring; this conceptualization was shared by workshop participants throughout the discussions.

Ruth Spencer, Barnes Hill Community Development Organization, Antigua and Barbuda, shared good practices for connecting with communities, including how to engage local communities for effective biodiversity management and monitoring. Ms. Spencer emphasized that communities have ecological knowledge and are able to conduct monitoring on the ground, which is an important asset to governments who need to collect and report data at the national level.

Session 3: Land tenure and land use indicator: introduction from the indicator experts

Eva Hershaw, International Land Coalition (ILC), introduced the Headline Indicator 22.1 and its current state of development. The indicator was adapted from SDG indicator 1.4.2¹¹ (*Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, (a) with legally recognized documentation, and (b) who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and type of tenure*). The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), ILC, Forest Peoples Programme, and World Resources Institute (WRI) in collaboration with a technical working group of experts have developed an "ideal scenario" step-by-step methodological approach for collecting and monitoring data for this indicator, which can be adapted to different national contexts.

Clinton Omusula, FAO, gave details on the process underway to update and refine the indicator's metadata for a more comprehensive applicability at various levels. In response to CBD [Notification 2025-046](#), seven Parties and 10 observer organizations provided feedback on the indicator methodology, whereby those Parties highlighted that a major strength of the indicator is its adaptability to the national context. Feedback from observer organizations highlighted the need for respect of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) when seeking data from Indigenous Peoples, and the potential value for Parties to recognize Indigenous and community data as reliable data pathways for monitoring and reporting on this indicator. The indicator methodology will undergo further revision and improvement through February 2026. The technical partners (FAO, ILC, WRI and FPP) are currently developing guidance for Parties on how to use and report on the indicator

¹¹ <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/files/Metadata-01-04-02.pdf>

using both global and national datasets, including guidance on the role of multi-stakeholder platforms to support data flows from the local to the national level.

Katie Reytar, World Resource Institute, presented an overview of the different statistical and geospatial global datasets that can be used to monitor and report progress using headline indicator 22.1, noting that data are available from global sources for more than 100 countries for use in 7th National Reports, subject to national needs and circumstances. Sources of global data identified and presented in the context of reporting on the indicator include LandMark¹², ICCA registry¹³, Prindex¹⁴, and Global Forest Watch¹⁵. Feedback was solicited from the workshop participants on the indicator methods and data sources presented such that they could be incorporated into the metadata revisions that are in progress.

Heather Bingham, lead for Protected Planet^{®16} UNEP-WCMC, presented on the connections between Indicator 22.1 and the indicators for KMGBF Target 3, highlighting how geospatial land tenure data on the traditional territories of Indigenous Peoples and local communities from sources such as LandMark and ICCA registry are also relevant to reporting on Target 3.

Q&A and discussion

In the discussions, a CBD National Focal Point asked how Indigenous Peoples were involved in developing the indicator, noting that local and national indicators do not always align. An expert explained that the indicator was created through an Indigenous-led process under the CBD Working Group on Article 8(j), though the technical metadata was largely developed by indicator specialists. They emphasized that meaningful Indigenous participation in both development and application remains an ongoing priority in the revision of the indicator metadata.

Another expert said feedback was sought from the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, highlighting the challenge of ensuring cross-country comparability while preserving national context.

Concerns were raised about potentially misleading interpretations, as land-use change on Indigenous lands may indicate loss of Indigenous management. An expert clarified that land-use change is only one component of the indicator. The framework assumes that strong legal recognition and positive perceptions of rights correlate with lower land-use change, and national reporting can distinguish between sustainable and externally driven change.

Session 3 continued: Country experiences on linking local data to the national level for indicator 22.1

Faith Nyokabi Wambugu, Ministry of Environment in Kenya, presented the Kenyan experience of using headline indicator 22.1, noting their view of the value of this indicator for illuminating the intersections between land governance, biodiversity monitoring and the rights of Indigenous Peoples. They have assessed how the indicator can be adapted to the Kenyan context, through learning by doing and with emphasis on practicality, sequencing of actions, and using existing relationships for data. The indicator has three distinct but linked components; Kenya will need to have three datasets, working with different data-custodians and ministries for different data sources. The government is using remote-sensing data managed by the Directorate for Resource Mapping and Remote Sensing to monitor land-use change in Indigenous territories. Kenya and FAO will be co-convening a national data mapping workshop to explore data availability, to pilot the indicator methodology, and to explore alignment between the indicator and other systems for biodiversity monitoring. The workshop will also aim at establishing a community of practice on the indicator's monitoring in Kenya, seeking to explore feasibilities of data interoperability between official and IP and LC-led data sources.

Vivian Silole Kaunga, IMPACT Kenya, introduced some of the biodiversity monitoring initiatives led by Kenyan communities. Ms. Kaunga highlighted that the Kenyan Community Land Act (2016) has been instrumental for communities gaining recognition and ownership of their land and has facilitated community-led biodiversity

¹² <https://landmarkmap.org/>

¹³ <https://www.iccaregistry.org/>

¹⁴ <https://www.prindex.net/>

¹⁵ <https://www.globalforestwatch.org/>

¹⁶ <https://www.protectedplanet.net/en>

monitoring linked with efforts to verify boundaries and develop area management plans. IMPACT serves as an intermediary organization connecting community-led biodiversity monitoring with national biodiversity monitoring systems that are managed by the Kenyan Ministry of Environment. IMPACT is an Indigenous-led organization using community-managed funds to map and monitor trends on Indigenous lands and territories, by working with communities and pastoralists to create land-use maps based on their traditional knowledge. IMPACT works to ensure that national policies take into account community-level experiences and data to inform decision-making. Ms. Kaunga shared a practical example of a One Health approach linked with biodiversity, with a network of community disease reporters who provide information related to human/wildlife interactions.

Camilo Niño Izquierdo and Laura Parra, Secretario Técnico Indígena de la CNTI (National Commission on Indigenous Territories) in Colombia, introduced the advanced monitoring systems developed for monitoring land use change and land tenure in Colombia. Mr. Izquierdo explained that data is an important tool for Indigenous self-determination and for strengthening evidence and advocacy for Indigenous Peoples land and territorial rights. In Colombia, CNTI have been working alongside the Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt³ to develop geographic information systems (GIS) that combine Indigenous data and government data to evidence biodiversity trends on Indigenous lands and territories. This dataset is novel in Colombia and wider Latin America. The data collected by CNTI are an asset to the government, providing specific geographic data points and other forms of ground-truthed data. Camilo emphasized that Indigenous monitoring systems are invaluable for national biodiversity monitoring while responding directly to the fundamental rights of Indigenous Peoples. Despite good progress, some methodological challenges remain, such as how to make their GIS data interoperable with data on human rights defenders and other government datasets. CNTI provided recommendations to improve the quality and uptake of the indicator in Colombia and elsewhere, such as increasing technical, financial and political support towards the inclusion of Indigenous information systems in national use of this indicator. In particular, government support was seen as critical to improving the uptake and use of this indicator for national monitoring.

Dave de Vera, Philippine Association for Intercultural Development (PAFID), described an Indigenous-led process to develop an Indigenous Peoples Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (IPBSAP) in the Philippines. The process to develop the IPBSAP involved bringing together participants from communities during three workshops to discuss local issues and define local priorities in relation to each KMGBF target (e.g. in regards to Target 2, they discussed community perspectives on which lands should be restored), then defining those targets in spatial terms where possible using participatory mapping. Mr. de Vera noted the need to conduct preparatory work with communities before the participatory mapping workshops. A practical asset is that these days many community members have access to electronic devices that can generate geo-spatial data points; this access combined with the growing availability of public tools, such as the Scene Coalition NBS tool¹⁷ supported the IPBSAP production. Their community workshops evidenced that Indigenous Peoples and local communities are already doing work across the KMGBF that may not be currently recognized or accounted for in national planning, monitoring and reporting. Following a year-long process, the IPBSAP was presented to the government and the government and is intended to work side-by-side with the NBSAP. Simultaneously to developing the IPBSAP, the local experts participated in the government-led processes.

Q&A and discussion

A participant raised that some communities directly engaged in biodiversity management struggle to gain direct access to funding. Ms. Kaunga from IMPACT Kenya explained that they have two approaches for creating direct finance flows into the communities: First, they advocate and fundraise for Indigenous-owned funds, based on an Indigenous-led funding model that respects customary governance arrangements; second, they support community members to decide their land management priorities, then those communities are often able to get loans from financial institutions to implement their own projects.

The publication of the Philippines IPBSAP was discussed: the IPBSAP authors are writing a report that will accompany the Philippines 7th National report, with the IPBSAP reported as a non-state actor commitment linked with Target 22. The CBD Secretariat encouraged the national submission of outputs such as an IPBSAP to the CBD reporting and clearinghouse mechanism: it is possible for a Party government to submit and thereby publish any relevant output, such as an IPBSAP.

¹⁷ <https://nbstool.scenecoalition.org/>

Another participant asked about the practicalities of developing the IPBSAP, for possible replication elsewhere. PAFID explained that one of the challenges was to produce a national-scale IPBSAP that still accounted for localized needs. In the process of bringing different communities together, they realized that many communities face similar situations. Having participatory discussions helped to define common challenges and potential solutions that could support communities across the country.

Session 4: Experiences with monitoring traditional occupations and youth-responsive monitoring

The objective of Session 4 was to hear directly from partners conducting monitoring activities and partners involved in biodiversity monitoring at the national level about their experiences and perceived benefits and challenges with rights-responsive monitoring. Participants formed two groups, each with a facilitator: One group discussed the indicator on traditional occupations and the other group discussed experiences with inclusive and participatory monitoring.

Group 1: Indicator for monitoring trends in the practice of traditional occupations

The group began by discussing what monitoring is currently being done on traditional occupations at the local and national level. In the Philippines, PAFID have been working to build the national understanding of the biodiversity impacts of traditional practices and the management of such practices. PAFID have worked with communities across the country to collect and monitor biodiversity-related data on the land and territories managed by Indigenous Peoples, including data related to Indigenous livelihoods and occupations in those territories. For PAFID, building trust with these communities was an important first step for accessing data and information; in many instances, a different setting is needed to capture community information, outside of formal policy consultation settings. Participatory mapping to generate evidence on trends in traditional occupations and livelihoods with status and trends of biodiversity in those areas. This monitoring has revealed overlap between trends in the traditional occupations performed by Indigenous Peoples, with trends in Indigenous languages and trends in biodiversity on the lands and territories managed by Indigenous Peoples: in the Philippines context, there is a clear link indicating that areas where traditional occupations are practiced align with areas of enhanced biodiversity, suggesting that traditional occupations are not opposed to conservation; an example was shared of a map showing high forest cover where native languages remain in use. In the Philippines, this data has been important for evidencing the positive trends in biodiversity on the lands and territories managed by Indigenous Peoples using traditional occupations. This evidence led to a change in legislation in the Philippines.

At the national level, a participant noted that census data in the Philippines primarily monitors formal occupations in the country's urbanized low-land areas, while data on informal and traditional occupations are not collected. Traditional occupations that sit within broader livelihood categories may be hidden in national statistics. The absence of national systems for collecting data on traditional occupations was echoed by a participant from Antigua and Barbuda. Understanding and awareness at the national level of the significant contributions that traditional occupations provide to the country's social infrastructure and economy, as well as to positive biodiversity outcomes, would underpin data collection on such occupations. A participant reflected that data is often more available for jobs and sectors that generate "high economic value", whereas traditional and informal occupations are perceived to be "low value" or low priority for monitoring despite their critical importance for underpinning the country's social and economic infrastructure. Participants discussed how gender bias has affected what are formally defined as occupations, with attention needed in the definition of care-based activities or sacred activities as occupations or not, with or without interpretation to conventional economic values. In some instances, economic links are clear and valid, as in the example shared of Philippines occupations and practices enabling upland headwater area conservation directly supporting lowland farming. The group participants agreed that monitoring data on traditional and informal occupations would significantly help to (a) evidence the monetary and non-monetary benefits of those occupations and (b) evidence the interconnections between traditional occupations and trends in biodiversity, which in turn could support more informed policy decisions.

The group identified other benefits, challenges, and practical considerations for monitoring traditional occupations at the national level. A clear benefit of the *process* of monitoring traditional occupations was more engagement on both the government and community sides, with stronger mutual understanding and resulting management. Other benefits included a sense of validation, as monitoring recognizes value in the monitoring

subject/process, and co-benefits socially and in terms of synergies across multiple multilateral environment agreements where traditional occupations link to multiple targets and intended outcomes.

The group agreed that there would be significant value and strong feasibility in disaggregating data on traditional occupations by sex, age, ethnicity and other socio-demographic factors, supported by national census data. Disaggregating in this way would produce useful evidence on how different societal actors are involved in the practice of traditional occupations, which in turn could enable the development of policies that support the practice of traditional occupations in a more equitable manner. Because there are nomadic communities whose traditional occupations shift across different spatial areas according to seasonal factors, it would be important to spatially capture the nomadic and seasonal nature of those occupations in national monitoring. Several participants highlighted the conceptual challenge of collecting data on traditional occupations that reflects the localized and contextual nature of traditional occupations, while also generating generalizable data on traditional occupations at a national scale. A participant noted that in the absence of national datasets on trends in biodiversity and trends in traditional occupations, some open-source global datasets can be used to help fill the gaps. For example, by overlaying global datasets on forest cover with the data they have collected on traditional occupations, PAFID have been able to demonstrate the interconnections between trends in biodiversity and trends in traditional occupations in the Philippines.

Finally, the group identified necessary actions that could help to improve the flow of data and information on traditional occupations from the local to the national level, including: (1) strengthened dialogue between local citizens and the government to identify what valid data are available and to explore the feasibility of different methods for monitoring trends in biodiversity and trends in traditional occupations; (2) stronger cross-sector dialogue between national statistical departments and ministries responsible for monitoring data on trends in biodiversity and traditional occupations, to improve the accuracy and relevance of national statistical data for biodiversity reporting and to improve the flow of data between departments; and (3) in the absence of national data sets, assessments of what open-source global data sets could be applied at the national level to help monitor interconnections between trends in biodiversity and traditional occupations.

Group 2: Inclusive and participatory monitoring

The group began by discussing the benefits they have observed from inclusive monitoring processes in their national contexts. In the Philippines, the development of the IPBSAP has shifted the government's perception of the role and responsibilities that Indigenous Peoples have in the sustainable management of biodiversity. In Colombia, the partnership between CNTI and the Humboldt Institute has helped the government to better understand how the conservation of species and ecosystems is interconnected with cultural diversity and has helped those leading biodiversity monitoring to contribute to decisions at the government level. In Cameroon, the government has conducted some consultations with organizations like REFACOF, creating opportunities for them to feedback on the NBSAP and propose activities that are more aligned with local needs and priorities.

The group identified several barriers preventing the inclusion of local actors in national biodiversity monitoring processes. These included: competition among many organizations to have their views heard when the government invited consultation on the NBSAP; limited funding preventing the meaningful participation of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in NBSAP consultations, with community members often giving up income during the time period of consultation; and institutional barriers at the government level, such as lack of dialogue and policy coherence across ministries resulting in contradictory policies that directly affect the participation of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

A major challenge identified for the monitoring of the impacts of the use of TK or the participation of specific groups, such as youth, was the time frame, often years, needed to observe changes. Participants also noted that measuring the impact of a way of conducting biodiversity management or monitoring is more difficult to measure than simply monitoring the type or number of participants.

The group discussed what changes could better support the inclusion and meaningful participation of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in national monitoring processes. A participant highlighted that receiving information from the government in a timely manner allows Indigenous Peoples and local communities to understand the government's plans and proposals, share information and coordinate within their communities, consult with one another on priorities, and coordinate meaningful input. For example, in Colombia, to address limited participation, CNTI organized "coordination spaces" with Indigenous and local community representatives to discuss and agree priorities to put forward to the government. These inputs were included in an annex to Colombia's NBSAP. Another participant highlighted the need for predictable mechanisms for engagement, so that Indigenous Peoples and local communities know when and how

engagement opportunities will happen. Institutionalizing engagement mechanisms can help to maintain these processes even if government personnel changes.

Session 5: Traditional Occupations

The objective of Session 5 was to gain an understanding of the current and potential measurement of traditional occupations in the context of biodiversity monitoring.

Joji Cariño, Senior Policy Advisor at Forest Peoples Programme, presented the evolution of work on traditional occupations within the CBD and biodiversity context and shared ways that the practice of traditional occupations is conceptualized. Ms. Cariño introduced the indicators associated with KMGBF Target 9, the types of data required and ongoing methodological development. Two complementary methods are proposed for the collection of data: a national approach using International Labour Organisation (ILO) classifications in collaboration with NSOs, and a CBMIS approach using tools such as the Indigenous Navigator community survey approach. Ms. Cariño noted common challenges, namely the limitations of what countries identify as traditional occupations, a lack of disaggregated data, and the issue of bridging statistical information with community-based data. Ms. Cariño expressed possible ways forward, with a focus on bridging local-national-regional and global data collection, promoting and supporting use of Indigenous Navigator Biodiversity Module, and inviting countries to include work on traditional occupations within national labour surveys and explore additional tools and methodologies.

Inka Saara Inari Arttijeffer, Secretary for International Affairs, Sámi Parliament of Finland, presented traditional occupations of the Sámi people, which have been formally defined as reindeer herding, fishing, hunting, handicrafts, foraging and tourism based on traditional occupations. Data for reindeer herding, fishing and hunting are available for national reporting. Ms. Inari Arttijeffer noted that in Finland, data cannot be disaggregated by ethnicity. Therefore, because non-Sámi people can practice traditional occupations associated with Sámi people, it is difficult to report on the proportion of Indigenous practitioners by contrast to reporting the overall prevalence of such occupations. The Sámi Parliament has data on Sámi and traditional occupations, and estimates based on single research studies provide some supporting information. Proxy figures have been developed based on multiple datasets. Ms. Inari Arttijeffer noted that data on traditional occupations are important not only for reporting but also for advocacy and negotiation.

With limited time for discussion, a participant proposed consideration of whether the intended outcome for the KMGBF was a target proportion of Indigenous Peoples practicing their own traditional occupations versus an increase, or retention, of the practice of such occupations in general, even by non-Indigenous people, due to the positive benefits for biodiversity.

Session 6: Gender considerations in rights-based monitoring and GPA indicator

The objective of Session 6 was to strengthen the awareness of the CBD Gender Plan of Action, share national experiences and build the community of practice.

Amelia Arreguin Prado, Coordinator of the CBD Women's Caucus, gave an overview of the CBD's mandate on gender, with gender embedded in COP decisions since the inception of the CBD and addressed in decisions related to agriculture, tourism, forests, protected areas, resource mobilization and much more. Ms. Arreguin Prado noted that gender has been an important part of the discussions under the Article 8(j) Programme of Work and the working group produced guidelines on the roles of indigenous women and the use of gender indicators. There have also been iterations of the CBD Gender Plan of Action. The current Gender Plan of Action includes all elements that are required to achieve gender-responsive implementation of the KMGBF. Ms. Arreguin Prado emphasized that the component indicator 23.CT.2 (*Indicator on national implementation of the Gender Plan of Action*)¹⁸ for monitoring national implementation of the Gender Plan of Action is the best tool available for comprehensively tracking what gender-responsive actions are being implemented at the national level. Ms. Arreguin Prado concluded with a plea to all those involved in developing and using indicators for monitoring and reporting to include sex-disaggregation to fill gender-related data gaps as the CBD has called for over more than 20 years. Ms. Arreguin Prado stated that the instruments for this work exist; what remains is their use.

¹⁸ <https://gbf-indicators.org/metadata/other/23-1-C>

Céire Booth, UNEP-WCMC, delivered an overview of the different options available for gender-responsive monitoring of the KMGBF. Based on the current monitoring framework, options include the global binary indicator for Target 23 (23.b) and the component and complimentary indicators available for Target 23, including indicator 23.CT.2. Across the goals and targets of the KMGBF, for indicators that relate to people, Parties can collect sex-disaggregated data to reveal gendered differences for each indicator. In addition, Parties can develop their own gender-specific national targets and use accompanying gender indicators. Ms. Booth reminded participants that gender-responsive monitoring concerns not only what data and information are monitored but also how women and girls are meaningfully engaged in the process of monitoring and reporting on implementation of the KMGBF.

Olivier Rukundo, CBD Secretariat, shared insights from the recent mid-term review of the CBD Gender Plan of Action. Based on the mid-term review, gender currently remains underrepresented in NBSAPs. While several NBSAPs reference the importance of gender-responsive implementation, fewer NBSAPs provide concrete examples of how Parties will ensure gender-responsive implementation of the KMGBF in practice. Mr. Rukundo identified several challenges that are limiting progress on implementation of the Gender Plan of Action. For example, even when Parties express strong commitment to gender-responsive implementation, Parties sometimes lack the knowledge and capacity to implement and monitor gender responsiveness in practice. Similarly, Mr. Rukundo explained that some Parties still do not fully understand the interconnections between gender and biodiversity and therefore have not taken this up in their NBSAP. Mr. Rukundo concluded by stating that gender is relevant across the Convention and that more work needs to be done at multiple levels to advance implementation of the Gender Plan of Action, grounded in deeper understanding of the positive biodiversity outcomes envisioned in the Gender Plan of Action.

Rose Pélagie Masso, African Women's Network for Community Management of Forests (REFACOF), highlighted progress in Cameroon on integrating gender into biodiversity governance. REFACOF has a two-fold aim of restoring landscapes while improving the lives and livelihoods of women. REFACOF have an ongoing initiative 'Women leaders in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management Circles' which provides support to women to organize themselves, exchange knowledge, and develop their economic power, leadership, negotiation and advocacy skills. Working with communities, REFACOF have conducted information and awareness campaigns with traditional leaders, heads of families, and household heads on the importance of securing land for women, girls, and widows. As a result of this initiative, men in the community have transferred plots of customary land to their wives, daughters, sisters, and widows in the family, formalized through the issuance of "Customary Land Ownership Certificates" which give women control over the land they acquire to carry out restoration activities, particularly planting fruit trees related to sustainable agriculture. Engagement between REFACOF and the government contributed to the integration of gender considerations into biodiversity policy, specifically the NBSAP. Cameroon's NBSAP III explicitly enshrines equal opportunities and empowers women and girls in decision-making processes and access to natural resources and land ownership, in line with KMGBF Target 23. The recent NBSAP revision used a participatory process within available resources. This is undeniable progress, and continued attention is needed to assess the effective implementation of the target and the monitoring and evaluation of the indicators. Despite gender-neutral land laws, customary interpretation can exclude women, underscoring the importance of explicit attention to women's land rights, monitoring of indicators, and adequate budget allocation for the implementation of the identified actions.

Ayesha Wijesekera, UNEP-WCMC, introduced indicator 23.CT.2, which measures national progress towards implementing the indicative actions in the Gender Plan of Action 2023-2030, for which Parties are the lead responsible actor. UNEP-WCMC and Women4Biodiversity co-developed the methodology with CBD Parties, CBD Women's Caucus and observers through a peer review process and piloted the indicator with CBD Parties in 2024. Cláudia Faustino, Senior Programme Officer at UNEP-WCMC, demonstrated the use of the calculation tool available to automatically calculate the resulting numerical index based on the responses.

Q&A discussion

A member of the Secretariat to the CBD encouraged the participants from local organizations to submit their data, information and case studies to CBD notifications requesting information and case studies from Parties and non-state actors. A participant explained that women's organizations and other non-state actors sometimes face challenges responding to official notifications, considering technological barriers, user-friendliness of the clearinghouse mechanism or because of a perception that organizations need to be accredited in order to submit. The participant emphasized the importance of making a range of mechanisms available for non-state actors to submit their information, to ensure their contributions are included.

Session 6 guided group exercise on gender-responsive monitoring

During this session, participants split into groups to reflect on experiences, challenges and opportunities for bridging gender-responsive monitoring at the local and national level.

In terms of observed barriers to gender-responsive monitoring, a key barrier relates to the absence of sex-disaggregated data collection at the national level. For example, participants highlighted that, even where national census data could be relevant for biodiversity-related monitoring and reporting, this data are rarely sex disaggregated. The participants expressed that closer coordination of ministries responsible for reporting under the CBD with national statistical offices could help to ensure that sex-disaggregated data are being collected to support gender-responsive reporting under the CBD. Similarly, the presence of national laws and policies which recognize women's rights to own and manage lands and resources could be served by the collection of sex-disaggregated data at the national level to monitor whether these laws and policies are being enforced effectively.

The timing and clarity of consultation processes was raised as a consideration for women's participation and broader community participation in national monitoring and reporting processes: providing local communities some clarity that the data and views they submitted may be integrated into the revised NBSAP or other policy or policy instrument can increase engagement and accountability, with national reporting back on the information submitted and how it was used to inform policy decisions as a practical step that would help show where participatory processes led to tangible outcomes. Participants highlighted the need for consistent engagement from the beginning of the process through to the end, rather than only involving communities when a policy decision is close to finalization.

Other participants addressed the issue of scale when it comes to translating local-level data into national reporting. For example, in the Philippines, national monitoring systems are designed to facilitate government reporting, but there are no mechanisms in place to systematically capture data collected through community-based monitoring and information systems. Although Partners for Indigenous Knowledge Philippines is collecting data on traditional occupations which is gender-disaggregated, this data often covers a few small areas in the Philippines and is therefore not representative of the whole country. Another challenge highlighted was the misalignment between timeframes for local, national and international monitoring processes.

The discussion highlighted that gender-responsive monitoring requires careful attention to both *what* data and information is monitored and *how* monitoring processes are conducted. To improve the gender-responsiveness of national monitoring processes, participants highlighted a need for more participatory dialogue and transparency between the government and local organizations who engage in consultation processes, so that community organizations are better informed on how their contributions were used in policy and planning decisions and so that national decisionmakers have better capacity to assess the validity of community data and information. The group reflected that a benefit of the indicator 23.CT.2 is that it consists of many survey questions that monitor multiple actions in the Gender Plan of Action, not only women's participation.

During this session, an online discussion was facilitated with a member of Ghana's national biodiversity steering committee, focusing on opportunities and challenges for collecting and compiling sex-disaggregated data on land tenure. The representative highlighted available sources, including records held by traditional chiefs and district land administrators, and noted opportunities for citizen science initiatives, building on successful women-led projects where women were trained to measure farm sizes using GPS equipment. Key challenges include fragmented and non-digitized data, the absence of a centralized land tenure data repository, lack of standardized methodologies for data collection, and difficulties in establishing data-sharing agreements with some data holders. A national process to engage stakeholders with relevant land tenure knowledge and data, including NGOs, land institutions, commodity-focused organizations, and relevant ministries, is ongoing. While the Ministry of Gender is responsible for gender targets, it lacks the technical staff and resources needed for data generation. Broader issues include weak incentives for agencies to share data, limited integration of biodiversity considerations in sectoral work, and insufficient financing for both biodiversity and gender priorities in Ghana.

Session 7: Youth-responsive monitoring

Josefa Isabel Tauli, Policy Coordinator and Steering Committee Member of the Global Youth Biodiversity Network (GYBN) and of the Indigenous Ibaloi-Kankanaey Igorot, opened the session with a presentation on youth-responsive monitoring in the context of relevant COP decisions and programmes of work. Youth-

responsive monitoring and intergenerational equity was highlighted as a gap within expert guidance on the KMGBF indicators¹⁹; youth are only specified within a binary indicator within the monitoring framework. Ms. Tauli introduced a policy brief produced by GYBN on youth-responsive monitoring, with an assessment of NBSAPs and national reports to provide a baseline of youth considerations in national biodiversity policy. Ms. Tauli explained that while youth are engaged in diverse and unique ways with biodiversity and biodiversity management, at this stage GYBN would benefit from having technical support to assess what important and meaningful aspects of the links between biodiversity and youth could be viably monitored. Ms. Tauli emphasized that all actors could benefit from youth-related and/or youth-derived information to improve decision-making processes.

Q&A and discussion

The discussion considered that based on the GYBN consultations, there is an idea of what should be monitored but a lack of methodology. Noting that there is not a present 'youth equivalent' to the CBD Gender Plan of Action to shape monitoring, a participant proposed setting a realistic timeframe for developing a proposed methodology and engaging with those Parties who have expressed interest in such an indicator, or who are already collecting youth-related information and data as part of their NBSAP. A first step may be understanding what Parties who have national institutions related to children and youth are monitoring and how, with relation to biodiversity.

Participants described their observations and experiences with youth-responsive monitoring in their national and local contexts. The discussion covered both how youth are being engaged in the process of implementing and monitoring NBSAPs, as well as efforts to collect age-disaggregated data that would help to show the relationships between youth and biodiversity roles and impacts.

Participants from Colombia and Cameroon provided examples of how youth are involved in actions related to NBSAP implementation at the local level. In Cameroon, REFACOF have established a "young women's chapter" to actively support their involvement in community level natural resource governance. However, at present they are not collecting specific data on the number of youth involved in this initiative. In Colombia, CNTI provide dedicated training to youth on data collection and GIS, to help demarcate and monitor their land and territories. This training involves bringing members of the community together to facilitate intergenerational knowledge transfer.

Similarly, in the Philippines, the engagement of youth and elders together in biodiversity monitoring and management efforts was observed to result in greater mutual respect. A participant shared that Indigenous youth are becoming more disconnected with Indigenous knowledge and languages. In the Philippines, they have found that teaching youth about how to use technology (e.g. drones, digital mapping) has been a good way to engage youth in environmental and territorial governance. In practice, the efforts have involved pushing university-trained youth to engage directly with traditional elders and engaging the youth in practice as lead authors in IP-led management plans, following from and reinforcing new-found respect for the youth from the elders. An observed change is the inclusion of youth in the council of elders or other committees of leadership. Similarly, in Kenya, the biocultural mapping process has helped youth develop respect for both the land and their elders. The group agreed that such a change in respect should be considered as a measure of success. The group discussed a possible proxy indicator of the share of youth in leadership roles but noted the limitations and risks of measuring presence rather than influence, capacity or impact.

In Kenya, local organisation IMPACT Kenya have been engaging youth in biocultural mapping and have observed that youth ascribe more value to their homelands as a result of their participation in these exercises. In Kenya, the Inclusive Conservation project has been creating encounters for youth and elders, using spaces such as a youth skills centre to help maintain TK transmission. This transmission was seen as a priority because of the role of TK in early warning systems of environmental change and necessary adaptive management. The project is also facilitating partnerships with universities: any practitioner trying to understand or use TK will be matched with relevant training. A three-week course is being developed, with two weeks of classroom training including in monitoring, combined with one week of experiential learning embedded in a community.

The participants stressed the urgency of action: there is a real and growing risk of a large divide between the generations and the loss of TK. Given the rapid changes in technology, in societal interactions, and in the risks

¹⁹ [CBD/COP/16/INF/3/Rev.1](#)

associated with decision-making positions (e.g. requiring English language skills to negotiate terms with outside parties), there is a growing trend towards more responsible youth. Participants agreed:

Success could be considered to be more processes that create encounters of youth and elders with their traditional knowledge, resulting in increasing mutual respect; this change has registered positive biodiversity outcomes.

Participants also discussed the conceptual, methodological, and technical barriers associated with youth-responsive monitoring. In Finland, there is little local or national-level data available on the role of youth in biodiversity-related initiatives, which makes it difficult to assess the relationships between biodiversity and youth. In Colombia, some Indigenous Peoples have expressed that they prefer not to disaggregate their data because they view their community as one coherent whole, so in line with their customary practices their data are not always age disaggregated.

The group considered the advantages and risks of having a stand-alone indicator for monitoring youth participation under the KMGBF. A major risk identified was that measuring participation in terms of “number of youth who participated” can create misleading evidence, with no indicator of whether their participation was meaningful. A stand-alone indicator also creates a risk of those elements being monitored in a siloed manner, instead of being systematically considered across the KMGBF. For monitoring youth-responsive implementation of the KMGBF, the group considered a necessary first step to be to define what youth-responsive monitoring means in practice, subsequently defining suitable indicators that would provide a meaningful measure of youth-responsive implementation.

Session 8: Indicator on linguistic diversity

Due to participant cancellations and time constraints, the planned session discussing the KMGBF indicator on the Index of Linguistic Diversity did not take place. An update on the status of the indicator and conceptual developments in addressing the links between biodiversity and linguistic diversity was provided in writing (see Annex 3).

Session 9: Gaps in rights-based monitoring and entry points for increasing uptake of TK and rights-based indicators

The objective of this session was to identify gaps and opportunities to improve uptake and local-national collaboration in the use of the traditional knowledge and rights-based indicators for monitoring and reporting under the CBD.

Ayesha Wijesekera, UNEP-WCMC, presented the National Monitoring Support Initiative and potential links with this community of practice to strengthen the uptake of TK and rights-based indicators. She highlighted opportunities for working with national and regional partners through the Initiative to develop national capacity to report on these indicators, where it aligns with national priorities and supports Parties in meeting their global commitments. Key entry points include national capacity assessments and the development of national monitoring action plans by the end of 2026, that could guide targeted capacity development and peer support from the community of practice. She also highlighted opportunities to share best practices and case studies on the use of TK and rights-based indicators with partners and other CBD Parties through the initiative, and to collaborate on distributing an expert survey to map expertise and types of support available for these indicators, to connect with CBD Parties seeking support.

Discussion

Participants reflected on their experiences with national biodiversity monitoring processes, particularly in relation to NBSAPs and the implementation of the KMGBF. Participants expressed that practical steps are needed to enable communities to engage in implementation and monitoring from the outset of decision-making and planning processes such as NBSAPs. Several people emphasised the importance of receiving information from governments in advance so that local communities can be properly informed, including making documents available and publishing consultation invite lists. Participants stressed the need for more intentional, people-centred processes in practice; some noted that the same individuals often participate in every reporting cycle, building substantive expertise but also pressure on a small number of people.

Participants stated that genuine uptake of a rights-based approach at the national level would require recognition that Indigenous Peoples are experts in biodiversity monitoring and that governments benefit from

the involvement of Indigenous Peoples and local communities to meet their biodiversity objectives. A participant expressed a wish for governments to institutionalize Indigenous governance maps and other community monitoring methods and databases within national systems.

The relationship between community-based monitoring and national systems was discussed at length. Participants expressed a desire to move away from positioning CBMIS and national monitoring systems as being at odds. Using the example of what IMPACT is doing in Kenya, it was suggested that community monitoring and citizen-generated data contributes to national progress even if it does not fit neatly within the targets and indicators of the KMGBF; how to better acknowledge and capture this was identified as a need. There were calls for more examples demonstrating how citizen data and non-conventional biodiversity data can be used by governments, and for better coordination of timelines between community and national processes.

Awareness and capacity building emerged as a recurring theme, including support for communities to understand and better monitor their rights in national contexts; practical training on how biodiversity monitoring processes work; dialogue between local organizations and governments to explain and use community monitoring approaches; and greater awareness among national focal points of existing functional community systems for monitoring and engagement. Participants noted that both governments and Indigenous Peoples rely on funding to carry out monitoring with differing access to financial resources. Participants noted that conservation is often perceived as donor-driven and questioned how to move beyond continuous reliance on external funding and how to foster mutual relationships between donors, communities, and governments. The need to “decolonise” monitoring processes was raised, including a partner sharing experiences of pushing back on donor expectations regarding monitoring methodologies.

Session 10: Approaches and options for further operationalization of rights-based indicators

Participants identified changes they will take forward in their own practice, such as using a holistic approach in national monitoring workshops or efforts to shift from focusing on a single indicator towards considering the rights-based approach more broadly in using multiple related indicators and/or in taking an inclusive approach rather than propagating existing siloes. As a benefit of the workshop process, participants noted their increased awareness of the TK indicators and the biodiversity relevance of a rights-based approach, suggesting that such awareness remains to be elevated among CBD Parties and other actors, working across sectors and with the regional and subregional Technical and Scientific Cooperation Support Centres.

Some participants shared actions they would like to explore in their contexts, including:

- A national scoping study of Indigenous People and local community biodiversity actions and their links to national monitoring;
- Building a national Indigenous Peoples coordinator network for those working on biodiversity and biodiversity monitoring;
- Workshops to bring together national governmental, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, and research representatives to identify relevant data and conduct validated data analyses;
- Educational module development and e-learning on rights-based approaches to biodiversity management and monitoring, building on such examples as IMPACT Kenya’s local community-developed Five Core Principles for Inclusive Conservation.

The group identified related ideas to advance rights-based monitoring, including (presented without prioritization):

- A convening to advance the methodology and approaches to monitoring **traditional occupations**;
- A convening to develop sound approaches and methodologies to consider **youth participation and intergenerational equity**;
- A convening or working group to advance the use of **functional links between linguistic diversity and biodiversity** for management, building from the adopted monitoring of the Index of Linguistic Diversity (the presence of multiple languages) towards considerations of language vitality (the application and transmission of languages)
- Continued exploration of the **evidence base of links between human rights and biodiversity outcomes**, noting ongoing efforts such as in Brazil, Colombia, and Namibia to begin to systematically assess how resource rights are devolved;

- Mutual learning exchanges among countries on good practices for **community-based monitoring and information systems** (CBMIS);
- Advancing dialogues around Indigenous data sovereignty, noting that much of the existing work and information is in English;
- Working with the donor and project development community to integrate a **rights-based approach into project design and resourcing**, building from such external examples as the Open Research Funders Group which enables mutual learning among donors about policy and practice to enact the members' shared vision of the kind of efforts they wish to fund and achieve.

The participants expressed interest in future co-development of funding and sustainability proposals to enable continued work on rights-based biodiversity monitoring, including through use of the adopted indicators of the KMGBF monitoring framework discussed in the present workshop.

The participants agreed to the further use of the information shared in the workshop for the development of case studies and the potential production of an information document to be provided to delegates to the 28th meeting of the CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA-28).

2. Next steps

During the workshop, work began on developing case studies that describe the experiences, successes and challenges on a) using the four traditional knowledge indicators and the component indicator on the Gender Plan of Action for monitoring and reporting to the CBD, and b) applying rights-based approaches to monitoring and reporting at the national level. These case studies capture the perspectives of Indigenous and local partners and government partners from the countries who participated in the workshop. The case studies fill an important knowledge gap on how rights-based monitoring is happening in practice in different countries and the challenges that are preventing rights-based monitoring. Building on the work that began during the workshop, UNEP-WCMC will be further developing the case studies in consultation with local and national partners in Colombia, Philippines, Finland, Kenya, Cameroon, Ghana to capture more information and detail on progress and plans with rights-based monitoring. It is anticipated that these case studies will be submitted as information to the Secretariat to the CBD to inform upcoming CBD discussions (e.g. COP17) on items relating to planning, monitoring, reporting and review under the CBD.

In addition, participants expressed interest in hosting a side-event at COP17 to showcase the progress that has been achieved with regards to the development, uptake and use of traditional knowledge and other rights-based indicators for national monitoring and reporting, including through the Transformative Pathways Project. Participants discussed that event could also highlight what challenges and barriers remain and priorities for advancing progress on rights-based implementation, monitoring and reporting for the KMGBF. In the longer term, participants began reflecting on what will come next after the Transformative Pathways Project concludes in June 2028. Participants collectively agreed that much more work is needed to advance rights-based monitoring and agreed that additional funding opportunities should be sought to continue driving the progress made under the Transformative Pathways Project.

2. Contact persons related to the outcome of the meeting

- Tiffany Straza, UNEP-WCMC, tiffany.straza@unep-wcmc.org
- Ceire Booth, UNEP-WCMC, ceire.booth@unep-wcmc.org
- Claudia Faustino, UNEP-WCMC, claudia.faustino@unep-wcmc.org
- Ayesha Wijesekera, UNEP-WCMC, ayesha.wijesekera@unep-wcmc.org
- Genevieve Beaufoy, UNEP-WCMC, genevieve.beaufoy@unep-wcmc.org

3. Annexes

- Annex 1 – List of Participants
- Annex 2 – Agenda

Annex I: List of workshop participants

In-person participants

Amelia Arreguin Prado, Coordinator, CBD Women's Caucus
Ana Lambert, Associate Programme Officer – Policy, UNEP-WCMC
Anouska Perram, Coordinator, Environmental Governance Programme, Forest Peoples Programme
Ayesha Wijesekera, Programme Officer – Policy, UNEP-WCMC **Céire Booth**, Lead of Focal Initiative on Nature, Gender & Rights; Programme Officer – Policy, UNEP-WCMC
Cláudia Faustino, Transformative Pathways project, Senior Programme Officer – Science, UNEP-WCMC
Clinton Omusula, Geospatial and Land Monitoring Specialist, UN Food and Agriculture Organization
David (Dave) de Vera, Philippine Association for Intercultural Development, Inc. (PAFID), Philippines
Eva Hershaw, Lead, Global Data and Land Monitoring, International Land Coalition
Flavio Affinito, Consultant to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
Genevieve Beaufoy, Associate Programme Officer – Policy, UNEP-WCMC
Heather Bingham, Senior Programme Officer, Protected Planet – Nature Conserved, UNEP-WCMC
Inka Saara Inari Arttijeiff, Secretary for International Affairs, Sámi Parliament of Finland
Josefa Isabel Tauli, Policy Coordinator and Steering Committee Member, Global Youth Biodiversity Network. Indigenous Ibaloi-Kankanaey Igorot
Katie Reytar, Technical Manager of LandMark: The Global Platform of Indigenous and Community Lands; Senior Research Associate, Land & Carbon Lab, World Resources Institute
Laura Alejandra Parra, National Coordinator of Biodiversity and Climate Change Projects with Indigenous Peoples, Lider de Biodiversidad y Cambio Climatico Observatorio de Derechos Territoriales de los Pueblos Indigenas, National Commission on Indigenous Territories (CNTI), Colombia
Maurizio Farhan Ferrari, Senior Policy Advisor, Forest Peoples Programme
Melissa de Kock, Deputy Director, UNEP-WCMC
Olivier Rukundo, Head of the Peoples and Biodiversity Unit, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
Rose Pélagie Masso, African Women's Network for Community Management of Forests (REFACOF), Cameroon
Ruth Spencer, Barnes Hill Community Development Organization, Antigua and Barbuda
Tiffany Straza, Lead of Focal Initiative on International Policy & Conventions; Programme Officer – Policy, UNEP-WCMC
Vivian Silole Kaunga, Indigenous Movement for Peace Advancement and Conflict Transformation (IMPACT), Kenya
Xilonem (Xilo) Clarke, Project Officer – Environmental Governance Programme, Forest Peoples Programme

Online participants

Adèle Zaboya Makomra, Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development, Cameroon; CBD National Focal Point on Traditional Knowledge
Ricardo Camilo Niño Izquierdo, Lider de Biodiversidad y Cambio Climatico Observatorio de Derechos Territoriales de los Pueblos Indigenas, National Commission on Indigenous Territories (CNTI), Colombia. Indigenous Arhuaco (*Spanish speaker*)
Britta Hackenberg, Head of Projects, Namibia Nature Foundation; CBD Gender and Biodiversity Focal Point, Namibia
Faith Nyokabi Wambugu, Environment Officer, Directorate of Multilateral Environmental Agreements, Ministry of Environment Climate Change and Forestry, Kenya
Joji Cariño, Senior Policy Advisor, Forest Peoples Programme
Mariglo Laririt, DENR Biodiversity Management Bureau, Philippines
Robeliza (Robie) Halip, Right Energy Partnership with Indigenous Peoples; Coordinator of the Indigenous Peoples' Major Group for Sustainable Development
Thomas Muronga, National Communal Conservancies and Community Forest Alliance, Namibia
Ward Anseeuw, Lead of the Land Tenure Team, UN Food and Agriculture Organization
Winnie Kananu, Assistant Director Gender, Kenya; CBD National Focal Point for Gender and Biodiversity
Yaw Osei-Owusu, Executive Director, Conservation Alliance International, Ghana
Suneetha M Subramanian, Research Fellow, United Nations University-Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability

Apologies from

Ari-Pekka Auvinen, Researcher, Ecosystem Services, Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE); CBD National Focal Point for the Clearinghouse Mechanism
David Berger, International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) and Indigenous Navigator
Hernando Garcia Martinez, Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt, Colombia
Jasmine Kindness, Senior Researcher, One World Analytics
Joyce Imende, National Environment Management Authority, Kenya

Lotta Manninen, Senior Ministerial Adviser, Ministry of the Environment, Finland
Marina von Weissenberg, Senior Ministerial Adviser, Ministry of the Environment, Finland; CBD National Focal Point
Patrick Maundu, Ethnobotanist, National Museums of Kenya; CBD National Focal Point for Traditional Knowledge, Article 8(j)
Silje Heldt Zaltzman, International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA)

Event support

Rita Dias, UNEP-WCMC Events

Katherine Grosset, UNEP-WCMC Events

Annex 2: Workshop agenda

Day 1 ~ Thursday, 29 th January	
8:30 – 9:00	Registration and meeting participants
9:00 – 9:30	Opening Session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome and introduction to the workshop
9:30 – 10:30	Session 1: Setting the scene <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding the objectives of the workshop
10:30 – 11:00	Break and group photo
11:00 – 12:00	Session 2: Key considerations regarding rights-based indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective: Understanding key considerations regarding rights-based indicators, including the traditional knowledge indicators, for the implementation of the KMGBF (addressing CBD/COP/16/31, CBD/CP/16/15, and CBD/COP/12/12).
12:00 – 13:00	Session 3: Case 1, Land-use change and land tenure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective: Share national experiences; Build the community of practice
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch Break
14:00 – 15:30	Session 3 (cont.) Land-use change and land tenure
15:30 – 16:00	Break. Change rooms
16:00 – 16:30	Session 4: Indicator stations / world cafe: 'What we have and what we are using across the rights-based indicators' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective: Group documentation, advancing each indicator
16:30 – 17:00	Discussions and key messages from day 1

Day 2 ~ Friday, 30 th January	
9:00 – 9:15	Recap from Day 1 and overview of Day 2 agenda
9:15 – 10:15	Session 5: Traditional Occupations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective: Share national experiences; Build the community of practice
10:15 – 11:00	Session 6: Gender – Use case of GPA indicator, Gender considerations in rights-based monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective: Strengthening awareness of the CBD Gender Plan of Action; Presenting national experiences; Building the community of practice
11:00 – 11:30	Break - Note: RSVP to request time with technical expert(s) on Saturday
11:30- 12:15	Session 6 cont. - Group exercise on using the GPA indicator as a tool
12:15 – 13:15	Session 7: Other TK indicators: Linguistic Diversity; Participation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective: Update on indicator status, share national experiences, Discuss next possible steps
13:15 – 14:15	Break
14:15 – 15:00	Session 8: Gaps in rights-based monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective: Learn about youth monitoring; Explore gaps and possibilities
15:00 – 16:00	Session 9: The monitoring landscape: Identifying opportunities and entry points for increasing uptake of TK and rights-based indicators

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Objective: Based on the rapid scan (Session 4) and experiences within countries (Sessions 3, 5, 6, 7), identify best practices and next steps, with the intention of developing guidance relevant for CBD Parties and partners <p>Work in groups: What are the key barriers and opportunities for TK and rights-based indicator use? What is working well? What existing efforts can be linked?</p>
16:00 – 16:30	Break
16:30 – 17:30	Session 9 (cont. and report back): Convergence on the spectrum of actions
17:30 – 17:45	Wrap-up and key messages from day 2

Day 3 ~ Saturday, 31 st January	
9:00 – 10:30	Session 10: Approaches and options for further operationalization of rights-based indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Objective: Converge on common advice for rights-based monitoring; Identify potential partners and next steps; Agree on workshop outcomes and their use
10:30 – 11:00	Break
11:00 – 13:00	Session 10 (follow-up & wrap up) - Recap, next steps and closing of the workshop

Annex 3: Summary of the status of the indicator: Index of Linguistic Diversity

1. The indicator on trends in linguistic diversity and number of speakers of indigenous languages serves as a proxy for traditional knowledge under the Framework and its monitoring framework. The metadata for the Index of Linguistic Diversity – Trends in Linguistic Diversity proposes to use, and update, the established and implemented methodology of the Index of Linguistic Diversity, which was last updated in 2010. The proposed update would focus on data collection and analysis on the national level and calls for a progressive transition to an indicator for linguistic vitality using participatory approaches.
2. This indicator is already a complementary indicator for Goal B, and is recommended as a component indicator for Targets 1, 2, 9, 21, 22 and 23. It is also very relevant to the operationalization of Section C. As such, the protection of traditional knowledge and linguistic diversity will support the full realization of these targets and goals.
3. Traditional knowledge is encoded in and expressed through the diverse languages spoken or signed by members of human societies worldwide. There are an estimated 6,000 to 8,000 spoken and signed languages worldwide. Counts of the number of speakers of languages over time provide a proxy indicator for trends in traditional knowledge. Existing evidence strongly suggests that languages, and the TK encoded within them, are being lost at an alarming rate.
4. Following adoption of the indicator in linguistic diversity by COP-7, the Index of Linguistic Diversity, (ILD) was developed by Terralingua based on a sample of 1,500 languages from the Ethnologue Catalogue of languages for the period 1970 to 2005.²⁰ The main finding of work on the indicator was that global indigenous linguistic diversity has declined by 21% since 1970 and has declined in all regions. The indicator was classified as available in COP Decision 13/28 in 2016 but has not been updated.
5. Counts of language speakers form part of indicators of *language vitality* consisting of six interrelated factors: a) intergenerational language transmission (e.g. are children learning the language); b) absolute number of speakers; c) proportion of speakers within the total population; d) trends in existing language domains (e.g. where a language is used such as home, school, or work); e) response to new domains and media (e.g. internet, video, artificial intelligence); f) materials for language education and literacy.²¹ The adoption of the UNESCO Global Action Plan of the International Decade of Indigenous Languages (2022-2032) in response to UN General Assembly Resolution 74/135 offers an important opportunity to further develop the linguistic diversity indicator

²⁰ Harmon, D., & Loh, J. (2010). The Index of Linguistic Diversity: A new quantitative measure of trends in the status of the world's languages. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, 4, 97-151.

²¹ UNESCO. (2003). *Language Vitality and Endangerment*. UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

under the Convention to address language vitality with the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples.

6. It is recommended that the existing indicator be updated without changing its fundamental structure and the up-to-date data from the Ethnologue Catalogue, which covers over 6,300 languages worldwide, be used, with a greater focus on disaggregation by country. It is proposed that future indicator development would focus on the national level. The indicator would be further developed after a call to Parties for submissions on best practices in participatory data collection with indigenous peoples and local communities. This would create a foundation for establishing pilot projects that would experiment in methodologies using robust data sources that may include Ethnologue, national census data, participatory indigenous data including census and survey data, NGO data and other data sources.
7. The transition from an indicator based purely on counts of language speakers towards an indicator of language vitality will require methodological work on issues such as the comparability between official statistics and contributions from indigenous peoples and local communities and civil society initiatives and experts.
8. It is therefore proposed that a multi-tiered approach to data collection is used that works with national statistics, existing data sources, participatory data from community-led initiatives and new approaches to data aggregation at scale (e.g. machine learning-based named entity recognition and large language models for tasks such as classification and summary). Combining these approaches will raise significant questions of data comparability for national and sub-national level data aggregation.
9. A number of countries are preparing National Action Plans for implementation of the Global Action Plan of the International Decade of Indigenous Languages (2022-2032) and some of them (e.g. Australia, Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, Norway, Peru and Ukraine) have already published details of the National Action Plans.²² These plans may provide opportunities for further cooperation on national data collection and aggregation and could potentially form the basis for 'flagship' initiatives in relation to the indicator during the Decade.

²² <https://www.unesco.org/en/decades/indigenous-languages/idil-actions/national-action-plans?hub=67103>