

Summary report

CBD COP 16

PREPARED BY THE PACIFIC OneCROP
attending COP16 (SPC, SPREP, OPOC)



In a nutshell:

One of the main objectives of the biodiversity COP16 was agreement on financial means for the **implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF)**, the landmark “Paris Agreement for nature” deal made at COP15 in Montreal in 2022.

COP 16 **reviewed the development of national targets** and the alignment of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) with the GBF. Despite their pledges to submit their national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) “by” COP16, **only 44 out of 196 parties (22%)** had come up with new biodiversity plans (only Tonga from PICs has already been submitted).

- COP 16, chaired by Columbia, came to an abrupt halt, as large number of developing-country delegates were forced to catch flights home, leaving parties without the “quorum” needed. This resulted in a number of agreements not being adopted despite heavy negotiating in the working groups.
- In contrast to what exists for climate negotiations, there are no official agreed AOSIS group or SIDS group for CBD negotiations. But PSIDs have been able to coordinate themselves to speak in the name of PSIDs and even high-level statements have been made on behalf of all SIDS.

During the most inclusive COP ever, actively incorporating the voices of Indigenous Peoples and local communities (IPLC), Countries agreed on:

- A new permanent subsidiary body for IPLC, which will allow them to advise and offer their view to biodiversity COPs directly for the first time, along with support for direct access to funding for biodiversity conservation, restoration and sustainable use for IPLCs.
- A new benefit-sharing mechanism for digital sequencing information of genetic resources (“DSI”), the “Cali fund”. Although contributions to the fund are voluntary and the responsibility now lies with companies to show impact, the mechanism aims to bridge part of the biodiversity finance gap.
- A new shared understanding of the most important areas of the world’s ocean to conserve, through procedures for describing Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs).
- Countries that have not yet done so have been urged to release new NBSAPs “as soon as possible”.
- Countries agreed to align their biodiversity and climate policies at the national level, prioritize action in key places for biodiversity and climate and establish pathways towards fostering collaboration between the CBD and UNFCCC.
- A new voluntary action plan highlighting the links between biodiversity and health.
- A vote has been held on the venue of COP 17, to be held in 2026: With 65 votes, Armenia was elected host of COP 17, with Azerbaijan receiving 58 votes.

No consensus has been reached on:

- Resource mobilization and financial mechanism (setting up a new fund under the COP). The Global Biodiversity Framework Fund (GBFF), an interim fund, will still be hosted under the Global Environment Facility (GEF).
- Endorsement of the strengthened framework for monitoring countries’ progress on tackling biodiversity loss. The monitoring framework adopted at COP15 equips countries to, for the first time, report in a way that can be aggregated and analyzed at the global level, allowing for real

understanding of progress to achieve the GBF. However, the set of mandatory binary questions and some of the methodologies for the mandatory headline indicators were missing at COP15, with some of the indicators existing in name only. Despite significant progress in an expert process updating methodologies, negotiations at COP16 stalled on disagreements over optional component and complementary indicators, and the monitoring decision was held back until the financial mechanism and resource mobilization decisions were adopted. Lack of adoption of this agreement is a significant missed opportunity.

- The budget for the secretariat.

Both topics will need to be revisited at intersessional meetings next year, likely to happen April 2025 aligned to a SBSTTA meeting.

Short history of the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD)

The CBD was adopted on 22 May 1992 and opened for signature on 5 June 1992 at the UN Conference on Environment and Development (the Rio “Earth Summit”). The CBD entered into force on 29 December 1993. There are currently 196 Parties to the Convention (the USA is not Party), which aims to promote the conservation of biodiversity, the sustainable use of its components, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources. The COP is the governing body of the Convention.

CCES (Anne-Claire Goarant and Rebecca Stirnemann) represented SPC within the one CROP team and worked closely with the SPREP team to support the Pacific Island Countries.

General findings:

- COP16 was the first biodiversity summit since nations signed a landmark agreement in late 2022 called the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF), which aims to halt and reverse nature loss by 2030 through 23 targets. It is often described as the “Paris Agreement for nature”. 6 heads of state and approximately 110 ministers attended a high-level segment.
- As part of the GBF, countries agreed to submit new or updated national biodiversity pledges, known as national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) “by” COP16. These NBSAPs were meant to outline how countries will implement the goals and targets of the GBF within their borders (viewed a key test of whether countries are taking action to ensure biodiversity loss is reversed by 2030).

By the summit’s end, just 44 out of 196 parties (22%) had come up with biodiversity plans aligned with the GBF. Some megadiverse nations and major economies said they did not have the time needed to put plans in place; while developing countries said they were not provided with the funding required to produce new pledges.

At COP16, a new decision text on NBSAPs was adopted (“urges countries that have not yet done so to release new NBSAPs “as soon as possible”, with no agreement on the proposed addition of “but no later than the end of 2025”). [CBD/COP/16/L.25](#)

- The summit ended abruptly as there were not enough country representatives present to proceed (this was the longest CBD COP, extending nine hours past the scheduled end at midnight Friday 1 November). DSI, finance and the monitoring framework were left to the end of the plenary, when many parties were no longer present to provide consensus. Delegates from Fiji and Panama told the hall that they were the only ones remaining from their delegations, with Fiji noting that they were the last remaining representative of the Pacific Island nations.
- In contrast to what exists for climate negotiations, there is not official agreed AOSIS group or SIDS group. However, PSIDs coordinated themselves to speak in the name of PSIDs, and SIDS coordination was strengthened at COP16, with even high-level statements having been made on behalf of the SIDS.
- A vote has been held on the venue of COP 17, to be held in 2026: With 65 votes, Armenia was elected host of COP 17, with Azerbaijan receiving 58 votes.

Approved

Support mechanisms

Strengthening the role of indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLC) in Biodiversity Efforts- 8(j)

[CBD/COP/16/L.5](#) (Programme of work on Article 8(j) & other provisions of CBD related to IPLC to 2030)

[CBD/COP/16/L.6](#) (Institutional arrangements for the full and effective participation of IPLC in the work undertaken under the CBD)

[CBD/COP/16/L.7](#): Role of people of African descent, comprising collectives embodying traditional lifestyles in the implementation of the CBD.

- Adoption of the programme of work to implement Article 8(j) and other provisions related to IPLC through to 2030, “prioritising those tasks that contribute directly to the timely, full and effective implementation” of the GBF.

This transformative programme has 9 general principles and 8 elements focusing on issues such as biodiversity conservation and restoration, sustainable use, full and effective participation and a human rights-based approach. Through this Programme, rights, contributions and traditional knowledge of IPLC are further embedded in the global agenda.

The work programme also includes elements such as direct access to funding for biodiversity conservation, restoration and sustainable use for IPLCs.

- Parties also agreed to establish a new permanent subsidiary body (SB) on article 8j and other Provisions, with its modus operandi to be developed over the next two years. It is expected to elevate issues related to the implementation of Article 8j and enhance the engagement and participation of IPLC in all convention processes and work under the Convention. It will be the third SB in addition to SBI (Subsidiary Body on Implementation) and SBSTTA (Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice).
- A further decision was taken to recognize the role of people of African descent comprising collectives embodying traditional lifestyles in implementing the Convention and in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity (in line with national legislation or circumstances).

Mainstreaming of biodiversity within and across sectors [CBD/COP/16/L.9](#)

- Actions that seek to ensure that biodiversity is considered in any policies and practices that could have a negative effect on it.
- Decision requests additional activities ahead of COP 18, including on assessing the need for an analysis of challenges of biodiversity mainstreaming, and scientific, technical, technological, and institutional capacity gaps.
- Launch of a “mainstreaming champions” group of nations, led by Mexico and Colombia. “Key priorities” will be “accelerating collective action and impact”, “collaboration and mutual learning” and “engagement designed to maintain momentum through 2030”. The group had 17 members (Columbia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, **Fiji**, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Mauritania, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, Spain).

Scientific and technical needs for the implementation of the GBF [CBD/COP/16/L.12](#)

- The decision text highlights a few areas of work where advancement could be made, including biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning, pollution and biodiversity and sustainable biodiversity-based activities.
- The Pacific called for inclusion of the work area on Equity, gender equality and the human rights-based approach relating to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resource

- The COP16 decision also “welcomes the establishment” of regional and subregional scientific and technical cooperation support centers, but falls short of calling for resourcing of these centers or asking Parties to support the centers. SPREP is the Oceania support center.

Capacity building and development, technical and scientific cooperation and technology transfer **CBD/COP/16/L.13**

- The decision ‘invites’ Parties to take several actions to continue sharing information, and requests the Informal Advisory Group to identify suitable options to further address the technological, technical and institutional capability gaps identified, in particular by developing country Parties, with a focus on the targets and cross-cutting considerations of the Framework. Pacific island countries successfully inserted ‘and cross-cutting considerations’, which refers to the 18 considerations set out in Section C of the KM-GBF including equality, human rights, ecosystem approach, etc.
- Welcomes the regional and subregional scientific and technical cooperation support centers, and Decides that the global coordination entity of the technical and scientific cooperation mechanism will be hosted by the CBD Secretariat.
- Invites relevant funds to ‘support the operationalization and activities of the regional and subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centres in developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States among them, and Parties with economies in transition’.

Sharing the benefits from digital sequence information on genetic resources (DSI):CBD/COP/16/L.32/Rev.1

- DSI is a term used at international talks to refer to genetic information from plants and animals. This genetic information is often sourced from plants and animals in developing, biodiversity-rich countries by companies headquartered mainly in the global north, who use it to make products, such as drugs, cosmetics and food.
- Having agreed at COP 15 to establish a multilateral mechanism, including a global fund, to share the benefits from uses of DSI more fairly and equitably, delegates at COP 16 advanced its operationalization, with a decision and six enclosures. Countries agreed to the first-ever global fund, the “Cali fund” to which companies using genetic data “should contribute”, along with a unique multilateral mechanism to support it.
- The model targets larger companies. Pharmaceutical, cosmetics, agribusiness, nutraceutical and technology conglomerates that benefit from genetic data “should” contribute 1% of their profits, or 0.1% of their revenue, to the Cali fund. The use of the word “should” implies that contributing to the fund is still voluntary and that the payment rates are “indicative”, non-binding ones. Total estimated sales in 2024 are US\$1,500 bn (and estimated in 2023, US\$2,300 bn). The Cali fund could raise between \$15 and \$19 billion a year.
- Academia and research institutions will not contribute to the fund but are expected to make explicit on their databases the countries of origin of data, to provide clues to users of these databases on to whom benefits should go to.
- At least half of all benefits going to the fund must be used to meet the “self-identified” needs of Indigenous communities in developing countries, particularly women and youth, although it concedes that this could be limited by “national circumstances”. Some funds may support capacity building and technology transfer.
- Countries, too, will receive “direct allocations” of funding, a subject that was keenly contested.
- Strong monitoring & reporting will ensure industries see the impact of their contributions in a transparent & open way, and regular reviews will build the mechanism’s efficiency and efficacy over time.

- COP16 decided to further explore the modalities of the multilateral mechanism, including possible additional modalities that take products and services into account, and new tools and models for making DSI publicly available and accessible.

Risk assessment

Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety welcomed new, voluntary guidance on assessing the risks posed by living modified organisms (LMOs) containing engineered gene drives, a milestone in international biosafety management aiming to bolster the scientific rigor and transparency of risk assessment procedures in the Protocol.

Engineered gene drives have the capacity to propagate genetic modifications rapidly through wild populations and the move to strengthen protocols comes amid increased debate over genetic engineering, particularly for applications for pest/invasive control, disease control, and agriculture. The new guidance prioritizes scientific transparency and accuracy in risk assessments.

The voluntary nature of these guidelines allows individual countries to tailor assessments to national contexts, considering ecological variables unique to their environments. This flexibility is crucial in regions with diverse ecosystems and will help regulators make informed decisions, considering both the benefits and risks of LMOs with gene drives.

Scientific and technical issues

Biodiversity and Climate Change: [CBD/COP/16/L.24](#)

Countries agreed to align their biodiversity and climate policies at the national level, prioritize action in key places for biodiversity and climate and establish pathways towards fostering collaboration between the CBD and UNFCCC.

The COP welcomes and takes note of the findings the Sixth Assessment Report of the IPCC (IPCC-6); and the IPBES 10 decision to foster further collaboration with the IPCC.

The COP urge parties to consider integrating and promoting nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches, non-market-based approaches, and Mother Earth-centric actions to climate change adaptation and mitigation and disaster risk reduction into their revised NBSAPs and relevant national targets.

COP calls secretariat to explore opportunities to address the ocean-climate-biodiversity nexus in an integrated manner to achieve the GBF goals (with UNFCCC, UN decade of Ocean science & UNDOALOS).

Agreement to remove reference to emissions reduction and “recognizing that the risks and impacts of climate change on biodiversity will be much lower at the temperature increase of 1.5°C degrees compared with 2°C.”

Agreement to preambular language recognizing that biodiversity and ecosystem resilience to climate change “are decreased by actions that may lead to increased risk of adverse climate-related outcomes,” and deletion of references to “adverse adaptation and mitigation” and “maladaptive actions”.

Item 20 Conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity and of island biodiversity: [CBD/COP/16/L.17](#)

Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs) ([CBD/COP/16/L.8](#)):

Under the CBD, work on EBSAs, which identifies the most critical and vulnerable parts of the ocean, began in 2010 and became a central area of ocean-related work. The modalities for the modification of descriptions of EBSAs and the description of new areas have been adopted, ensuring that the cataloging of information of these areas can support planning and management with the most advanced science and knowledge available. Over 8 years in the making and touching upon delicate political matters relating to the law of the sea, the modalities are expected to make a crucial contribution to the implementation not only of CBD and the GBF (the 30x30 protected areas target) but also of the BBNJ Agreement.

Conservation and Sustainable Use: In an update of the coastal and marine Programme of Work, there was agreement that further efforts are needed to: “improve the understanding of the impacts of geoengineering activities on marine and coastal biodiversity in line with the precautionary approach”, deletion of a mention addressing work on geoengineering under the London Convention on marine pollution and reference to

implementing the UN system-wide strategy for water and sanitation kept. Also note that the call for efforts on understanding and acting for human rights-based approaches was removed from the coastal and marine Programme of Work and the Island Programme of Work

Mention the need to improve understanding of marine biodiversity across mesopelagic, deep-sea, and benthic ecosystems; to enhance the use of nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches; and to map, monitor, restore, and effectively manage marine and coastal ecosystems that contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation. agreement on the need to improve integration of the multiple values of biodiversity across marine and coastal areas, and “take effective” measures “at all levels, as appropriate,” to ensure benefit-sharing from marine genetic resources and DSI.

On subsidies, exclusion of “subsidies to fisheries,” to identify, understand, and avoid the negative impacts of incentives, in sectors harmful for biodiversity in marine and coastal ecosystems, and to eliminate, phase out, or reform such incentives in line with relevant international obligations, but addition of a footnote on the WTO agreements, including the agreement on fisheries subsidies.

On island biodiversity, agreement on the need to enhance the use of ocean accounting and marine spatial planning.

The COOK ISLANDS, on behalf of Pacific SIDS called for the establishment of a standalone agenda item on island biodiversity and the development of a dedicated decision on island biodiversity and its programme of work at future meetings of the COP.

The COP further requests the Secretariat to continue to facilitate capacity-building and partnership activities and enhance cooperation, collaboration, or synergies, as appropriate, on various thematic issues related to marine and coastal biodiversity and island biodiversity to support the achievement of the SDGs.

Biodiversity and health [CBD/COP/16/L.10](#)

Biodiversity loss is linked in many ways to the health of people, wildlife and ecosystems. Robust ecosystems and species diversity benefit the production of food, clean water, medicine and other essentials for good health.

Countries approved a voluntary Action Plan highlighting the links between biodiversity and health to help curb the emergence of zoonotic diseases, prevent non-communicable diseases, and promote sustainable ecosystems. The global action plan also ensures biodiversity and health co-benefits regarding GBF Target 13 (benefit-sharing DSI and TK) and promotes equitable access to tools and knowledge required to implement the holistic “One Health” approach and other approaches for plant, animal, and human health.

It outlined several voluntary actions on issues such as pollution, climate change and agriculture, plus detailed how they are relevant to the aims of the GBF. These include:

- Integrating the “consideration” of the links between climate change, biodiversity and health into national policy and planning rules.
- Reducing the “negative impacts on biodiversity and health” from agriculture and other sectors by boosting “sustainable practices”, such as “sustainable intensification” and “integrated pest management”.
- Developing ways to better understand the links between chemicals, waste and human health impacts.

The plan also gives policymakers a toolbox to address issues feeding into pandemic risks. At the heart of the plan is a collaborative framework that brings together health professionals, conservationists, and policymakers. The COP decision invites nations to designate national focal points for biodiversity and health, and to develop policies reflecting these interconnections, integrating biodiversity-health considerations in policies across the range of sectors from agriculture to urban planning.

Parties further called for close cooperation with international organizations, including the WHO, to develop monitoring tools and metrics for assessing the progress of biodiversity-health initiatives.

Invasive alien species [CBD/COP/16/L.4](#)

Invasive species are one of the five main drivers of biodiversity loss and are covered under target 6 of the GBF. Discussions on invasive species, as well as best practices for their prevention and control have featured on the COP agenda for many years.

COP 16's decision highlighted the need for international cooperation, capacity-building, and technical support for developing countries. It proposes guidelines for managing invasive alien species, touching on issues such as e-commerce, multicriteria analysis methodologies and others.

New databases, improved cross-border trade regulations, and enhanced coordination with e-commerce platforms aim to address gaps in managing invasive species risks and align with the goals of KMGBF, where cross-sectoral and collaborative approaches are central to biodiversity protection.

Synthetic biology [CBD/COP/16/L.21](#)

Synthetic biology refers to developments in biotechnology that can change genetic materials, living organisms and biological systems. These include gene drives, where genetics of species are altered to try and disrupt certain genes in a population. It was a prominent topic at COP 16, with an eye toward its potential benefits while considering the risks.

To address inequity in the participation of developing countries in the synthetic biology field, countries agreed to work towards developing a "thematic action plan" to support capacity building, address technology transfer and information sharing around these biotechnology developments.

A newly established ad hoc technical expert group will guide identification of synthetic biology's potential benefits and review the potential impacts of recent technological developments – a unique opportunity to explore synthetic biology in relation to the CBD's three fundamental objectives and in implementing the KMGBF.

Sustainable Wildlife Management [CBD/COP/16/L.2](#) and Plant Conservation - [CBD/COP/16/L.3](#)

Among the most crucial areas of discussion was the protection of wild species. A decision on sustainable wildlife management underscores the necessity of monitoring, capacity-building, and the inclusive participation of indigenous peoples, local communities, and women. To this end, the decision calls for the cooperation of international bodies like CITES and FAO to implement. The framework encourages research on how wildlife use, biodiversity loss, and zoonotic diseases are interconnected, a vital area for a world increasingly aware of the public health implications of biodiversity loss.

Plant conservation efforts are now aligned with the GBF monitoring framework. This includes updating the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation with specific indicators and a standardized reporting template, ensuring that progress in plant protection is measurable and consistent with global biodiversity targets.

IPBES [CBD/COP/16/L.11](#)

The COP requests SBSTTA to consider IPBES outputs according to the annexed schedule of IPBES assessments and their consideration under the CBD (2024-2030).

COP16 invites IPBES to consider the following request for potential additional assessments in its rolling work programme: pollution and biodiversity; cities and biodiversity; biodiversity and poverty; and biodiversity and climate change. It also invites IPBES to explore ways to raise awareness of, and include matters related to, the human rights-based approach, as relevant, in its work including in the scoping of future assessments.

Not approved

Support mechanisms

Cooperation with other conventions and international organizations [CBD/COP/16/L.30](#)

The draft decision proposed means to link CBD to other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), such as the UNFCCC and the BBNJ Agreement, to the UN Environment Assembly (UNEA), and possibly IPBES and IPCC, in accordance with national circumstances and priorities. Requests have been proposed to request to FAO to prepare a draft plan of action for the initiative on biodiversity for food and nutrition; to UNEP to continue its reflections on the rights of nature; and the governing bodies of the chemicals and waste conventions, FAO, and others to collaborate with the three Rio Conventions and the future legally binding instrument on plastic pollution.

Resource mobilization and financial mechanism

Resource mobilization [CBD/COP/16/L.34](#)

The funding gap for biodiversity, estimated at around \$700 billion a year, must be closed by 2030. The new “Strategy for Resource Mobilization” includes:

- Means to secure \$200 billion/year by 2030 from all sources for biodiversity (one of the GBF’s goals)
- A 360° solution: at international, domestic, and private sector levels, with positive impacts and redirection by 2030 of \$500 billion per year in subsidies that harm biodiversity.
- A high-level dialogue between finance and environment ministers
- Possible creation of a new dedicated global financing instrument for biodiversity to receive, disburse, mobilize and articulate funding needs by 2030 (disagreement between the global north and South)

The parties and others are encouraged to use the revised resource mobilization strategy 2025-2030 as flexible guidance to implement the CBD and its Protocols, and to achieve the GBF’s goals and targets. The strategy is to be implemented coherently with GBF Section C (considerations for GBF implementation), considering national circumstances and priorities, and encouraging action without affecting existing obligations.

One of the presidency’s key priorities for the conference is the recognition of existing high debt burdens. This was despite pushback from debtor countries, such as China.

Financial mechanism Administration of the Convention and budget for the trust funds [CBD/COP/16/L.35](#) and Financial mechanism [CBD/COP/16/L.31](#)

To date CBD has been able to count on resources mobilized to support the GBF through a variety of bilateral arrangements, private, and philanthropic sources, as well as dedicated funds such as:

- The Global Biodiversity Framework Fund (GBFF), agreed at COP 15 in 2022 is an interim fund hosted under the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The fund accepts contributions from governments, the private sector, and philanthropies, and finances high-impact projects in developing regions, with emphasis on supporting countries with fragile ecosystems, such as SIS and economies in transition. To date, 11 countries (including New Zealand, France) as well as the Government of Quebec have pledged nearly US \$400 million to the GBF Fund, with US \$163 million pledged during COP 16.
- The Kunming Biodiversity Fund (KBF), launched at COP 16 with a US \$200 million contribution from the Government of China. The KBF supports accelerated action to deliver 2030 Agenda and SDG targets and 2050 goals of the GBF, particularly in developing countries.

Developed countries, including the USA, had contributed \$12.1bn towards biodiversity finance in 2022. Furthermore, only \$3.8bn of that finance was biodiversity-specific (OECD, 2022).

The GEF has been requested to consider how to integrate Mother Earth-centric actions in its programming directions. The importance of providing adequate and predictable support to developing countries for national reports, NBSAPs, and national biodiversity finance plans or similar instruments have been underscored.

Agreement that GBF Fund needs to significantly scale up the mobilization of adequate and predictable resources made available to the GBF Fund to contribute to the timely implementation of the GBF, in particular for its Target 19 (mobilize USD 200 billion annually for biodiversity). Agreement on the terminology around

“developed country parties & other parties which voluntarily assume the obligations of developed country parties”.

COP 16 also considered an evaluation of the effectiveness of the GEF, which serves as the financial mechanism of the Convention. The evaluation noted that the GEF has made significant progress in its role in resource mobilization & in supporting the implementation of activities that achieve the objectives of the CBD. Parties recommended ways to enhance the governance of the GEF and how to effectively engage with IPLCs, women and youth. The Convention also outlined a 4-year outcome-oriented framework of biodiversity priorities that can help enhance GEF support to the Parties for its next 9th replenishment cycle. During the first two years of its current funding cycle (GEF-8), the GEF approved 2.42 billion in direct support to the KMGBF.

Brazil (CCCOP 30 host) launch at COP 28 the Tropical Forest Finance Facility (TFFF) and during COP 16 brought 5 countries (Germany, Colombia, the United Arab Emirates, Malaysia and Norway), committed to work together to define the architecture of the mechanism, which will be launched at COP30.

SIDS statement: The need for a more robust and effective financial mechanism under the direct authority of the COP is very glaring. It is needed for the implementation of Articles 20 and 21 and should be separated from the existing financial mechanism, such as the GEF. We continue to call for the establishment of a dedicated Biodiversity Fund to support the implementation of the KMGBF. We SIDS reaffirm our commitments to fulfil the objectives of the Convention and its Protocols. *We are at a critical point in addressing the biodiversity crisis brought upon by various factors including, climate change. Action must be taken before it's too late.*

Monitoring [CBD/COP/16/L.26](#) & [CBD/COP/16/L.33](#)

The lack of a clear monitoring framework at the time of adoption contributed to the world's failure to achieve the Aichi Targets. Recognizing this challenge, countries adopted a monitoring framework at COP15 with standard required (headline) indicators for almost all GBF goals and targets, as well as agreement that binary indicators would be required for some targets. The monitoring framework is made up of a set of indicators corresponding to each goal and target of the GBF. There are 4 types of indicators:

- Headline indicators (used to measure progress against quantitative targets, such as the pledge to protect 30% of the world's land and oceans by 2030).
- Binary indicators (more qualitative targets relating to process, the presence or absence of legislation, policies or regulations relating to the target).
- Component indicators measure (progress towards sub-targets in the GBF)
- Complementary indicators (areas that are related, but not necessarily explicitly laid out in the GBF)

Countries are mandated to report on headline and binary indicators, but the component and complementary indicators are optional. At COP15, the binary indicators were named without a set of questions or methodology. An expert group was established to advance the methodologies for monitoring.

Mains issues related to indicators:

- On pesticide use (indicator 7.2), parties were split over whether countries should report “pesticide environment concentration” or “aggregated total applied toxicity”. The former indicator is what was agreed in name only with no accompanying methodology, but the latter is what was suggested by the ad-hoc technical expert group, which said that there is no reliable data on pesticide environment concentration.
- indicators on coral reef coverage & health were not lost from the Monitoring Framework during COP negotiations. These indicators were removed from the list of complementary indicators as they are a disaggregation of headline indicators A.1 and A.2
- Only component and complementary indicators that had no methodology were removed, or those that were already identified as disaggregation's of headline indicators; those are the only things that were taken away and were clearly documented as such by the AHTEG. See inf/5.

Countries managed to agree that only the metadata underpinning required indicators would be left for review. They also agreed to leave room for new optional indicators to be added or adjusted in the monitoring framework as their methodologies are defined.

Using the mandatory headline and binary indicators, countries will, for the first time, report in a way that can be aggregated and analyzed at the global level, allowing for real understanding of progress to achieve the GBF. Lack of adoption of the strengthened monitoring framework, including the agreed questions for binary indicators, is a significant missed opportunity.

Expected outputs of the process are:

- a global report,
- report from dialogues at regional subnational and international levels (guide by Subsidiary bodies),
- identification of major gaps, barriers and transformative paths

Some countries did not want to endorse monitoring framework without a deal on resource mobilization. For this reason, the draft decision was held back to the end of the plenary, and the suspension of the COP blocked agreement on this draft decision.