

4. Implications for the Global Review and second-cycle NBSAPs



For the Global Review at COP17, **CBM offers a practical and politically feasible way to accelerate KMGBF delivery without reopening the question of ambition.**

For Parties revising NBSAPs in the 2026 to 2028 cycle, CBM provides a concrete way to operationalise commitments, particularly under Targets 21 to 23 and on ecosystem condition and sustainable use. For donors and the financial mechanism, **CBM is among the most cost-effective options for closing data and participation gaps.**

Without deliberate policy choices in Yerevan, however, CBM risks remaining project-based and disconnected from national systems.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To translate the evidence base into accelerated delivery of the framework, this brief proposes **five concrete actions**, each directed to a specific actor and a decision pathway.



• To CBD Parties at COP17.

Adopt language in the decision on the monitoring framework that explicitly recognises CBM and citizen science as complementary sources of data for KMGBF and NBSAP implementation, and request the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators to develop guidance on integrating community-generated data into national reporting.



• To CBD Parties as NBSAP focal points.

In second-cycle NBSAPs (2026-2028), identify the specific targets and indicators to which CBM will contribute, define institutional pathways for uptake, and ensure that data-sharing arrangements respect community data sovereignty, consistent with Collective benefit, Authority to control, Responsibility, and Ethics (CARE) principles and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC).



• To donor governments, GBFF and the Cali Fund.

Earmark a defined share of biodiversity finance for community-led monitoring and for the institutional infrastructure required to use community-generated data, with safeguards consistent with CARE principles and FPIC, and with priority given to Indigenous-led and women-led monitoring initiatives.



• To national agencies and research institutions.

Establish interoperability between CBM systems and national biodiversity databases, including platforms such as the Global Biodiversity Information Facility, the UN Biodiversity Lab and the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, while maintaining community control over the use and dissemination of locally generated data.



• To the CBD Secretariat and the Article 8(j) programme of work.

Strengthen recognition of CBM as a tool for IPLC participation in implementation, monitoring and review, and align future guidance with the new programme of work on Article 8(j) adopted at COP16.

CONCLUSION

A successful Global Review at COP17 will be judged not by the renewal of commitment but by evidence of accelerated delivery in the years that follow. CBM is one of the most concrete, evidence-grounded and cost-effective contributions available to Parties.

Yerevan should mark the point at which CBM moves from the margins of biodiversity governance to a recognised pillar of the monitoring architecture, with corresponding pathways into national reporting and second-cycle NBSAPs.

The evidence is now sufficient. The decision is political.

REFERENCES

- Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). (2022). *Decision 15/5: Monitoring Framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework*. CBD COP15, Montreal.
- Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). (2024). *Decision 16/31: Enhanced Approaches to Monitoring and Reporting under the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework*. CBD COP16, Cali.
- Government of Armenia & CBD Secretariat. (2026). *Host Country Information for the Seventeenth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP17)*. Yerevan.
- Argyriou, D., Brofeldt, S., & Theilade, I. (2026). *Community-Based Monitoring (CBM) in Practice: Digital Tools, Local Agency, and Environmental Governance Across Five Countries*. University of Copenhagen.
- Danielsen, F., et al. (2024). *Involving citizens in monitoring the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework*. Nature Sustainability, 7.
- IPBES. (2019). *Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, Bonn.



SCAN to read the full CBM report

Policy brief for the World Biodiversity Forum (Davos, 14 to 19 June 2026) and **CBD COP17** (Yerevan, 19 to 30 October 2026).

FROM COMMUNITY-GENERATED DATA TO GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY ACTION

Community-based monitoring and the first Global Review of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework



A joint publication by the **University of Copenhagen**, **more4nature**, **Terra Co. Lab** and **Danmission**, June 2026

UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN



DANMISSION

more4nature
with citizen science

terra co.LAB.
www.terra.co.lab

Citation: University of Copenhagen, more4nature, Terra Co. Lab and Danmission (2026). From community-generated data to global biodiversity action: community-based monitoring and the first Global Review of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. Policy brief for the World Biodiversity Forum and CBD COP17. Hellerup: Danmission.

KEY MESSAGES



COP17 in Yerevan will host the first Global Review of collective progress on the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGBF). The implementation gap persists, driven by data shortfalls, weak sub-national reporting and limited societal engagement.

Community-based monitoring (CBM) is a credible, evidence-based response. Around 30 per cent of the framework's 365 indicators can directly involve Indigenous Peoples, local communities, faith-based actors and citizen scientists, and a majority can benefit from community participation in data collection.

CBM adds the greatest value at the level of component, complementary and selected headline indicators, particularly those related to ecosystem condition, sustainable use, knowledge and participation under Targets 21 to 23.

Recognising CBM in the COP17 decision on the monitoring framework, and embedding it in second-cycle National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), would be a low-cost, high-leverage step. The Global Biodiversity Framework Fund (GBFF) and the Cali Fund should earmark a defined share of resources for community-led monitoring.



CBM BRINGS LOCAL KNOWLEDGE AND CITIZEN DATA INTO BIODIVERSITY MONITORING, adding the most value where community evidence can strengthen ecosystem, restoration, species and participation indicators.

These contributions are not evenly distributed across the framework. **CBM adds the most value in three areas.**

First, or component and complementary indicators, where local data is often the only practical source of fine-grained information on ecosystem condition, pressures and use.

Second, at selected headline indicators related to ecosystem extent, restoration and species recovery, where community-collected data can supplement national systems.

Third, for Targets 21 to 23 on knowledge accessibility, participation, equity and gender responsiveness, where community engagement is itself part of the intended outcome.

CBM is less suited to indicators that depend primarily on centralised analytical, legal or legislative inputs, such as those on subsidy reform or access to genetic resources. This distinction matters: **CBM should be scaled where it is strongest**, rather than promoted indiscriminately across the entire framework.

Indicator tier or target group	CBM contribution	Examples of where CBM is best placed to feed in
Headline indicators	Selective	Extent and condition of natural ecosystems; species population trends; coverage of protected and conserved areas; restoration coverage
Component indicators	High	Ecosystem condition; pressures on ecosystems; sustainable use of wild species; quality of governance arrangements
Complementary indicators	High	Local pressures and drivers; traditional knowledge; ecosystem services and livelihoods; gender-disaggregated participation.
Targets 21 to 23	Central	Equitable participation in decision-making; gender responsiveness; access to data, information and justice

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The first Global Review of the KMGBF will take place at a time when a familiar problem remains unresolved. Nature continues to decline, and biodiversity data systems remain incomplete, particularly at the sub-national scale. **The implementation gap at the country level is widening rather than closing.** New global ambition alone will not close it; doing so requires better evidence, broader participation and stronger institutional uptake of locally generated data.

This brief argues that **CBM**, grounded in citizen science and in the meaningful participation of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs), **is a necessary complement to professional and government-led monitoring.** Drawing on the March 2026 report *Community-Based Monitoring (CBM) in Practice: Digital Tools, Local Agency, and Environmental Governance Across Five Countries*, published by Danmission, the University of Copenhagen and more4nature, as well as a recent peer-reviewed article in Nature Sustainability, this brief identifies where CBM adds the most value, which institutional pathways are needed to scale it, and which decisions COP17 should take in Yerevan to embed CBM in the monitoring architecture and in second-cycle NBSAPs.

The KMGBF, adopted at COP15, set 23 targets and four goals to halt and reverse biodiversity loss by 2030. Its monitoring framework, further refined at COP16 in Cali in 2024, comprises headline, binary, component and complementary indicators for use in national reporting. COP17 in Yerevan, under the slogan **Taking action for nature**, will host the first **Global Review of collective progress and is expected to shape the next phase of implementation.**

Three constraints are now well documented and risk slowing delivery.

- one** **The first is the continued acceleration of biodiversity loss**, with around one million species at risk of extinction and ecosystem functions already severely degraded, according to the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). Global Assessment.
- two** **The second is the data gap**: many countries lack the institutional capacity, financial resources or geographic reach to monitor biodiversity systematically, particularly in remote forests, coastal and marine ecosystems, and Indigenous territories.
- three** **The third is limited societal ownership**: although the framework explicitly calls for a whole-of-society approach, this principle has proved difficult to translate into national practice.

The **Aichi Biodiversity Targets** fell short not because they lacked ambition, but because implementation and evidence at the sub-national scale remained too weak. **The KMGBF risks repeating that pattern unless monitoring is broadened beyond what professional institutions can deliver on their own.**

CBM refers to systematic, long-term monitoring in which communities play a central role in defining priorities, collecting and interpreting data, and using evidence to inform decisions. A peer-reviewed assessment published in Nature Sustainability (Danielsen et al., 2024) finds that **30 per cent of the 365 indicators in the KMGBF monitoring framework can directly involve IPLCs and citizen scientists in CBM programmes**, while a further **51 per cent could benefit from citizen involvement in data collection.**

CBM STRENGTHENS BIODIVERSITY MONITORING by connecting local knowledge, citizen science and institutional decision-making.

COP17 CAN HELP CLOSE THE IMPLEMENTATION GAP by formally embedding community-led data into global and national biodiversity frameworks.

1. COP17 and the implementation gap

COP17 WILL REVIEW PROGRESS on the Global Biodiversity Framework, but biodiversity loss, weak data systems and limited public ownership still threaten delivery.

2. Where community-based monitoring adds the most value

3. Evidence from practice



CBM CASE STUDIES SHOW THAT COMMUNITY-LED MONITORING can produce credible biodiversity data and support advocacy, enforcement and policy dialogue when it is co-designed locally and recognised by institutions.

The report, Community-Based Monitoring (CBM) in Practice, documents CBM initiatives across Cambodia, Myanmar, Lebanon, Tanzania, and Kenya, covering forests, mangroves, freshwater systems, and coastal ecosystems. Across these contexts, CBM has generated credible, geo-referenced biodiversity data, strengthened community organisation and, where governance conditions allowed, contributed to enforcement, advocacy and policy dialogue.

Three lessons emerge across the cases.

CBM systems produce high-quality data when they are co-designed with communities from the outset, rather than adapted from external protocols.

Digital tools can enhance consistency and accessibility, but do not replace social organisation and local governance.

The impact of CBM depends on whether institutions are willing and able to use community-generated evidence; in practice, institutional uptake is often the binding constraint. Data quality and data integrity are generally sufficient and not the constraining factor.

CASE IN POINT:

In Kawthoolei, in southeastern Myanmar, Indigenous Karen communities and the Karen Environmental and Social Action Network (KESAN) have developed a community-based monitoring system using the KERBWA mobile application. Operating in the Salween Peace Park, the system enables local forest patrollers to collect geo-referenced data on illegal activities, biodiversity and environmental change in a conflict-affected landscape.

The case reflects three features identified across global CBM practice.

- **Data quality is strengthened** through community co-design and training.
- **Uptake** is enabled by **strong local governance and by data-sharing agreements** with authorities.
- **CBM supports both biodiversity protection and climate resilience** by improving forest management and reducing pressure on ecosystems.