



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General

30 June 2026

English only

Subsidiary Body on Implementation

Seventh meeting

Nairobi, 4–12 August 2026

Item 10 of the provisional agenda*

Capacity-building and development and technical and scientific cooperation

Progress report on the technical and scientific cooperation mechanism**

Note by the Secretariat

I. Introduction

1. The present note provides a review of the progress achieved in operationalizing the technical and scientific cooperation mechanism. It is based on information drawn from the activity reports submitted to the interim Global Coordination Entity by 12 regional and subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centres¹, available as at 13 May 2026, and the report of the interim Global Coordination Entity.

II. Summary of progress on operationalization of the technical and scientific cooperation mechanism

A. Operations of the Global Coordination Entity

2. In [decision 16/3](#), the Conference of the Parties decided that the Global Coordination Entity would be hosted by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and that the Bio-Bridge Initiative, funded by the Republic of Korea, would continue to provide coordination support to the technical and scientific cooperation mechanism until the Global Coordination Entity is established and fully operationalized. The following section summarizes the work undertaken during the biennium.

3. During the reporting period, the interim Global Coordination Entity (hereinafter referred to as “the interim GCE”) has relied on staff of the Bio-Bridge Initiative (one P4 staff and one G6 staff) who developed and implemented its workplan. In March 2026, the interim GCE received a Junior Professional Officer (P2), funded by the Republic of Korea for two years. The European Union also provided funding to support the recruitment of one staff member for a period of one year, to be recruited soon. The CBD Secretariat, as the host of the interim GCE, provided office space, computers and other office equipment and supplies for staff, and covered the core operating costs, including Internet and communications. The Secretariat’s in-kind contribution also included time of

* [CBD/SBI/7/1](#).

** The present document is being issued without formal editing.

¹ The workplans and activity reports submitted by the support centres are available at: www.cbd.int/tsc/tscm/subregionalcentres

senior management staff who provided strategic guidance and oversight and of administrative staff who provided operations support.

4. During the biennium, efforts primarily focused on the operationalization of the network of the technical and scientific cooperation support centres². As an initial step, the interim GCE engaged with all Parties to confirm their affiliation with the centre best positioned to support them, taking into account both geographic proximity and linguistic compatibility to ensure effective communication and collaboration.

5. The interim GCE facilitated the signing of 10 host agreements between the Secretariat and the organizations that were selected to host the technical and scientific cooperation support centres. Four other agreements are at an advanced stage and are expected to be finalized before the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. It should be noted that the Secretariat will not enter into agreements with all the 18 centres because in some regions, the organizations selected to host the centres entered collaborative arrangements whereby one of them will lead and sign the host agreement and the other centres will play a supporting role³.

6. To facilitate coordination with the technical and scientific cooperation support centres, the interim GCE organized eight monthly online coordination meetings as at 15 June 2026. In addition, it created a Microsoft Teams workspace and a WhatsApp group to support communication and information exchange among the support centres.

7. The interim GCE also established a helpdesk to provide information, advice and technical support to the Centres and respond to their requests and queries on an ongoing basis.

8. With financial support from the European Union, a consultant was engaged to assist the interim GCE in facilitating the operationalization of the support centres. This work included assessing the institutional readiness of the Centres to deliver on their mandates, providing strategic guidance on their governance structures, and supporting the development of their biennial workplans.

9. Other activities undertaken by the interim GCE include the following:

(a) Organized a workshop on the operationalization of the technical and scientific cooperation support centres held from 13 to 15 January 2026 in Montreal. The participants used the opportunity to refine their biennial workplans for 2025-2026, engaged in peer-to-peer exchange and learning, shared experiences and lessons learned regarding the operationalization of their centres;

(b) Embarked on the development of the TSC mechanism's communication strategy and branding and the strategic plan to mobilize resources for the support centres;

(c) Facilitated strategic partnerships, in close collaboration with the Secretariat staff leading relevant programmes of work. For example, several centres formalized collaborations with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) on the Target 2 Roadmap to develop country capacity for planning, monitoring and reporting on effective ecosystem restoration, and with the Secretariat on Target 3. The centres were also connected with the GEF 8 Umbrella Programme on NBSAP and National Reporting led by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and with the NBSAP Accelerator Partnership.

10. The most critical constraint affecting the interim GCE is the lack of predictable and sustained funding to fully operationalize its mandate. Insufficient resources for core staffing and essential functions, such as annual in-person coordination meetings, limit its ability to provide consistent and

² A total of 18 centres were selected by the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties and were formally welcomed by the Conference of the Parties in its [decision 16/3](#).

³ Three of the four centres selected for Europe, namely the Joint Research Centre (JRC) of the European Commission, IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation, and the Royal Belgian Institute for Natural Sciences, agreed to partner together under the leadership of JRC, which will provide a single-entry point for the concerned Parties in Europe. Likewise, the IUCN Regional Office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia (IUCN ECARO) and the Regional Environmental Centre for Central Asia (CAREC) agreed to work together, whereby IUCN ECARO will serve as the single-entry point for the concerned Parties in Eastern Europe and Central Asia.

strategic support to the centres. This funding gap has also delayed the implementation of key operational modalities⁴, underscoring the need for reliable financing to enable the GCE to function effectively.

B. Operations of the Technical and Scientific Cooperation Support Centres

11. The following section summarizes the key achievements of the technical and scientific cooperation support centres, identifies the three most significant constraints, and outlines proposed solutions to address these challenges and strengthen the overall delivery of technical and scientific cooperation.

1. Technical and Scientific Cooperation Support Centres in Africa

12. As at 13 May 2026, all the five centres in the Africa region had signed host agreements with the Secretariat, conducted assessments to understand the needs and priorities of the Parties they serve, developed biennial workplans, and embarked on establishing governance structures and management drawn on existing resources of the host organization for staffing. All the centres in the region have temporarily appointed Coordinators on a part-time basis and have assigned other staff within their organizations to assist them in their day-to-day work. Four out of five technical and scientific cooperation support centres⁵ submitted their biennial activity reports to the interim GCE, which are available on the Secretariat website⁶.

13. One centre has finalized the establishment of its steering committee; however, it has not yet convened a meeting owing to resource constraints and members' preference for in-person engagement.

14. All centres reported activities aimed at enhancing their visibility and recognition. Three centres organized events to launch their operations, while all centres leveraged international forums, such as the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment and the G20 Leaders' Summit hosted in South Africa, to promote their work and raise the profile of their centres. Two of the centres reported the development of branding and communication materials, such as fact sheets, webpages, banners and brochures.

15. Partnership development and resource mobilization were among the core priorities for all centres during this first biennium. They focused on leveraging existing networks while successfully building and expanding new partnerships. Three of the centres reported that they officially joined the NBSAP Accelerator Partnership and established collaborative arrangements with several regional organizations and global entities including FAO, the Center for International Forestry Research and World Agroforestry (CIFOR-ICRAF), UNEP and UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), UNDP and the World Bank, among others.

16. Two of the centres established partnership committees that serve as broader external advisory groups. These committees complement the steering committees by drawing on expertise from partner institutions and the private sector, while also helping to identify opportunities for collaboration and funding.

17. One of the centres adopted a structured and innovative approach to expanding its partnership network by mapping all potential partner organizations in its region and issuing a call for expressions of interest in collaboration. This initiative resulted in more than 60 organizations submitting expressions of interest to support the centre's work.

⁴ [Decision 16/3, annex II](#)

⁵ Central African Forest Commission (COMIFAC), Regional Centre for Mapping of Resources for Development (RCMRD), Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS) and the South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI).

⁶ www.cbd.int/tsc/tscm/subregionalcentres

18. It is also worth noting that the centres are actively promoting collaboration among themselves by inviting one another to events they organize, sharing contacts, knowledge and information, and identifying opportunities for joint action.

19. All centres have, to varying degrees, leveraged existing international cooperation projects, and a few have succeeded in mobilizing new financial resources, albeit on a limited scale. Some of the partners that have provided new financial resources to African centres include the French Development Agency, the European Union, FAO, the German development agency (GIZ) and the Kunming Biodiversity Fund. One centre has invested in developing a business case that clearly outlines funding needs and budget requirements.

20. Additionally, most of the centres report having developed project pipelines and concept notes for submission to a range of donors, including the Green Climate Fund and the Kunming Biodiversity Fund. Two centres have also secured licenses for a geographic information system (GIS) software called ArcGIS⁷ through a memorandum of understanding with the Environmental Systems Research Institute (Esri), which will be made available to the countries they support for a period of three years.

21. With regards to programmatic work and facilitating technical and scientific cooperation, all the centres undertook capacity needs assessments to better understand the needs and priorities of the Parties they serve. The needs assessments highlight strengthening biodiversity data, monitoring, and reporting systems, including through the expanded use of geospatial technologies and interoperable information platforms. Key thematic priorities include invasive species management, ecosystem restoration, other effective area-based conservation methods (OECMs), nature-based solutions, and the interlinkages between biodiversity and agriculture.

22. During the reporting period, the centres focused on strengthening biodiversity planning, monitoring and reporting, while building technical capacity and promoting regional cooperation. Countries received support related to the review and implementation of their national biodiversity strategies and actions plans (NBSAPs), biodiversity data and reporting, particularly on Target 2, preparation of their seventh national reports, Target 3 on protected areas and OECMs, and access to tools such as geographic information system and the United Nations Biodiversity Lab. This support was delivered through in-country assistance, mentoring, peer learning and helpdesk services (operational in one centre and under development in others), alongside at least eight trainings and five regional workshops, complemented by additional webinars and exchanges.

2. Technical and Scientific Cooperation Support Centres in Latin America and the Caribbean

23. As at 13 May 2026, all three centres in the region⁸ had submitted their biennial activity reports to the interim GCE, signed a host agreement with the Secretariat, carried out capacity needs assessments, prepared a workplan for the 2025–2026 biennium, established steering committees, and embarked on the process of developing resource mobilization strategies.

24. One centre further formalized a partners' network, comprising representatives from Parties and key sectors, including academia, the private sector, indigenous peoples and local communities, and youth. With support from the German development agency (GIZ), this centre convened an in-person steering committee meeting, which helped define roles, responsibilities, and operational arrangements.

25. One centre is consolidating a regional directory that integrates strategic information on research institutes, national focal points, institutional partners, regional centres and experts on Target 2 of the Global Biodiversity Framework. This tool serves to strengthen coordination, collaboration, and capacity mobilization at the regional level, and is expected to be continuously expanded and updated. In parallel, the centre formalized research partnerships with key institutions to enable joint scientific agendas and collaborative research, and has advanced strategic technology partnerships,

⁷ ArcGIS is used for managing, analyzing and visualizing spatial data, and creating maps.

⁸ Alexander von Humboldt Biological Resources Research Institute (Humboldt), Caribbean Community (CARICOM) and the Central American Commission on Environment and Development (CCAD/SICA).

including the development of a memorandum of understanding with Google to support technical cooperation and capacity-building, and ongoing collaboration with WildLabs to integrate innovative technological approaches into regional biodiversity initiatives.

26. The capacity needs assessments across the three centres consistently highlight systemic constraints hindering the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. These include limited human and institutional capacity; weak data, knowledge, and monitoring systems; and insufficient interoperable platforms and indicators for decision-making. The assessments underscore the need to strengthen governance frameworks and align national biodiversity strategies and action plans with effective implementation, alongside improving access to finance, technology, and technical support. They also stress the importance of long-term capacity-building, enhanced scientific cooperation, and more inclusive participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth.

27. Two centres have begun providing technical assistance in response to requests from the Parties they serve. One has piloted a help desk for Target 2, and the other is developing national technical assistance plans.

28. Collaboration among the three Latin American and Caribbean centres is active and ongoing. They are working together to maximize regional impact, strengthen coordination, and promote mutual learning and exchange of experiences. Monthly regional coordination meetings are organized to monitor progress and identify possible synergies.

29. Furthermore, two centres are in the process of developing communication strategies to enhance their strategic visibility and outreach. They also routinely participate in international events and strengthen their institutional presence through newsletters and webinars, among others.

30. One centre has successfully mobilized funding through various initiatives supported by the United Kingdom, Germany (IKI), and the Global Environment Facility, contributing to the implementation of Targets 2, 3 and 15 of the Framework, as well as the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. This progress was enabled through strong partnerships with FAO, UNEP and the NBSAP Accelerator Partnership. In addition, the centre has developed and submitted nine funding proposals, including one proposal submitted under the Google AI Challenge to develop a global artificial intelligence-based warning system for detecting early signs of ecosystem stress.

31. Another centre has also successfully mobilized resources through partnerships with the European Union and the Japanese development agency (JICA), in collaboration with Expertise France, GIZ, and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN). As a result, an initial budget has been secured for the centre to support training and technical assistance requested by Parties, as well as other related activities.

3. Technical and Scientific Cooperation Support Centres in Asia and the Pacific

32. As at 13 May 2026, three of the five centres in Asia and the Pacific⁹ had submitted their biennial activity reports to the interim GCE. Two centres signed host agreements with the Secretariat, two additional agreements were being finalized, while one remained under development. Four centres submitted their workplans for the 2025–2026 period, and the remaining centre will be presenting its workplan for endorsement by its steering committee during an upcoming in-person meeting later in 2026.

33. Progress in establishing steering committees varies across the centres. One centre has advanced its efforts by convening an initial online regional coordination meeting and engaging all Parties within its mandate. Another centre launched its operations during an in-person steering committee meeting, with participation from partners, in May 2026.

⁹ ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB), International Union for Conservation of Nature Regional Office for West Asia (IUCN ROWA) and the Nanjing Institute of Environmental Sciences (NIES).

34. Capacity needs assessments in Asia and the Pacific are at varying stages of completion. One centre has finalized a regional survey covering the countries it serves, identifying priority needs such as the identification and registration of OECMs, GIS and spatial planning, biodiversity finance, biodiversity monitoring, and support for national reporting. The assessment also highlights the importance of context-specific approaches, including language-adapted tools and tailored engagement modalities. Another centre has identified ecosystem restoration, knowledge management, and protected areas as key priorities. A third centre is currently conducting a comprehensive needs assessment based on stakeholder consultations and analysis of national reports and NBSAPs, the findings of which were discussed at the first steering committee meeting in May 2026.

35. Two centres have made efforts to enhance their visibility through various activities, including through participation in multiple international fora and regional workshops and dialogues. Another centre is laying the foundation for institutional communication systems, including the development of a communication strategy and plans for a dedicated website and specific branding and communication materials.

36. One of the centres established a help desk for monitoring Target 2 in close partnership with FAO. The centre also entered into agreement with one of the countries it is serving to support capacity development and data exchange for monitoring and reporting national progress towards Target 2.

37. Two centres have started the development of technical tools, knowledge products, and regional learning initiatives. One centre organized the first regional workshop on OECMs in West Asia and developed adapted technical tracking tools, including translated guidance materials. Another centre developed two knowledge products, including a report and a case study on governance systems for human–nature coexistence, delivered a training course on biodiversity conservation and supervision, and organized two side events at the fifth UNESCO World Congress of Biosphere Reserves on the climate–biodiversity nexus to support green development and the Belt and Road Initiative.

38. Partnerships have continued to expand across the centres. One centre established an expert database comprising more than 160 experts and is further expanding it jointly with partner institutions. Another centre advanced technical cooperation through partnerships with organizations such as FAO and UNEP-WCMC and is developing a specialized matchmaking mechanism and registry to connect national capacity gaps with technical assistance.

39. All centres are developing resource mobilization strategies. Notably, one centre already submitted five funding proposals, of which three have been successful, and is also leading a project supported by Norway, the European Union, and Germany. Another centre is currently developing four funding proposals focused on Targets 2 and 3.

4. Technical and Scientific Cooperation Support Centres in Europe and Central Asia

40. In Europe and Central Asia, there was significant overlap in the country coverage by the entities selected to serve as technical and scientific cooperation support centres. Following the request of the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties, the centres in the region entered into collaborative arrangements. Three of the centres, namely the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation, the Joint Research Centre (JRC) of the European Commission and the Royal Belgian Institute for Natural Sciences, agreed to work together under the European Technical and Scientific Cooperation Support Centre (European TSCC) led by JRC, which provides a single-entry point for the Parties concerned, coordinated by the European Commission Knowledge Centre for Biodiversity (EC KCBD). Likewise, the IUCN Regional Office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia (IUCN ECARO) and the Regional Environmental Centre for Central Asia (CAREC) agreed to work together in a collaborative arrangement, whereby IUCN ECARO serves as the single-entry point for the concerned Parties in Eastern Europe and Central Asia.

41. As at 13 May 2026, the centres servicing Europe and Central Asia had submitted their biennial activity reports to the interim GCE. One of the two lead centres has already signed a host agreement

with the Secretariat, while the other one is in the final stages of concluding the agreement. Both lead centres have also developed their workplans for the 2025–2026 period.

42. In Europe, notable progress has been made with the centre establishing itself as a regional support mechanism for the implementation of the Framework. During the reporting period, the centre successfully put in place key operational foundations, including a coordination structure with regular meetings, clarified governance and workflows, approved its workplan, and appointed a coordinator.

43. Parallel to its operational setup, progress has been made in establishing visibility and accessibility as a regional “one-stop-shop” for technical and scientific cooperation. A dedicated webpage and functional mailbox were launched while active outreach through major regional and global biodiversity fora has helped raise awareness among Parties and stakeholders. The centre has also initiated the development of a communication strategy and begun structuring a demand-driven support system, reflecting strong interest from its 45 participating countries and stakeholder groups.

44. A unique feature of the approach in Europe is the creation of a decentralized network of knowledge hubs aligned with all 23 targets of the Framework, which rely on existing knowledge, data, institutions and networks. Initial mapping of expertise and the establishment of two pilot hubs demonstrate early progress toward a collaborative, network-based approach to providing support.

45. For its part, the centre supporting Central Asian countries is building its foundations. A part-time coordinator has been appointed and an operational strategy with key milestones, including setting up the governance structure, carrying out needs assessments with the Parties and mobilizing resources, is under development. The centre has participated in some international meetings to help raise awareness, has supported the development of NBSAPs in a few countries, and organized a workshop related to Target 3.

III. Challenges limiting operations of the Technical and Scientific Cooperation Support Centres

46. Despite the unique nature and specific contexts of each region, all the technical and scientific cooperation support centres are facing, more or less, similar challenges that limit their operations and effectiveness.

47. The main challenges reported by the support centres across the regions include the following:

(a) *Inadequate and unpredictable financial resources*: all the centres currently lack a stable core budget leading to heavy reliance on in-kind contributions and short-term project-based funding, which constrains the centres’ staffing capacity, day-to-day operations and long-term planning. This also limits their ability to scale up activities and respond proactively to the growing demands of Parties and stakeholders. Few donors have so far provided funding to the centres to enable them to respond to requests from Parties. Limited direct access to relevant funding mechanisms, such as the Global Environment Facility and the Kunming Biodiversity Fund, currently restricted to specific agencies, has also constrained financing opportunities.

(b) *Delayed establishment and activation of governance structures* (including steering committees and administrative institutional arrangements), due to resource constraints and other factors, are hindering effective governance and timely collective decision-making, including delays in the approval and implementation oversight of the biennial workplans. Various centres noted that they had not yet convened meetings of the steering committees nor organized regional stakeholder consultation workshops due to lack of resources. They highlighted the urgent need to accelerate the activation of governance structures to ensure more timely and effective coordination and oversight.

(c) *Lack of dedicated staff capacity to sustain core TSCC functions*: due to lack of resources, most centres lack full-time staff dedicated to TSSC work making it difficult to track and respond to Parties’ requests for support, provide helpdesk services, maintain systematic outreach, and scale up country support.

(d) *Mismatch between the high demand for technical support and the limited delivery capacity of the centres:* Parties' requests for assistance are growing and are often wide-ranging and highly specialized, exceeding the current capacity of the centres. Some centres noted that there are also unrealistic expectations from the countries they support, including requests to the centres to take on extensive implementation responsibilities rather than playing a supporting role.

(e) *Varying technical capacities of countries across the subregions:* a number of TSCCs noted that countries in their regions have varying levels of technical capacity, digital infrastructure, data availability and access to interoperable biodiversity information systems, compounded by the complexity of integrating biodiversity monitoring systems, indicators, and reporting frameworks, making it difficult to establish harmonized approaches for biodiversity monitoring and reporting.

(f) *Institutional fragmentation and coordination challenges across multiple countries and institutions:* some centres noted the current limited integration of regional perspectives into national processes, budgets and implementation plans and the limited coordination and collaboration among national institutions within the subregions, which hinders systematic identification and collective responses to shared regional gaps and priorities. It was also noted that though regional mechanisms for participation and dialogue exist, these do not always translate into joint planning, a shared vision or sustainable commitments and actions. The challenge for the centres is moving towards more inclusive and cross-cutting mechanisms that allow for the coordination of national and regional efforts, strengthen regional communication, collaboration and coherence to support long-term implementation and impact. This requires sustained administrative engagement and timely responses from participating countries, institutions and stakeholders.

(g) *Limited engagement of key sectors and actors,* including sectoral government institutions, civil society, private sector, research institutions and academia, is another challenge identified by some of the support centres, which constrains ownership and implementation effectiveness. To address this challenge, the centres emphasize the need to strengthen inclusive, cross-sectoral, and multi-level governance, as well as strengthening science-policy interfaces.

48. Other challenges and limitations that are unique to specific support centres are outlined in the respective biennial reports, available on the CBD website¹⁰.

49. To address the above challenges, the centres propose prioritizing a limited set of high-impact, standardized support packages, expanding regional and in-country capacity-building through mentoring and peer learning, strengthening digital and interoperable systems, and leveraging shared regional resources, such as expert rosters and technical partnerships, while promoting common standards for biodiversity monitoring and reporting, in order to better align demand with capacity and enhance the overall effectiveness of technical and scientific cooperation.

50. The centres are also prioritizing the finalization of governance arrangements as an immediate next step, including the endorsement of workplans and the establishment of steering committees. They further plan to strengthen demand-driven service delivery systems, such as help desks and matchmaking mechanisms for technical assistance. In addition, the centres have identified enhanced coordination among themselves, expanded partnerships with academia, the private sector, and civil society, and more targeted engagement strategies tailored to diverse country contexts as key priorities. Mobilizing partnerships and knowledge hubs is a gradual process due to coordination complexity and limited visibility. Some centres are rolling out demand-driven systems, strengthening partnerships, and implementing targeted communication, while progressively scaling up.

IV. Summary and way forward

51. During the biennium, significant progress was made in operationalizing the Technical and Scientific Cooperation Mechanism. In particular, the interim GCE has delivered notable early results,

¹⁰ www.cbd.int/tsc/tscm/subregionalcentres

establishing core coordination functions, including regular meetings with the technical and scientific cooperation centres, a global helpdesk, and digital collaboration platforms to facilitate information exchange and joint planning.

52. A number of important milestones were achieved in the operationalization of the support centres, including signing 10 host agreements. Across all regions, support centres have developed workplans, initiated governance arrangements, and begun delivering technical support aligned with national priorities. This includes needs assessments, capacity-building activities, and targeted support on biodiversity monitoring and reporting, implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and priority thematic areas such as protected areas, ecosystem restoration, and data systems. The centres have also strengthened partnerships with international organizations and initiatives, while initiating resource mobilization efforts and developing project pipelines.

53. While notable progress has been achieved, several systemic constraints continue to limit effectiveness and scalability. The most critical challenge is the lack of predictable and sustained funding, resulting in heavy reliance on short-term, project-based financing and constraining staffing, operations, and long-term planning.

54. Institutional and governance gaps persist, including delays in establishing steering committees, and challenges related to multi-country coordination and fragmented national institutional landscapes, compounded by uneven technical capacities, infrastructure limitations, and the complexity of biodiversity data and reporting systems. In addition, operational challenges, including incomplete institutionalization in some regions, limited coordination among centres, and uneven country engagement, further affect the overall effectiveness of support centres.

55. In light of the above, some strategic measures to further strengthen the effectiveness, sustainability and impact of the Technical and Scientific Cooperation Mechanism that could be considered, include:

(a) Increased and more predictable financial support, including multi-year and core funding, to support sustained operations of both the GCE and the centres, and dedicated funding windows by multilateral and bilateral financing mechanisms that could be accessed to support the Convention's Technical and Scientific Cooperation Mechanism;

(b) Active engagement of Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth organizations and other relevant stakeholders in the governance and functioning of the centres, including through participation in steering committees, as appropriate, identifying needs, setting priorities and co-designing activities, supported by whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches to strengthen national ownership and ensure alignment with national biodiversity strategies and action plans;

(c) Stronger and more systematic engagement in the Technical and Scientific Cooperation Mechanism by partners and stakeholders, including United Nations entities, international organizations, development agencies, research institutions, academia, civil society organizations and private sector actors, in addressing capacity gaps, supporting demand-driven cooperation initiatives and enhancing delivery, including through strategic partnerships, aligning their programmes and contributing expertise, tools, data and innovative solutions;

(d) Coordinated resource mobilization efforts to reduce fragmentation and improve efficiency, including enhanced collaboration in developing joint project pipelines, strengthening donor engagement and exploring innovative financing approaches, supported by improved communication and outreach;

(e) Acceleration of institutional development and improvement of delivery modalities, including finalizing governance structures, strengthening coordination and knowledge exchange among the centres, and developing support packages and scalable delivery mechanisms to better match demand with available capacity;

(f) Continued efforts to strengthen coordination and synergies, including facilitating collaboration among relevant initiatives, programmes and partners to reduce fragmentation, enhancing complementarity and maximizing the impact of technical and scientific cooperation in support of the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.
