



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General
5 June 2026

Original: English

Compliance Committee under the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing Fifth meeting

Montreal, Canada, 27–29 May 2026

Agenda item 7

Adoption of the report

Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from Their Utilization Sixth meeting

Yerevan, 19–30 October 2026

Item 5 of the provisional agenda*

Report of the Compliance Committee

Report of the Compliance Committee under the Nagoya Protocol on the work of its fifth meeting

I. Introduction

Attendance

1. The following members of the Compliance Committee under the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization and observer from indigenous peoples and local communities were present for the fifth meeting of the Committee:

African States

El Khitma El Awad Mohammed
Betty Kauna Schröder
Etim Okon William

Asia-Pacific States

Won Seog Park
Somaly Chan

Eastern European States

Elzbieta Martyniuk
Peter Maňka
Sino Tohirzoda

Latin American and Caribbean States

Teresa Dolores Cruz Sardiñas
José Alfredo Hernández Ugalde

Western European and other States

Marcus Schroeder
Katie Beckett
Mery Ciacci

Indigenous peoples and local communities

Viviana Elsa Figueroa

Item 1

Opening of the meeting

2. The meeting was opened by the outgoing Chair of the Compliance Committee under the Nagoya Protocol, Betty Kauna Schröder. In her opening remarks, Ms. Schröder noted that the

* CBD/NP/MOP/6/1.

submission of the first national reports marked the first time in many years that the Committee had new and comprehensive information from Parties on the status of implementation, which would inform the work of the Committee moving forward. She also conveyed how much of an honour it had been for her to serve as Chair of the Committee.

3. The Committee was also addressed by the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Astrid Schomaker, who welcomed the participants to the meeting, thanked the outgoing Chair and drew the attention of the Committee to the analysis for the second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Nagoya Protocol, which they would be considering. Ms. Schomaker noted that, while progress had been made, further work remained to be done, including changing perceptions surrounding the Protocol so that it could be viewed as a robust instrument for achieving the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.

4. A representative of the Secretariat reported that, with 13 members present, there was a quorum for the meeting to proceed, in accordance with section B, paragraph 10, of the cooperative procedures and institutional mechanisms to promote compliance with the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol and to address cases of non-compliance.¹

Item 2

Organizational matters

(a) Election of officers

5. In section B, paragraph 9, of the cooperative procedures and institutional mechanisms, it is provided that the Compliance Committee shall elect its Chair and a Vice-Chair, who will rotate among the five regional groups of the United Nations.

6. Rule 12 (2) of the rules of procedure for the meetings of the Committee provides that the Chair and Vice-Chair shall be elected for a period of two years and that no officer shall serve for more than two consecutive terms.

7. As the outgoing Chair and Vice-Chair had served two consecutive terms in those roles, the Committee was invited to elect a new chair and a vice-chair. The Committee elected Elzbieta Martyniuk as Chair and José Alfredo Hernández Ugalde as Vice-Chair.

8. The Chair thanked the Committee for the trust that it had placed in her and the Secretariat for its work in preparing for the meeting.

(b) Adoption of the agenda

9. The Compliance Committee adopted the agenda for the meeting, as contained in document CBD/NP/CC/5/1.

(c) Organization of work

10. The Compliance Committee approved the organization of work proposed by the Secretariat, as contained in annex I to the annotated provisional agenda.² It was agreed that consideration of item 4 would be split into two parts, with the part addressing information from the second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol to follow consideration of agenda item 5.

11. The Committee expressed its appreciation to the Secretariat for the high quality of the documents prepared for the meeting.

Item 3

Outcomes of the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the

¹ Decision NP-1/4, annex.

² CBD/NP/CC/5/1/Add.1.

Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from Their Utilization regarding items relevant to compliance

12. A representative of the Secretariat introduced document [CBD/NP/CC/5/2](#).
13. The Compliance Committee welcomed the positive consideration of its recommendations by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its fifth meeting. It recognized that the amendments made by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol had strengthened the text that had been recommended by the Committee.
14. The Committee agreed that it would be beneficial for regions to coordinate ahead of meetings of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol and come prepared with information on their nominees for election to the Committee.

Item 4

Review of general issues of compliance

15. A representative of the Secretariat introduced document [CBD/NP/CC/5/3](#) and indicated that, since the preparation of the document, one additional Party (from Latin American and Caribbean States) had submitted its first national report. She also indicated that the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) was planning in-country support sessions to assist Parties that were participants in the Global Environment Facility (GEF)-funded project on support for the preparation and submission of the first national report on implementation of the Nagoya Protocol but that had not yet submitted their first national report.
16. The Compliance Committee noted that, pursuant to its request at its fourth meeting, the Executive Secretary had sent letters to 103 Parties that had not yet adopted access and benefit-sharing measures, established the required institutional arrangements or published available information on the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House. About 20 per cent of those Parties acknowledged receipt, responded or took action following receipt of the original letter.
17. The Committee expressed its appreciation to those Parties that had responded to the letters and taken action. The Committee expressed concern, however, at the low response rate to the letters and recalled that, under Article 13 of the Protocol, national focal points were responsible for liaison with the Secretariat. The Committee discussed possible reasons why Parties might not have responded to the letters (for example, insufficient capacity and resources, lack of political priority and absence of the necessary authority to respond to the letter) and possible follow-up actions.
18. The Committee welcomed the high rate of submission of first national reports on the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the capacity-building materials and activities to support Parties' understanding of the reporting requirements and facilitate the submission of the reports provided by the Secretariat, including in collaboration with the UNEP-GEF project on support for the preparation and submission of the first national reports.
19. The Committee requested the Secretariat to send letters to Parties that had not yet submitted their first national report to remind them of their obligation to do so and urge them to submit their report as soon as possible and no later than the date of the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. The Committee requested its Chair, as a second step, to send letters to the Parties concerned in the case where no response to the letters sent by the Secretariat had been received and no report had been submitted.
20. The Committee agreed on several recommendations regarding national reporting and the financial mechanism for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, as set out in annex I to the present report.
21. On the basis of information from the second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol, the Committee reviewed general issues of compliance with the obligations to establish legislative, administrative or policy measures on access and benefit-sharing; put in place institutional

structures required under the Protocol; and publish information on the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House.

22. The Committee recognized that 74 per cent of Parties had established one or more competent national authorities. Given the central role of competent national authorities, however, further efforts were needed to advance compliance with that obligation. Moreover, the Committee expressed concern that only 46 per cent of Parties had designated one or more checkpoints and that nearly 50 per cent of Parties had indicated that they had information that had not yet been published on the Clearing-House.

23. The Committee agreed on several recommendations regarding compliance for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, as set out in annex I to the present report.

24. The Committee requested its Chair to send letters to Parties:

(a) That had indicated that they had information that had not yet been published on the Clearing-House, reminding them of their obligation to publish such information;

(b) That had not yet taken measures to implement the Protocol or had not yet designated a national focal point, competent national authority or checkpoint, reminding them of their obligation to do so.

25. The Committee agreed that, at its next meeting, it would review consistency between information contained in the national reports and information published on the Clearing-House, with a view to identifying specific gaps and enabling targeted and supportive follow-up consistent with the Committee's facilitative mandate.

Item 5

Input to the second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Nagoya Protocol

26. A representative of the Secretariat introduced documents [CBD/NP/CC/5/4](#), [CBD/NP/CC/5/4/Add.1](#) and [CBD/NP/CC/5/4/Add.2](#) and gave a presentation on the methodology used for conducting the second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol. The representative described how the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol had decided to conduct the second assessment and review on the basis of the elements listed in the annex to decision NP-5/5. The representative also described the framework of indicators agreed to in annex II to decision NP-3/1 and the reference points contained therein to be used as a baseline against which progress on each element could be measured.

27. The Compliance Committee noted that it was to work in a complementary and non-duplicative manner with the Informal Advisory Committee on Capacity-building for the Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and, accordingly, it would consider element (a), sections 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7, and element (g), section 1, on the basis of document [CBD/NP/CC/5/4/Add.1](#); and element (j) on the basis of document [CBD/NP/CC/5/4/Add.2](#). The Compliance Committee discussed the allocation of elements between the two bodies and noted the relevance of Article 8 of the Protocol to its work.

28. The Compliance Committee noted that, while the indicator data highlighted progress made by Parties in establishing institutional structures and putting access and benefit-sharing measures in place since the first assessment and review of the Protocol in 2018, the data did not reflect whether those institutions and measures were operational or effective in accomplishing the objectives of the Protocol. The Committee also noted that the wording for some of the indicators related to access (for example, issuance of permits or internationally recognized certificates of compliance) could be adjusted so that they would be measured based on the number of Parties that had required prior informed consent instead of on the total number of Parties to the Protocol.

29. The Committee discussed the different approaches taken by Parties with respect to responding to the questions of the first national report related to implementation of Article 5 of the Protocol, as

explained in paragraph 49 of document [CBD/NP/CC/5/4/Add.1](#). The Committee noted that it might be useful to provide more clarity on what type of measures on fair and equitable benefit-sharing Parties had adopted in subsequent national reports.

30. In the context of element (g), the Committee noted that while the publication of checkpoint communiqués should apply to genetic resources coming from another country, some Parties had published certificates for access to and checkpoint communiqués for utilization of genetic resources by domestic users. It therefore suggested that a distinction could be created on the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House between certificates and checkpoint communiqués for domestic users and those for users in another country.

31. For elements (a) and (g), the Committee agreed on key findings and messages; indicative actions that could be taken at the national level to enhance the implementation of the Protocol; and actions that could be taken at the global or regional level to enhance the implementation of the Protocol, as set out below in annexes II, III and IV, respectively, as its inputs to the second assessment and review.

32. For element (j), the Committee recognized that experience with the cooperative procedures and institutional mechanisms on compliance was limited to date and that it had not fully explored the tools at its disposal as provided for under the cooperative procedures and institutional mechanisms. That finding is reflected in annex II below.

Item 6

Other matters

33. Under agenda item 6, the Secretariat recalled that five seats (one per region) in the Compliance Committee would be up for election at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

Item 7

Adoption of the report

34. The Chair introduced the draft report of the meeting, which was adopted, as orally amended.

Item 8

Closure of the meeting

35. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the meeting was closed at 5.40 p.m. on 29 May 2026.

Annex I

Recommendations of the Compliance Committee for consideration at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from Their Utilization

I. Compliance

1. The Compliance Committee recommends that, at its sixth meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from Their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopt a decision along the following lines:

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol

1. Welcomes the progress made by Parties in the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from Their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity;¹

2. Recognizes that further work is needed to advance the implementation of the Protocol;

3. Expresses concern that:

(a) Twenty-six per cent of Parties have not yet designated one or more competent national authorities and 54 per cent of Parties have not yet designated one or more checkpoints, indicating significant gaps in the institutional and monitoring architecture of the Protocol;²

(b) Nearly 50 per cent of Parties indicated that they had information that had not yet been published on the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, pointing to a gap in fulfilling the requirements under Article 14 of the Protocol;³

4. Urges Parties that have not yet done so to establish legislative, administrative and policy measures and institutional arrangements for implementing the Protocol, publish as soon as possible all available information required under Article 14 of the Protocol through the Clearing-House and keep such information updated as required;

5. Requests that Parties collaborate fully when requested to provide information related to their compliance with obligations under the Protocol;

6. Welcomes the contribution of the Compliance Committee under the Nagoya Protocol to the second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol.

II. Monitoring and reporting

2. The Compliance Committee also recommends that, at its sixth meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopt a decision that includes the following elements:

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol

1. Welcomes the first national reports submitted;

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 3008, No. 30619.

² See [CBD/SBI/7/7/Add.1](#).

³ Ibid.

2. *Urges* Parties that have not yet submitted their first national reports to do so as soon as possible;

3. *Expresses its appreciation* to the Global Environment Facility and the United Nations Environment Programme for the support provided to eligible Parties in the preparation and submission of their first national reports, and acknowledges the administrative challenges associated with the project development process and the resulting significant delay in the distribution of funds;

4. *Commends* the efforts made by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity⁴ to assist Parties in submitting their first national report;

5. *Urges* Parties to monitor the implementation of their obligations under the Protocol pursuant to Article 29 with respect to facilitating the preparation and timely submission of the second national reports and explore opportunities for mobilizing resources in support of those activities.

III. Financial mechanism

3. The Compliance Committee further recommends that, at its sixth meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopt a decision that includes the following elements:

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol

Recommends that, at its seventeenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity,⁵ in its guidance to the financial mechanism, request the Global Environment Facility to make funds available in a timely manner to support eligible Parties in the preparation and submission of their second national reports on the implementation of the Protocol and encourage the initiation of the associated project development process in 2027, with a view to securing project approval by the end of 2027 and enabling project activities, including any regional workshops, to be undertaken in 2028 and early 2029, well in advance of the expected reporting deadline.

⁴ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1760, No. 30619.

⁵ *Ibid.*

Annex II

Key findings and messages

Element (a): extent of implementation of the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol and related obligations of Parties, including assessment of progress by Parties in establishing institutional structures and access and benefit-sharing measures to implement the Protocol

1. According to the updated indicator data, and in comparison with the data for February 2018, there has been significant progress in setting the legislative, administrative and policy foundations for advancing implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, including the designation of national focal points and competent national authorities and the adoption of legislative, administrative and policy measures on access and benefit-sharing, although progress has been uneven among regions. There are differences with regard to understanding of the role of checkpoints; their designation and operationalization constitute a challenge for many Parties; and the limited progress in that area is concerning. In that regard, information shows that many Parties still need to adopt further measures to render the Nagoya Protocol fully operational and translate principles into practice.
2. While indicator data highlight progress made by Parties in establishing institutional structures and putting access and benefit-sharing measures in place, the data do not elucidate whether those institutions and measures are operational or effective in accomplishing the objective of the Protocol. It is concerning that many Parties still have information available that has not yet been published on the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, as required under Article 14 of the Protocol.
3. Insufficient human resources and capacity, the multiplicity of roles and responsibilities of national focal points and issues relating to internal coordination among different authorities or ministries or among competent national authorities and checkpoints are ongoing challenges.
4. While the indicators related to implementation of Article 6 show significant progress by Parties, the diversity of national approaches to requirements and procedures for access and benefit-sharing presents key challenges for users, including with respect to understanding the scope of application and terminology and the steps to be followed in acquiring prior informed consent and a permit and negotiating mutually agreed terms and sharing benefits. Furthermore, while the internationally recognized certificate of compliance is an important tool for providing legal certainty of access and supporting the monitoring of the utilization of genetic resources, to date, only a limited number of Parties with access measures in place have published permits on the Clearing-House that constitute such certificates.
5. Developing clear procedures (for example, step-by-step guidance for users on applicable rules and requirements), practical information and model contractual clauses and publishing them on the Clearing-House will allow the Clearing-House to be more effective in achieving its objective of providing users with key information about access to genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge and benefit-sharing.
6. Indicators related to Article 5 show significant progress made by Parties, even if they do not demonstrate whether the measures put in place are effective in accomplishing the objective of the Protocol. It should be noted that Parties followed different approaches in answering the relevant question of the report, with some Parties providing information on measures to ensure benefit-sharing from the utilization of genetic resources or associated traditional knowledge accessed within their jurisdiction (through requirements for prior informed consent and mutually agreed terms) and others providing information on measures to ensure benefit-sharing from the utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge accessed from other Parties (through the adoption of compliance measures) and still others addressing both approaches.
7. With regard to reducing negotiation-related asymmetries between providers, including indigenous peoples and local communities, and users of genetic resources, there is a need to enhance

the capacity of providers to negotiate mutually agreed terms and understand the commercial and non-commercial research environment, supply and value chains and the innovation process.

8. The assessment of the indicators measuring implementation of Article 15 indicated that significant progress has been made in establishing the foundational elements of the Protocol's compliance provisions.

9. With respect to Article 17, the available information indicates that progress continues to be limited and uneven across regions and Parties.¹ There are differences in understanding related to the role of checkpoints and significant challenges remain in fully operationalizing the provisions of the article, in particular with regard to the designation and operationalization of effective checkpoints by all Parties, as well as the use of checkpoint communiqués as part of the system for monitoring the utilization of genetic resources established under the Protocol.

10. The situation described in paragraph 9 above is further illustrated by the limited number of checkpoints communiqués published which indicates that the monitoring system envisaged under Article 17 has not yet been widely or systematically implemented. A number of countries continue to be concerned about the misappropriation and misuse of their genetic resources once those resources leave their country which makes them more inclined to adopt access measures and systems for monitoring the utilization of their genetic resources that are more precautionary, as well as their own systems for monitoring utilization.

11. Experience indicates that cooperation between user and provider countries remains important for enhancing compliance with domestic access and benefit-sharing measures. Much of the cooperation reported has been prompted by the issuance or receipt of checkpoint communiqués, underscoring the value of that tool for supporting compliance.

12. Indicators related to the implementation of Articles 6, 7 and 12 show uneven progress. Among Parties that reported having indigenous peoples and local communities in their country, most included the requirement for prior informed consent in access and benefit-sharing measures and in that regard, indicators related to the Protocol's provisions related to indigenous peoples and local communities showed moderate progress. However, many Parties have not yet fully operationalized those provisions and a limited number of examples have been reported, which highlights the need for case studies on practical experiences in implementing measures related to indigenous peoples and local communities.

13. To improve the operationalization of the provisions related to indigenous peoples and local communities, it is essential to support the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in access and benefit-sharing processes through early engagement, targeted awareness-raising and capacity-building, establishment of coordination mechanisms and empowerment.

14. The development of community protocols is a critical first step, as it enables indigenous peoples and local communities to articulate their values, customary practices and aspirations and communicate them effectively to users of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge and government authorities. In that regard, Parties need to further support the development and application of community protocols by indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with Article 12 of the Protocol.

15. There is a need to further strengthen political will to support the effective implementation of the provisions of the Protocol. That could be achieved through, for instance, highlighting the contribution of access and benefit-sharing to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity; mainstreaming access and benefit-sharing in broader policy goals (as related, for example, to the

¹ Forty-six per cent of Parties had established one or more checkpoints, with the following regional breakdown: 35 per cent of Parties in Africa; 27 per cent of Parties in Asia-Pacific; 62 per cent of Parties in Eastern European States; 50 per cent of Parties in Latin America and the Caribbean; and 94 per cent of Parties in Western European and other States (see CBD/SBI/7/INF/2, para. 26 and figure 3).

bioeconomy, research and innovation and development strategies) and showcasing the value of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge. In that context, there is a need to change the narrative so that the third objective of the Convention is perceived not as a regulatory burden but rather as a strategic mechanism for valorizing biodiversity, supporting its conservation and sustainable use and creating opportunities for sustainable development.

Element (g): review of implementation and operation of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, including number of access and benefit-sharing measures made available; number of countries that have published information on their competent national authorities; number of published internationally recognized certificates of compliance; and number of published checkpoint communiqués (Article 14)

G.1 National records on the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House

16. Overall, there has been a trend towards the continued increase in both the number of national records published across all record types and the percentage of Parties publishing national information. At the same time, however, the core objectives of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House have not been completely met owing to the lack of full compliance by Parties with their obligations under Article 14 of the Protocol.

17. Given the central role of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, it is of particular concern that, while many Parties have mandatory national information, they have not yet made it available on the Clearing-House despite having the capacity to publish that information, as illustrated by the high rate of submission of first national reports.

18. The following reasons were given by Parties for not publishing information: insufficient resources, high staff turnover, lack of prioritization or coordination and lack of understanding of the Protocol's system for monitoring utilization of genetic resources as elaborated under Article 17. Sharing of information through the Clearing-House has significant advantages for Parties, as it reduces queries from users about access and benefit-sharing, promotes compliance by users with domestic rules and procedures and supports Parties in monitoring the utilization of genetic resources internationally.

Element (j): preliminary review of the compliance procedures and mechanisms (Article 30)

19. As experience related to the compliance procedures and mechanisms, including the Compliance Committee, is still relatively limited, it would be premature to make changes to them at this point in time. The compliance procedures and mechanisms are still being explored as a tool for supporting Parties in complying with their obligations under the Protocol. Increasing the visibility of the compliance procedures and mechanisms may be a useful means of encouraging Parties to engage with the Committee in its efforts to support compliance.

Annex III

Indicative actions that could be taken at the national level to enhance the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol

1. Provided below is a list of indicative actions that could be taken at the national level, as appropriate and in accordance with national circumstances and priorities, to enhance the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, based on experiences and lessons learned, and as a means to address identified challenges.

Element (a): extent of implementation of the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol and related obligations of Parties, including assessment of progress by Parties in establishing institutional structures and access and benefit-sharing measures to implement the Protocol

2. Establishing a clear policy vision prior to drafting legislation, as well as integrating and mainstreaming access and benefit-sharing into broader policy approaches (for example, with respect to the bioeconomy and research and innovation), can help build a solid framework and strengthen the political relevance of access and benefit-sharing.
3. Building flexibility in national access and benefit-sharing legal frameworks, for example, by adopting interim measures, can help Parties make adjustments as they gain experience. Over time, that experience could support further efforts to simplify procedures and standardize approaches for access and benefit-sharing.
4. Early engagement by the lead agency with other relevant agencies, clarity of roles and responsibilities, establishing effective coordination and communication channels among relevant authorities (such as committees or digital systems) and developing internal protocols and procedures can strengthen national coordination and cooperation. This would include national coordination and cooperation among entities responsible for access and benefit-sharing under different international instruments.
5. Establishing, where applicable, clear policies for full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities and their inclusion in national committees on access and benefit-sharing would help ensure their ongoing engagement in access and benefit-sharing processes.
6. Early and ongoing engagement with users can help provider countries ensure that access and benefit-sharing procedures and measures take into account the perspectives and circumstances of users and support their compliance.
7. When national focal points and competent national authorities are being established, their mandates should fulfil the requirements under Article 13 of the Protocol and they should be equipped with adequate authority, dedicated personnel, capacity and training to be able to respond to users and indigenous peoples and local communities and negotiate mutually agreed terms. National focal points are also responsible for either taking on the role of publishing authority on the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House or designating another person for that role and are responsible for ensuring that all published information is accurate, complete and up to date.
8. Developing and promoting country guides, step-by-step procedures, standardized documentation including application forms, checklists summarizing needed information, template forms for mutually agreed terms, defined parameters for benefit-sharing, and a list of possible monetary and non-monetary benefits can greatly facilitate the access and benefit-sharing process. Availability (when possible) of information in different languages and provision of transparent national access and benefit-sharing requirements, including clear definitions of what falls within or is beyond the scope of national access and benefit-sharing measures, are key to helping users determine at an early stage whether access and benefit-sharing obligations apply and streamline preliminary exchanges.

9. Developing user support systems, including online systems for submitting and tracking access and benefit-sharing applications, and streamlined simplified approaches for permitting and negotiating mutually agreed terms can help reduce administrative burdens and transaction costs for providers and users.
10. Engaging government departments with expertise in commercial business practices could provide support, for example, in the negotiation of mutually agreed terms and building the capacity of national institutions.
11. Developing simplified procedures for non-commercial use to facilitate access can enable countries to maintain oversight while avoiding barriers to mutually beneficial scientific activities. Embedding access and benefit-sharing within broader institutional cooperation frameworks (for example, memorandums of understanding between research organizations, long-term research programmes and regional networks) could help build sustained collaboration and mutually beneficial outcomes.
12. Establishing effective checkpoints and strengthening the institutional capacity to implement Articles 15 and 17 by all Parties will advance the full operationalization of the compliance and monitoring provisions of the Protocol.
13. Enhancing awareness among users and providers, including Governments and indigenous peoples and local communities, and facilitating the exchange of information and experience on compliance measures can support compliance with access and benefit-sharing obligations.
14. Supporting the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in access and benefit-sharing processes is key for the implementation of the Protocol. This can be achieved through supporting the development and implementation of community protocols by indigenous peoples and local communities and raising their awareness and capacities as required by the Protocol. Those activities help empower communities to actively participate in access and benefit-sharing negotiations and build trust among all parties involved.
15. Strengthening competent national authorities can play a role in identifying the relevant indigenous peoples and local communities to be involved and facilitate effective communication between users and representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities to strengthen coordination.
16. Publishing community protocols on the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House as part of national records can give those documents greater visibility and recognition, as they would be included in a Party's national access and benefit-sharing framework.

Element (g): review of implementation and operation of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, including number of access and benefit-sharing measures made available; number of countries that have published information on their competent national authorities; number of published internationally recognized certificates of compliance; and number of published checkpoint communiqués (Article 14)

G.1 National records on the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House

17. Publishing all available national information on the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House and ensuring that it is accurate, reliable and up to date, in accordance with Article 14 of the Protocol, strengthens credibility at both the national and international levels; makes access and benefit-sharing requirements easier for researchers and companies to understand and follow; and enhances trust in the monitoring system established in the Protocol.
18. Integrating training on the Clearing-House into onboarding activities can help address staff turnover. Resource materials are available on the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House knowledge base and online training and guidance, available from the Secretariat upon request, can assist Parties in building capacity and addressing any technical support issues related to publication of information on the Clearing-House.

19. Developing national access and benefit-sharing information systems, including plans for their long-term sustainability, that are interoperable with the Clearing-House can help streamline the efficient publication of internationally recognized certificates of compliance and checkpoint communiqués and reduce the burden of manual publication.

Annex IV

Actions that could be taken at the global or regional level to enhance the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol

Element (a): extent of implementation of the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol and related obligations of Parties, including assessment of progress by Parties in establishing institutional structures and access and benefit-sharing measures to implement the Protocol

1. Strengthening and supporting institutional capacity of Parties that still need such support to put access and benefit-sharing measures and institutional structures in place and operationalize them; and promoting a better understanding of access and benefit-sharing value chains and underlying market structures to inform policy- and decision-making.
2. Supporting Parties in the following priority areas: implementation of provisions related to indigenous peoples and local communities and Article 17; and publication of national information on the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, as appropriate.
3. Facilitating the sharing of experiences and good practices among all actors to enrich the implementation of access and benefit-sharing measures, in particular in the priority areas. That includes encouraging exchanges between users and providers of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge; and peer-to-peer support between Parties (such as support between national focal points and/or competent national authorities) at different levels of implementation or between provider and user countries. Those exchanges could be useful in supporting compliance.
4. Encouraging relevant regional organizations to actively engage in access and benefit-sharing processes. That could support the development of regional approaches to access and benefit-sharing.
5. Strengthening communication efforts with a view to changing the narrative so that the third objective of the Convention is perceived not as a regulatory burden but rather as a strategic mechanism for valorizing biodiversity, supporting its conservation and sustainable use and creating opportunities for sustainable development.
6. Promoting awareness of access and benefit-sharing among users in the scientific and business community across all countries.
7. Establishing and strengthening mechanisms to facilitate partnerships between users and providers of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge, including by:
 - (a) Developing matchmaking platforms or partnership hubs;
 - (b) Providing technical or legal advisory services for users and providers, including indigenous and people and local communities;
 - (c) Integrating access and benefit-sharing considerations into broader institutional cooperation frameworks such as memorandums of understanding between research organizations, long-term research programmes and regional networks, with mechanisms for facilitating technology transfer possibly included, where appropriate.

Element (g): review of implementation and operation of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, including number of access and benefit-sharing measures made available; number of countries that have published information on their competent national authorities; number of published internationally recognized certificates of compliance; and number of published checkpoint communiqués (Article 14)

G.1 National records in the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House

8. Strengthening the effectiveness of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House to support the implementation of the Protocol through:

(a) Enhancing the means by which relevant information for users is displayed on the Clearing-House to help them understand and comply with applicable access and benefit-sharing rules and procedures;

(b) Prioritizing improvements to Clearing-House functionality that support Parties in updating and publishing their national information and help ensure that the information is complete and reliable, for example, through automated reminders and streamlined record management processes;

(c) Providing proactive and targeted outreach and online training on how to use the Clearing-House, as needed, including for Parties with available national information not yet published on the Clearing-House;

(d) Sharing experiences and best practices in the development of national access and benefit-sharing information systems and promoting interoperability of those systems with the Clearing-House for efficient publication of national information, in particular internationally recognized certificates of compliance and checkpoint communiqués;

(e) Creating opportunities, incentives and recognition to encourage Party participation and demonstrate the value of the Clearing-House as a tool for supporting implementation of the Protocol;

(f) Integrating the support for publication of relevant information on the Clearing-House into capacity-building initiatives supporting implementation of the Protocol;

(g) Strengthening capacity-building efforts related to the practical implementation of the Protocol's international system for monitoring the utilization of genetic resources through the Clearing-House, which should include the role and function of internationally recognized certificates of compliance, checkpoints and checkpoint communiqués and opportunities to strengthen communication, cooperation and trust between provider and user country authorities.
