



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General
13 October 2025

English only

**Subsidiary Body on Scientific,
Technical and Technological Advice**
Twenty-seventh meeting
Panama City, 20–24 October 2025
Item 5 of the provisional agenda*
Biodiversity and climate change

Compilation of inputs into the process for identifying options for enhanced policy coherence and cooperation between the Rio conventions**

Note by the Secretariat

I. Introduction and background

1. In its decision [16/22](#), the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity requested the Executive Secretary of the Convention to compile views on options for enhanced policy coherence, including a potential joint work programme of the Rio conventions, for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at a meeting held before the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. It also requested the Executive Secretary to invite the heads of the other Rio conventions to collaborate on the organization of a technical information exchange in 2025 to further explore options to enhance cooperation and policy coherence to support the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, and of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Paris Agreement.
2. The heads of the Secretariats of the three Rio conventions met as the Joint Liaison Group on 29 May 2025 to discuss the request from the Conference of the Parties and other topics related to coherence and cooperation. The meeting resulted in a statement on synergies among the Rio convention in response to the call by the Secretary-General of the United Nations for suggestions for greater synergy in implementation, in the context of the UN80 Initiative, along with an accompanying overview of areas of collaboration for 2025–2026. The statement is included in annex I.
3. In response to paragraph 19 of decision 16/22, and collaboration with the Secretariats of the other Rio conventions, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity organized a technical information exchange, hosted by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) at their premises in Bonn on 15 June 2025.¹ Funding for eligible participants was generously provided by the European Commission. The event was held in a hybrid format and attended by 138 people representing Parties to the Convention and observers, the United Nations

* CBD/SBSTTA/27/1.

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

¹ See www.cbd.int/meetings/CC-OM-2025-01.

Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention to Combat Desertification. Speakers included representatives of the secretariats, financial mechanisms and science-policy interfaces of the Rio conventions, and the incoming presidency of the thirtieth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The report of the technical information exchange is included in annex II.

II. Synthesis of views on options for enhanced policy coherence, including a potential joint work programme of the Rio conventions

A. Introduction

4. In its decision [16/22](#), the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity requested the Executive Secretary to invite Parties, observers and other stakeholders, to submit their views on options for enhanced policy coherence, including a potential joint work programme of the Rio conventions, and to invite the executive secretaries of the other Rio conventions to collaborate on the organization of a technical information exchange to further explore options to enhance cooperation and policy coherence to support the implementation of the Conventions.

5. Through notification [2025-005](#), dated 28 January 2025, Parties, other Governments and international organizations, as well as representatives of Parties and observers to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), were invited to submit their views on options for enhanced policy coherence, including a potential joint work programme of the Rio Conventions. A total of 71 submissions were received from 11 Parties² and 60 observer organisations.³

6. The present note provides a synthesis of the submissions received. The full submissions are available online.⁴

² Brazil, Canada, Colombia, European Union, Gambia, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, South Africa and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

³ Advisory Committee on Subnational Governments and Biodiversity and Advisory Committee on Local Governments and Biodiversity; Articulation of Indigenous Peoples, Cipó Platform and World-Transforming Technologies of Brazil; Ateliers pour la biodiversité; Australian Rainforest Conservation Society, Greenpeace International, Griffith University and Wild Heritage; Avaaz; British Academy; Bundesamt für Naturschutz and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit; Canadian Nursery Landscape Association; Center for International Environmental Law; Centre for International Sustainable Development Law and the Biodiversity Law and Governance Initiative; Colombian Platform for Children and Youth, Fundación Grothendieck, Student Platform for Engineering Education Development and Youth Network for the Sustainable Development Goals; Conservation Biology Institute; Conservation International; Convention on Biological Diversity Women's Caucus; Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals; Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat; Convention to Combat Desertification; Environmental Defense Fund and Indigenous Movement for Peace Advancement and Conflict Transformation Kenya; Fathom Science, OceanForesters, COILReef and Hasan Consultants; Finance for Biodiversity Foundation; Four Paws; Friends of the Earth International; Fundación Ambiente y Recursos Naturales; Fundación Edu-Residuos; Global Forest Coalition and Climate Land Ambition and Rights Alliance; Global Greens; Global Youth Biodiversity Network, on behalf of the Joint Youth Caucus; High Meadows Environmental Institute of Princeton University; Hot or Cool Institute; Institute of Zoology of the Zoological Society of London, York University, Radboud University and others; International Fertilizer Association; International Fund for Animal Welfare, Born Free, Whale and Dolphin Conservation, World Federation for Animals and Global Rewilding Alliance; International Institute for Sustainable Development; International Union for Conservation of Nature; International Union of Biological Sciences; Ipieca; Latin American Climate Lawyers Initiative; Nature Conservancy; Nepal Indigenous Nationalities Preservation Association; Ocean and Climate Platform; Ocean Visions; Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights; Principles for Responsible Investment; Red Latinoamericana y Caribeña por un Sistema Financiero Sostenible; Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, on behalf of a number of non-governmental organizations; Soka Gakkai International, on behalf of the Human Rights and Biodiversity Working Group; students from Fatima Jinnah Women University; Third World Network; Transforma, on behalf of a number of Latin American and Caribbean civil society organizations; United Nations Development Programme; United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women); United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction; United States Council for International Business; University of Lethbridge; University of Oxford, on behalf of a group of academic and research organizations; Wetlands International; World Benchmarking Alliance, We Mean Business Coalition and Business for Nature; World Farmers' Organisation; World Wide Fund for Nature; and World Wide Fund for Nature-Brazil, on behalf of the Global Partnership on Forest and Landscape Restoration.

⁴ Available at www.cbd.int/notifications/2025-005.

B. Alignment of national strategies: national biodiversity strategies and action plans, nationally determined contributions, national adaptation plans, and land degradation neutrality targets

7. Submissions received following notification 2025-005 affirmed the need for improved alignment of national strategies across the three Rio Conventions – the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). Many Parties and observer organizations viewed the alignment of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), and Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) targets as foundational for enhancing policy coherence, reducing duplication, and improving the effectiveness of implementation across biodiversity, climate change, and land agendas.

8. Submitters noted that alignment leads to the practical benefits of alignment: more efficient use of resources, strengthened cross-sectoral governance, better monitoring and reporting, and improved delivery of multiple international commitments simultaneously. For instance, Brazil promoted the use of the ecosystem approach and ecosystem-based adaptation, and referenced NbS as adopted at UNEA, positioning them as co-benefit generators across conventions. Peru linked NbS with DRR and adaptation, emphasizing safeguards and human rights, including Indigenous knowledge and governance.

9. Common proposals included the integration of biodiversity and land considerations into NDCs and NAPs, the incorporation of climate resilience and land restoration objectives into NBSAPs, and the harmonization of national targets and indicators across all strategic frameworks. Some Parties also recommended that coherence be built into national development plans and budgetary processes, ensuring whole-of-government engagement.

10. Observer organizations echoed these priorities. They highlighted the importance of cross-sectoral coordination, data sharing, and institutional mechanisms that could manage integrated planning and implementation.

11. Several submissions offered practical mechanisms to advance alignment:

12. Integrated planning cycles: Aligning the revision and update timelines of NBSAPs, NDCs, and NAPs to facilitate mutual reinforcement.

13. Common indicators and data systems: Developing and using joint metrics for progress assessment across biodiversity, climate, and land.

14. Institutional coordination: Establishing or strengthening inter-ministerial committees or task forces dedicated to Rio Convention coherence.

15. Capacity building: Supporting national institutions in applying integrated planning frameworks and accessing technical knowledge and tools.

16. While alignment was broadly supported, several Parties emphasized context-specific needs. For instance, some Parties noted that institutional and data limitations might constrain rapid integration and called for sustained international support to build the necessary enabling environments. Others supported a flexible but results-focused approach, recommending that Parties be encouraged, but not required, to align plans, while donors and global institutions should provide incentives and guidance.

17. Overall, the submissions reflected a widely shared recognition that aligning NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs, and LDN targets was not only desirable but essential. Doing so offered a strategic entry point to maximize synergies between biodiversity conservation, climate action, and land restoration, and would require coordinated technical, financial, and institutional support tailored to national contexts.

C. Nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches

18. There was broad recognition on the centrality of nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches as pivotal instruments for achieving coherence across the three Rio Conventions. These approaches were widely portrayed as practical, scalable, and cost-effective strategies that yielded co-benefits for biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and land degradation neutrality. Parties and observers alike framed nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches, when implemented appropriately, as scientifically grounded and socially equitable mechanisms that could serve as an operational nexus for synergistic implementation of multilateral environmental commitments.

19. All Parties mentioned the use of nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches as foundational for integrated policy action. Many observer organizations supported this, emphasizing the ecological and social value of nature-based solutions and advocating for their institutionalization within inter-convention cooperation mechanisms.

20. There was shared support for mainstreaming nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches into the national policy instruments such as NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs, and LDN targets. Several submissions proposed the development of integrated toolkits and practical guidance to support Parties in designing, implementing, and evaluating NbS, particularly in sectoral strategies related to agriculture, urban planning, and water management.

21. A cross-cutting theme throughout the submissions was the insistence that nature-based solutions be implemented in a manner that was rights-based, participatory, and socially just. Many Parties and observers alike underscored the central role of indigenous peoples and local communities in all phases of nature-based solution and/or ecosystem-based approach design, governance, and benefit-sharing. The need to uphold Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), protect traditional knowledge systems, and secure customary land tenure emerged as a key operational principle. Submissions stressed that nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches initiatives led by indigenous peoples and local communities were often more resilient, culturally appropriate, and biodiversity-rich.

22. Several Parties and observers raised concerns about the potential misuse or mischaracterization of NbS, especially in the context of carbon markets and offsetting schemes. It was also cautioned that without strict safeguards, NbS could be co-opted into narrowly “climate-first” agendas that compromised biodiversity, displaced local communities, or supported ecologically harmful practices such as monoculture plantations. These actors stressed the importance of applying environmental and social safeguards, establishing measurable biodiversity outcomes, and adhering to international standards such as the IUCN Global Standard for nature-based solutions. Additionally, a number of submissions expressed apprehension regarding the commodification of nature under market-oriented NbS models, urging instead stronger regulatory frameworks, public financing, and inclusive governance mechanisms.

23. To strengthen implementation, several Parties and observers highlighted the need for increased international and regional cooperation on capacity building, knowledge exchange, and finance.

24. Submissions supported the strategic inclusion of nature-based solutions as a central pillar in a future joint work programme under the Rio Conventions. Many proposed that such a future joint work programme should define shared goals for nature-based solutions, coordinate capacity-building efforts, track multi-convention contributions, and facilitate joint financial planning. Importantly, they argued that a future joint work programme should align the UNCCD’s restoration agenda, the Targets 2 (restoration) and 8 (climate change) of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, and the UNFCCC’s adaptation priorities under a coherent NbS-compatible framework.

D. Monitoring, reporting and review

25. Monitoring, reporting and review was a recurrent theme in the submissions received. It was broadly recognized as a strategic tool essential for enhancing coherence among the Rio conventions.

Across the submissions, monitoring, reporting and review was not treated solely as a technical obligation, but as an enabler for tracking progress, fostering transparency, informing decision-making, and reducing duplication in reporting. A wide range of Parties highlighted monitoring, reporting and review, or related elements, as integral to synergistic implementation of the Rio Conventions.

26. One of the most consistent calls across submissions was for harmonized reporting frameworks that would facilitate integrated implementation and ease administrative burdens. Some Parties recommended synchronizing reporting cycles across the three Conventions to allow for joint assessments. Other submissions advocated the development of common reporting templates and shared indicators relevant to all three conventions further recommended modular monitoring, reporting and review approaches, where Parties could report on thematic areas such as nature-based solutions, restoration, and ecosystem services using aligned metrics. Several governments and observer organizations suggested that these efforts be anchored in a joint work programme overseen by the Joint Liaison Group, ensuring that harmonized monitoring, reporting and review is developed within a structured institutional framework.

27. A common focus in the submissions was the need for coherent and integrated indicators that can capture the multiple co-benefits of actions across biodiversity, climate, and land agendas. Digital tools and open data platforms were frequently referenced as vital to enabling integrated and transparent monitoring, reporting and review.

28. Several Parties stressed the need for international support to ensure the digital infrastructure required for accessible, interoperable, and open monitoring, reporting and review systems, and a recurring concern among submissions was the capacity gap in many Parties ability to implement integrated monitoring, reporting and review systems. Institutions such as UNDP, FAO, and UNEP were seen as key actors in delivering coordinated capacity-building initiatives. Proposals ranged from establishing shared regional training centres to promoting South-South cooperation and supporting community-led monitoring, particularly in Indigenous and local territories.

29. Several submissions emphasized the value of participatory monitoring, calling for the inclusion of non-state actors such as indigenous peoples and local communities, youth, and civil society in monitoring, reporting and review processes. A number of submissions advocated the recognition of community-generated data and traditional knowledge within monitoring, reporting and review frameworks, highlighting the potential of participatory indicators to increase legitimacy and inclusiveness.

30. While there was broad recognition on the importance of monitoring, reporting and review, divergences also emerged. Many developing country Parties expressed concern over the cost and complexity of integrated monitoring, reporting and review and insisted on sustained external support. Some cautioned against adding monitoring, reporting and review burdens without first rationalizing existing obligations. Some suggested phased approaches that begin with aligning indicators and gradually move toward integrated reporting as national capacities strengthen. Some Parties supported aligning review cycles across conventions, and/or harmonizing spatial data systems.

31. Collectively, the submissions reaffirmed the central role of monitoring, reporting and review as a driver of policy coherence under the Rio Conventions. They reflect broad support for harmonized indicators, interoperable reporting frameworks, and inclusive monitoring, reporting and review approaches grounded in robust digital infrastructure and institutional capacity. However, the realization of this vision will require significant international support and political commitment to address capacity constraints, promote participatory governance, and ensure that monitoring, reporting and review serves as a meaningful mechanism for coordinated action.

E. Role of scientific assessments and evidence-based policy

32. Scientific assessments and evidence-based policymaking were widely acknowledged across the submissions received as essential elements for enhancing coherence among the Rio Conventions.

Parties and observer organizations alike emphasized that strengthening the interface between science and policy was indispensable for synergistic implementation. There was broad agreement on the understanding that science provided a shared foundation for policy alignment across biodiversity, climate, and land agendas, even as there were differences in how Parties proposed to operationalize this understanding in practice.

33. Across the submissions, there was agreement that global scientific assessments offered the tools needed to drive coherence and integration. Many Parties explicitly called for grounding national and international policies in the best available science. The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) were referenced as being fundamental for supplying the interdisciplinary knowledge necessary to inform decisions spanning the mandates of the three Conventions. These institutions were also seen as building blocks for cross-sectoral collaboration, not just by providing information, but by framing it in ways that bridged biodiversity, climate, and land considerations. Particular attention was drawn to the IPBES Nexus and Transformative Change Assessments, viewing these as pivotal resources for formulating integrated strategies.

34. Many Parties argued that global assessments should be embedded systematically within national policy cycles. The use of national science-policy platforms was also highlighted to contextualize global assessments and translate them into actionable knowledge at the country level. The need to strengthen national research institutions, enhanced data systems, and scientific advisory bodies capable of informing integrated decision-making was therefore recognised.

35. The submissions also highlighted the need to improve coordination among the scientific bodies that supported each of the Rio Conventions. A number of Parties advocated for institutionalised collaboration among IPBES, IPCC, and the UNCCD's Science-Policy Interface (SPI), including the organisation of joint workshops, development of interoperable data systems, and co-authoring of thematic policy briefs. Observer organisations also emphasized the importance of multidisciplinary scientific approaches, particularly those that incorporated both social and ecological sciences, as well as increased investment in global environmental monitoring infrastructure.

36. A common concern raised was the need for evidence-based policymaking to effectively navigate trade-offs and maximise co-benefits among the three Conventions. Some Parties warned that without a science-led approach, actions that served one objective, such as afforestation for carbon sequestration, might inadvertently undermine biodiversity goals. In response, it was proposed that assessments incorporate integrated modelling tools to forecast the cross-sectoral impacts of interventions such as ecosystem restoration, sustainable agriculture, and nature-based solutions.

37. Several Parties pointed to structural barriers to accessing or applying global scientific outputs. These included deficits in scientific infrastructure, capacity constraints, and a lack of locally relevant data. To remedy this, some Parties and several observers advocated for targeted investments in capacity building, technology transfer, and South-South cooperation. Observer organisations further called for inclusive science systems that incorporated traditional knowledge alongside formal scientific research to ensure more equitable and context-sensitive policy outcomes.

38. Across submissions, a number of priority actions were identified to reinforce the science-policy interface. These included formalising institutional collaboration among IPBES, IPCC and SPI through mechanisms like the Joint Liaison Group; embedding scientific assessments within national planning and review cycles; creating regional platforms to translate and adapt global assessments to local realities; strengthening national scientific infrastructure and advisory systems; and promoting inclusive knowledge systems that drew on both traditional knowledge and Western scientific methods. These proposed actions reflected common recognition that integrated, evidence-based decision-making was fundamental to aligning the Rio Conventions with each other and with broader planetary goals.

39. Nevertheless, there were differences in emphasis across submissions. Some Parties placed less weight on international scientific assessments and instead underscored the role of national expertise

and policy autonomy. While not rejecting global science, they appeared to prioritise domestic research institutions and locally defined priorities in shaping their approaches. These variations suggested that while global scientific collaboration was broadly supported, its practical application needed to be tailored to national contexts and capacities.

40. Taken together, the submissions demonstrated a shared understanding that scientific assessments formed the backbone of effective, coherent environmental governance. The challenge now lay in operationalising this understanding through inclusive, collaborative, and capacity-sensitive mechanisms that empowered all Parties to align their commitments under the Rio Conventions through a common, evidence-informed foundation.

F. Knowledge management and capacity-building

41. The submissions received offered a clear and consistent message: the integration of biodiversity, climate, and land agendas under the Rio conventions could not be achieved without substantial investment in knowledge management and capacity building. These enablers were widely recognized as foundational for achieving policy coherence, especially for Parties with limited institutional or technical capacity. The submissions emphasized that aligning strategies and streamlining reporting mechanisms was insufficient without robust knowledge systems to support integrated decision-making. A number of Parties and observers called for the creation or strengthening of inclusive and interoperable knowledge platforms. These platforms were expected to facilitate the generation, dissemination, and use of scientific, technical, traditional, and policy-relevant knowledge, and they needed to be accessible and collaborative across sectors and levels of governance.

42. Many Parties advocated for digital platforms that integrated data, indicators, and tools related to biodiversity, climate, and land degradation. These included open-access, science-policy platforms that connected national monitoring with global frameworks such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGBF), as well as those used by the science-policy platforms.

43. However, knowledge tools alone were not sufficient. Submissions repeatedly stressed the importance of building institutional and human capacity to interpret and apply this knowledge. Parties called for cross-sectoral training that bridged environment, planning, agriculture, and finance ministries, and for functional capacity at the subnational level, where local governments needed to be equipped to use integrated data in decision-making. Several also advocated for regional, culturally adapted, and language-sensitive capacity-building programs rooted in South–South cooperation and peer learning between Parties with similar ecological and governance contexts.

44. A significant number of submissions stressed the need to recognize and empower indigenous peoples and local communities as knowledge holders and governance partners. Many emphasized that indigenous peoples and local communities should not only contribute observations and data but also be integrated into the governance of knowledge platforms. The use of community-based monitoring systems that feed into national biodiversity and climate reporting, linking grassroots observations to global frameworks was also noted.

45. Parties expressed concerns about fragmented reporting systems under the three Conventions. Some Parties identified capacity gaps in monitoring, reporting and review processes, calling for harmonized support to address overlapping obligations. Others suggested that aligning indicators and synchronizing reporting cycles could reduce administrative burdens while improving coherence.

46. Overall, the submissions illustrated the need to invest in both knowledge infrastructure and capacity development to operationalize synergies across the Rio Conventions. Whether through existing mechanisms or through the creation of new regional platforms, Parties and observers agreed that without coordinated approaches to knowledge and capacity, integrated implementation would remain out of reach. These elements, therefore, needed to be treated as central pillars in any future

joint work programme or institutional mechanism aimed at advancing coherence among the CBD, UNFCCC, and UNCCD.

G. Resource mobilization

47. The challenge of mobilizing and aligning finance for integrated responses to biodiversity loss, climate change, and land degradation continues to hinder effective implementation of the three Rio Conventions. The submissions underscored the inadequacy, fragmentation, and misalignment of existing financial flows, and called for transformative approaches to increase the coherence, effectiveness, and equity of finance across these interlinked environmental agendas.

48. A recurring theme across many submissions was the need to align financial strategies at both national and international levels, ensuring that climate, biodiversity, and land investments reinforced one another. Parties advocated for joint financial programming frameworks that synchronized funding criteria, reporting cycles, and co-benefit prioritization under multilateral mechanisms such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF), Green Climate Fund (GCF), and Adaptation Fund. Similarly, some Parties emphasized the importance of aligning domestic budget planning to reflect the objectives of all three conventions and called for horizontal integration through national multi-sectoral finance platforms that engaged the environment, finance, agriculture, and planning ministries. Observers proposed broader adoption of integrated financial planning instruments, such as biodiversity expenditure reviews and climate budget tagging, as tools to enable harmonized planning.

49. A second priority that emerged from the submissions was the urgent need to phase out environmentally harmful subsidies and redirect incentives toward positive environmental outcomes. Some Parties highlighted that subsidies supporting fossil fuels, monoculture agriculture, and land conversion directly undermined the Rio Conventions' goals. Proposals included reforming or removing such subsidies and reallocating fiscal space to support ecosystem-based approaches and sustainable agriculture. Observers recommended binding timelines and accountability frameworks for subsidy reform, aligning these efforts with Target 18 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. Parties variously proposed scaling up payments for ecosystem services, promoted sustainable agricultural incentives, or highlighted ecosystem-based adaptation as a critical area for redirected support.

50. Many Parties emphasized the need to scale investment in nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches as a pathway to generate synergistic finance. Some submissions encouraged blended public-private financing for initiatives such as green infrastructure and watershed restoration. However, many stressed the need for robust safeguards to uphold the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

51. Addressing access to finance remained a critical concern, particularly for developing country Parties and marginalized groups. Some Parties identified technical barriers, complex application procedures, and restrictive co-financing requirements as persistent obstacles. Proposed solutions included establishing technical assistance units within the GEF and GCF to support cross-convention project design, expanding direct access modalities, and simplifying approval pathways for certain recipients.

52. The central role of the GEF as a financing mechanism for the Rio Conventions also featured prominently. Parties recommended that future replenishments incorporate an Integrated Program dedicated to synergistic action, simplified reporting for multi-focal projects, and national coordination guidance. At the domestic level, some Parties proposed reforms such as green budgeting tools, environmental performance-linked fiscal transfers, and subnational finance mechanisms.

53. Engaging the private sector through innovative finance mechanisms was another key area of focus. Submissions proposed tools such as green and blue bonds, debt-for-nature swaps, and insurance-linked resilience bonds, while also stressing the importance of valuation frameworks for

ecosystem services. However, Parties cautioned that private finance needed to be governed by strict safeguards to prevent greenwashing and ensure meaningful outcomes.

54. Transparency and accountability in financial monitoring and reporting were highlighted as essential to track progress and build trust. Several Parties called for harmonized methodologies and public finance reports aligned with Rio Convention goals. Observers proposed a global finance dashboard to track cross-convention commitments and disbursements.

55. Collectively, the submissions emphasized that a coordinated financial architecture, one that was inclusive, rights-based, and nationally driven, was essential for scaling up resource mobilization. There was broad support for reforming harmful subsidies, enhancing financial alignment, and ensuring equitable access. The opportunity now lay in translating these proposals into an integrated financial framework that met the scale and urgency of the interlinked biodiversity, climate, and land degradation crises.

H. Indigenous peoples and local communities

56. The submissions from both Parties and observer organizations revealed broad support for the recognition, empowerment, and meaningful participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the implementation of the Rio Conventions. Across the 69 submissions, indigenous peoples and local communities were consistently acknowledged not only as rights-holders but as indispensable partners in achieving policy coherence across biodiversity, climate, and land agendas. These inputs emphasised that advancing coherent strategies across the Rio conventions required systemic, rights-based, and culturally respectful approaches that elevated the voices and knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities.

57. Several Parties emphasized the necessity of respecting the rights of indigenous peoples in accordance with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). These rights included land tenure, access to natural resources, and the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). Submissions underscored that the pursuit of policy coherence must not have overridden existing commitments to Indigenous sovereignty or diminished the hard-won protections of human rights frameworks. Observer organizations echoed this perspective, cautioning that large-scale climate and conservation programmes, if poorly coordinated, might inadvertently have harmed indigenous peoples and local communities unless appropriate safeguards were in place.

58. Beyond rights recognition, a prominent theme throughout the submissions was the recognition of indigenous peoples and local communities as stewards of ecosystems and holders of traditional ecological knowledge. Parties drew attention to the critical role of traditional knowledge systems in sustaining biodiversity, restoring degraded lands, and guiding nature-based solutions. Observers advocated for integrating traditional knowledge with scientific data to strengthen the science-policy interface and ensure that policies were culturally grounded and locally effective. Such integration was recommended to be contingent on full consent, recognition of intellectual property, and protections against misappropriation.

59. The importance of participatory governance emerged as another unifying priority. Many submissions called for the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the planning, decision-making, and implementation of national strategies such as NBSAPs, NDCs and LDN targets. Parties proposed institutionalized representation of indigenous peoples and local communities in national coordination mechanisms or advocated co-governance models that elevated Indigenous leadership in both biodiversity conservation and climate action, arguing that coherence must have been driven from the ground up, not imposed from the top down. Observer organizations supported these recommendations and proposed channelling international finance to Indigenous-led initiatives and community-based solutions. The inclusion of indigenous and local youth in national delegations and technical platforms, fostering both intergenerational equity and local ownership, was also highlighted.

60. A number of submissions raised concerns about the potential for maladaptation and displacement if coherent initiatives were not designed with indigenous peoples and local communities at the centre. Many Parties and observers cautioned that climate or land restoration efforts carried out without adequate safeguards could have resulted in resource loss, dislocation, or disruption of customary governance systems. They advocated for the development of robust grievance mechanisms and human rights-based approaches to minimize unintended harm and ensure accountability.

61. Several Parties and observers stressed the importance of involving indigenous peoples and local communities in monitoring, reporting and review systems. Some promoted community-based monitoring initiatives that empowered local actors to assess ecosystem health, track progress on restoration, and feed into national reporting frameworks. These initiatives not only enhanced data collection but also reinforced traditional knowledge systems and upheld data sovereignty. Observers supported these proposals and recommended establishing frameworks that recognized and protected the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities over their knowledge and contributions.

62. The submissions articulated that coherent implementation of the Rio Conventions must have embedded indigenous peoples and local communities at the core, not as beneficiaries, but as co-creators and decision-makers. Rather than treating inclusion as a procedural exercise, Parties and observers called for structural reforms that institutionalized indigenous and local leadership, ensured secure land and resource rights, protected traditional knowledge, and guaranteed equitable access to benefits and decision-making power.

63. The proposals spanned institutional coordination at the national level to community-anchored implementation, reflecting different national approaches but a shared objective. This alignment reflected a deeper recognition that genuine policy coherence was as much about cultural legitimacy and social justice as it was about technical integration, and that these values must have underpinned efforts to implement the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, the Paris Agreement, and the UNCCD Strategic Framework.

I. Whole-of-Society Approach

64. The 69 submissions received illustrated a growing recognition that true policy coherence across the Rio Conventions had to be grounded in inclusive and cross-cutting approaches. The integration of social, economic, and spatial dimensions, namely gender equality, youth engagement, private sector mobilization, and urban-nature linkages, emerged as central pillars in many Party and observer contributions. These submissions collectively conveyed that beyond institutional alignment and technical harmonization, transformative environmental governance required deliberate efforts to mainstream equity, justice, and innovation across all sectors and demographics.

65. Gender equality and women's empowerment featured prominently in both Party and observer submissions, highlighting a shared understanding that women were not only disproportionately impacted by environmental degradation but also played vital roles as custodians of biodiversity. Parties emphasized mainstreaming gender considerations across NBSAPs, NDCs and LDN targets. The incorporation of gender-responsive indicators and budgeting across the three Rio Conventions, and the collection and use of sex-disaggregated data were proposed to ensure that policy impacts were appropriately measured and addressed for both women and men. Several submissions stressed the need for greater inclusion of women in environmental decision-making, including advocating for women's leadership at all levels. Observers further advanced a rights-based framing of gender equality, asserting that it had to serve as a foundational principle across all intergovernmental programming under the Rio Conventions.

66. Youth inclusion was also a recurring theme. Submissions from numerous Parties and observers championed the essential role of young people in driving environmental transformation. Proposals included the formal integration of youth representatives into national coordination bodies and joint liaison mechanisms. The need to invest in education, capacity building, and leadership development tailored to biodiversity, climate, and land governance was also emphasized. Beyond participation,

youth organizations called for accountability mechanisms, with observers urging that youth help monitor the implementation of frameworks like the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the Paris Agreement. Several submissions framed youth engagement as a matter of intergenerational justice, warning that the failure to act coherently in the present would impose disproportionate burdens on future generations.

67. Private sector engagement was widely recognized as indispensable for achieving integrated outcomes under the Rio Conventions. Several Parties and observers stressed that mobilizing private capital and innovation had to go together with strong safeguards and public oversight. Proposals ranged from creating enabling environments for investment in green technologies and nature-based solutions, to incentivizing carbon markets, biodiversity credits, and ecosystem services. Some Parties called for mandatory environmental, social, and governance disclosure frameworks to improve corporate transparency regarding biodiversity and climate risks. Public-private partnerships were promoted as vehicles for sustainable agriculture, reforestation, and restoration, particularly when anchored in national strategies. However, cautionary notes from some Parties highlighted the risks of over-reliance on market mechanisms without robust regulatory frameworks, particularly regarding the commodification of nature.

68. Urban-nature linkages formed another common theme. With rapid urbanization posing escalating threats to both climate resilience and biodiversity integrity, several submissions underscored the importance of integrating the various conventions' goals and targets into urban planning and governance. Examples of ecosystem-based urban design, such as green roofs and peri-urban wetlands, were shared, as were the use of localized biodiversity action plans aligned with national and international targets. Some parties also promoted nature-based solutions in cities to mitigate heat stress, flooding, and air pollution. The need for enhanced governance coordination between municipal and national levels was raised to mainstream biodiversity and climate considerations into infrastructure, housing, and zoning decisions.

69. Overall, the submissions demonstrated that policy coherence under the Rio Conventions could not be achieved through technical alignment alone. Equity, intergenerational responsibility, economic innovation, and spatial integration were indispensable for effective and inclusive environmental governance. These cross-cutting themes provided a powerful foundation for reshaping the way global environmental agreements were implemented, anchoring them in the lived realities, aspirations, and capacities of diverse actors across society.

J. Joint Liaison Group

70. The Joint Liaison Group (JLG) of the Rio Conventions was originally established to facilitate cooperation among the three secretariats. Although it had operated for over twenty years, many Parties and observers believed the JLG had not yet realized its full potential, proposing reforms aimed at enhancing its mandate and utility. These proposals collectively reflected a desire to transform the JLG into a more strategic and operational mechanism for advancing policy coherence across the Rio Conventions.

71. Many submissions expressed clear support for strengthening and reforming the JLG. Parties and observers viewed the JLG as a critical institutional platform for realising the synergies among biodiversity, climate, and land agendas. While it was currently limited in scope, many stakeholders advocated expanding its remit beyond information exchange to include more strategic responsibilities. There were repeated calls for the JLG to become a coordination body capable of guiding a joint work programme, aligning cross-cutting initiatives, and offering cohesive thematic guidance that supported implementation across all three Conventions.

72. A core recommendation appearing in many submissions was the designation of the JLG as the lead entity in developing and overseeing a voluntary joint work programme. Some Parties emphasized that the JLG should define a JWP's thematic priorities, expected outputs, and implementation modalities. Beyond this, several Parties also recommended that the JLG develop harmonized reporting frameworks and shared technical briefs on common themes such as ecosystem

restoration, nature-based solutions, and integrated indicators for co-benefits. This function was seen as essential for avoiding duplication and ensuring policy alignment. Knowledge sharing was also a recurring theme, with calls for the JLG to become a central hub for facilitating peer-to-peer learning and cross-sectoral dialogue, particularly through technical platforms and thematic exchanges.

73. Some Parties and observers went further, proposing that the JLG assume a role in joint representation and advocacy in global processes. These included calls to engage collectively in intergovernmental assessments like those led by IPCC and IPBES. Observer organizations additionally suggested that the JLG monitor and assess the progress of synergy implementation on the ground, offering feedback to the respective COPs and helping track policy effectiveness.

74. Governance reforms were another prominent theme. Some proposed broadening the composition of the JLG to include indigenous peoples and local communities, youth groups, and the scientific community. Others stressed the importance of defining a clear terms of reference and establishing a joint work plan that would be endorsed by all three Conventions' Conferences of the Parties. Observers recommended regular engagement with non-state actors and thematic experts, enhancing inclusiveness and the scientific robustness of the JLG's activities.

75. Not all submissions, however, called for deep institutional transformation. Some Parties advocated for a flexible approach, insisting that participation in JLG-led initiatives remain voluntary and responsive to national contexts. There was also some hesitation regarding the potential for the JLG to overreach and imposing on national-level implementation. Meanwhile, submissions some Parties highlighted the importance of making the JLG more transparent and inclusive, pointing to previous challenges in accessing its deliberations and outputs.

76. Overall, the submissions highlighted that the JLG could and should play a stronger role in fostering collaboration across the Rio Conventions. There was a shared interest in transforming it into a mechanism with the capacity to coordinate a joint work programme, harmonize reporting, and serve as a hub for knowledge exchange. At the same time, the proposals underscored the importance of flexibility, voluntary participation, and inclusive governance. While there were divergent views on the degree of reform required, the submissions provided a compelling foundation for reimagining the JLG as a pivotal instrument for enhancing coherence, efficiency, and ambition in the implementation of the Rio Conventions.

K. A potential joint work programme under the Rio conventions

77. In response to notification 2025-005, a wide range of Parties and observer organizations submitted inputs on how to enhance policy coherence through the development of a joint work programme (JWP) to operationalize synergies across the three Rio conventions.

78. Support for such a programme was widespread across Parties and observers. They viewed a JWP as a tool to translate overarching calls for coherence into tangible, implementable strategies. The rationale advanced emphasized the need to reduce duplication, align national policy instruments such as NBSAPs, NDCs and LDN targets, and to foster cross-sectoral cooperation, data integration, and shared use of resources.

79. There were common thematic areas that a joint work programme should prioritize nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches were identified by many as strategic entry points for cooperation, offering co-benefits for biodiversity conservation, climate adaptation and mitigation, and sustainable land use. Submissions proposed scaling up nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches, establishing safeguards, and sharing best practices. Restoration and sustainable land management also featured prominently, as did harmonization of monitoring, reporting and review systems and the development of joint indicators for biodiversity, climate, and land use.

80. This was complemented by calls for interoperable data platforms from observer organizations. Financial coherence was another recurring theme, with proposals from a number of Parties emphasizing the need for aligned investment strategies, including guidance for funding mechanisms like the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and blended finance initiatives. Knowledge exchange

and capacity building were highlighted in several submissions, with recommendations for regional hubs and data-sharing platforms that could have fostered implementation partnerships, particularly for developing country Parties. Moreover, many Parties stressed the importance of ensuring that indigenous peoples and local communities were involved through rights-based, participatory approaches.

81. In terms of governance, the JLG was widely regarded as the most suitable mechanism to coordinate a JWP. There were numerous suggestions for enhancing inclusivity, with proposals to incorporate scientific bodies like the IPCC, IPBES and SPI, as well as representatives from indigenous peoples and local communities, youth, and local authorities. A voluntary, country-driven structure was advocated by many Parties to respect sovereignty and accommodate varying capacities. Some proposed a modular or phased approach that could have begun with informal joint activities such as technical workshops or shared indicator development. Some Parties cautioned against institutional overlap and stressed the importance of grounding a JWP in national contexts. As a safeguard, multiple submissions recommended that a JWP be aligned with existing frameworks such as the KMGBF, the Paris Agreement's implementation architecture, and the UNCCD Strategic Framework.

82. Observer organizations sought formal inclusion in a JWP structure. Many proposed a multi-stakeholder advisory group to inform design, thematic priorities, and outreach strategies. They also offered to provide technical expertise, coordinate pilot initiatives, and facilitate regional dialogues to support implementation. This reflected the wide recognition that observer bodies were not only sources of technical knowledge but also key implementation partners.

83. While support was broad, some Parties expressed reservations. The need to respect the principles and mandates of the individual Rio Conventions was emphasised, and several Parties underscored the need for dedicated technical and financial support, cautioning that additional obligations could have overwhelmed under-resourced institutions. There was also divergence on whether a JWP should stand as an independent instrument or be embedded within broader processes.

84. Despite these reservations, there was agreement in the submissions that a joint work programme had the potential to enhance the coherence, efficiency, and strategic alignment of actions under the Rio Conventions. Submissions repeatedly emphasized that a JWP should have been voluntary, flexible, and grounded in national implementation needs. The Joint Liaison Group was widely endorsed as the coordinating entity, with calls for inclusive governance and systemic integration over time. The diverse and detailed contributions offered a robust foundation for advancing a JWP. Ensuring transparency, inclusivity, adequate resourcing, and alignment with national priorities would have been critical to its success and to unlocking the transformative potential of integrated environmental governance.

Annex I

Statement of the Joint Liaison Group on greater synergies in implementation, in the context of the UN80 Initiative

A. Rio conventions synergies: Triple impact for planet and people

1. The world's population is on track to reach 10 billion by 2050, just as the planetary systems that sustain life on Earth are being pushed to their limits. The existential risks facing humanity can, and must, be jointly addressed, recognizing that climate change, biodiversity loss and land degradation are different expressions of one planetary crisis — a crisis driven by “misallocation of capital” and underpinned by the challenges of poverty on the one hand and overconsumption, including the unsustainable exploitation of nature, on the other.

2. We cannot tackle these issues in isolation. Leveraging synergies between international commitments to stem biodiversity loss, tackle climate change and combat land degradation and drought is key to addressing these interconnected crises. At a time when the United Nations system is looking for practical solutions to augment its impact and increase efficiency, a truly synergistic approach is one whose time has come, building on the outcome of the Pact for the Future and the Secretary General's UN80 initiative.

3. The secretariats of the three global treaties that emerged from the 1992 Rio Earth Summit — Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) — have been collaborating since their establishment including, since 2003, through the Joint Liaison Group of the Rio Conventions (JLG). Through the JLG, the secretariats exchange knowledge on overlapping issues (see Annex), coordinating the efforts of scientists and experts, facilitating the meaningful engagement of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, and supporting government negotiators and practitioners.

4. Of note is the Rio Conventions Joint Capacity-building Programme which was initiated by the three secretariats in 2023. This programme aims to strengthen individual, institutional and systemic capacities to enhance synergies between the climate, biodiversity, and land agendas. It promotes collaboration, integrated planning, policy development and resource mobilization, and the recognition of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of Indigenous Peoples and local communities to achieve the three Rio conventions' objectives and the Sustainable Development Goals.

5. On the programmatic level, there is a strong rationale for synergies. Sustainable ecosystem management and restoration, agrifood systems and energy transitions present vital opportunities to advance all three Rio conventions and make societies and economies more resilient. However, leveraging the convergence between the Rio conventions urgently requires policy and funding coherence at the national and subnational levels, starting with land and sea use planning and the allocation of budgets and incentives. Concretely, the Rio convention secretariats can support countries in integrating land, climate and biodiversity action into national policies and strategies by:

- (a) Fostering cooperation between national focal points of the three Conventions for policy coherence;
- (b) Leveraging synergies in planning and implementation processes via integrated actions and approaches; and
- (c) Prioritizing holistic solutions to address land degradation, climate change and biodiversity loss.

6. There is growing momentum behind the synergy agenda at the levels of Rio conventions Presidencies, Parties and stakeholders. The intersections between the Rio conventions are being

increasingly prioritized as key areas for action within the global environmental agenda and multilateral frameworks, as well as among the donor community and innovative financing mechanisms focused on achieving multiple benefits. We hope that governments, through the respective Conferences of the Parties (COPs) of each Rio convention, will seize the unprecedented urgency, and opportunity, of raising coordinated investments and action to protect our planet and respond to the growing demand for food, water and resources.

7. The Rio convention secretariats are constantly exploring further operational opportunities for greater synergies—in the way our respective COPs are being planned and organized, through sharing expertise on issues such as engagement of all stakeholders and actors, and by leveraging new technologies such as AI-assisted translations. Such operational synergies—and related efficiencies—will contribute to shaping the future of multilateral environmental negotiations. While synergies clearly extend well beyond the Rio conventions, these three highly symbolic and widely ratified global agreements can offer useful insights for other processes.

8. As Executive Secretaries of the three Rio conventions, we stand united in our commitment to make synergies a lynchpin of our collective efforts that benefit climate, land and biodiversity—and ultimately all of us who depend on our planet's life-support system.

12 June 2025

Ibrahim Thiaw
Executive Secretary
United Nations Convention to
Combat Desertification
(UNCCD)

Astrid Schomaker
Executive Secretary
Convention on Biological
Diversity (CBD)

Simon Stiell
Executive Secretary
United Nations Framework
Convention on Climate Change
(UNFCCC)

B. 2025-2026 Areas of collaboration

9. The overview below shows the various activities relevant to the implementation of CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC that represent the main ongoing areas of collaboration, as well as areas in which additional efforts are being explored under the guidance of the Rio Conventions Joint Liaison Group (JLG). As per the JLG's guiding principles (see Addendum), the work is carried out within the respective mandates of each Convention and implemented within existing resources.

Country support	Coherence and complementarity	Outreach and visibility
Capacity-building for National Focal Points: (continued implementation of the Joint Capacity-building Programme) - Joint NFP negotiation skills training and capacity-building workshops - Integrated planning and policy development Resource mobilization - Explore options for developing and financing synergistic projects - Strengthen engagement with climate and nature partnerships - Approaches to mobilize financial resources for synergistic projects	Thematic issues with large crossover - Integrated Land Use Planning - Food Systems - Gender mainstreaming - Other thematic areas and biome-focused work, e.g. forests, water, mountains Non-Party stakeholder engagement - Indigenous Peoples - Youth	Joint advocacy by the Principals Rio conventions visibility - Branding and digital presence - Joint narrative/messaging on Rio Convention synergies & cross-promotion - Joint events Showcasing best practices on synergies - Country case studies - Engaging country champions for synergies

C. Guiding principles for the Joint Liaison Group

10. The work of the JLG is defined by a set of guiding principles intended to ensure that the mandate and purpose of the JLG is reflected in its outputs.

(a) Principle 1: As synergies and coordination can be best implemented at the national level, the JLG primarily supports Parties in the achievement of national level synergies and coordination among the Rio Conventions;

(b) Principle 2: The activities undertaken by the JLG are country-driven and needs-based;

(c) Principle 3: The JLG recognizes the distinct and specific objectives of each convention and their different Parties, as well as the individual mandates and independent status of their treaty bodies and secretariats;

(d) Principle 4: The JLG aims to add value to work already ongoing within each secretariat while minimizing duplication of activities and promoting cost-effectiveness;

(e) Principle 5: The JLG can only undertake activities that can be completed with existing resources or have identified funding.

11. See also:

www.cbd.int/cooperation/doc/jlg-modus-operandi-en.pdf

<https://unfccc.int/topics/capacity-building/projects/rio-conventions-joint-capacity-building-programme>

Annex II

Technical information exchange on enhanced cooperation and policy coherence to support the implementation of the Rio conventions

Meeting report

15 June 2025; Bonn, Germany, and online

A. Introduction

1. The three Rio conventions, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) emerged from the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, held on 3-14 June 1992 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The global problems of biodiversity loss, climate change and desertification were recognised then for their seriousness and need to be effectively addressed.
2. At its sixteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties to the CBD requested the Executive Secretary to invite Parties, observers and other stakeholders, to submit their views on options for enhanced policy coherence, including a potential joint work programme of the Rio conventions, and to invite the executive secretaries of the other Rio conventions to collaborate on the organization of a technical information exchange further explore options to enhance cooperation and policy coherence to support the implementation of the Conventions.
3. The Technical Information Exchange was held in the margins of the sixty-second session of the Subsidiary Bodies of the UNFCCC in Bonn, Germany, on 15 June 2025.⁵ It considered the submissions made by Parties and observers and past efforts on this matter and provided input on options to take forward.

B. Opening of the meeting

4. Tristan Tyrrell, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), opened the meeting guiding participants through decision 16/22, in particular paragraph 19, which provides the background and justification for the organization of the Technical Information Exchange.
5. The decision requested the Executive Secretary to the Convention, to invite Parties, observers and other stakeholders, to submit their views on options for enhanced policy coherence, including a potential joint work programme of the Rio conventions, to submit its compilation for consideration the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) at a meeting held before the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP), and to invite the executive secretaries of the other Rio conventions to collaborate on the organization of a technical information exchange in 2025 to further explore options to enhance cooperation and policy coherence.
6. On behalf of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Astrid Schomaker, Executive Secretary, emphasized the need for an integrated response to biodiversity loss, climate change, and land degradation. The joint implementation of the three conventions is strategic and essential to achieve significant opportunities for efficiency, leveraging investments, ensuring policy coherence, and avoiding duplication of efforts, as also reflected in reports from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the Intergovernmental science-policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). However, it was reiterated that effective synergies require collaboration at every scale, from national to regional and local scales, including with a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach, while integrating the knowledge and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities. Furthermore, policies and incentives across sectors should also align to support integrated objectives, she said.

⁵ See www.cbd.int/meetings/CC-OM-2025-01.

7. Daniele Violetti, Senior Director, Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change highlighted the importance of working together on policy coherence and the growing momentum for synergies between the three Rio conventions at both international and national levels. Deeper collaboration and the importance of aligning the conventions on the ground were particularly stressed. It was underlined how past efforts as well as the submissions received in response to the notification shared by the CBD Secretariat constitute an important evidence base to inform future developments on the joint work and implementation at the national level of the three Rio Conventions. The Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) remains deeply engaged in the work of the Joint Liaison Group of the Rio Conventions, including on matters related to capacity building. In the near future, the Brazilian presidency of the thirtieth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC represents a great opportunity to support the discussion on synergies within the UNFCCC process.

8. Daniel Boeira Lodetti, Deputy Head for Sustainable Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brazil, representing the incoming UNFCCC COP30 Presidency, underscored the importance of addressing biodiversity, climate change, and desertification interlinkages from an implementation perspective. He emphasized the need for policy coherence to be responsive to the needs and priorities of countries and highlighted the importance of transparency, inclusivity, and safeguarding national policy space to fully reflect realities on the ground. He also stated that a synergistic approach to the implementation of the three Rio Conventions, including through a potential joint work programme, could support countries with integrated national planning and enable harmonized reporting. Several elements are also relevant in the context of synergies across the Rio Conventions, including indigenous peoples and local communities, people of African descent, as well as thematic issues such as bioeconomy and carbon storage. It was remarked, however, that equity in decision-making as well as transparency of financial flows will be key, including on matters related to synergies.

C. Setting the scene

9. Tristan Tyrrell, Programme Management Officer, CBD, provided an overview of past efforts towards cooperation and policy coherence across the Rio conventions, highlighting various initiatives and challenges. Past cooperation initiatives focused on thematic areas such as ecosystem-based adaptation under the Nairobi Work Programme of the UNFCCC or ecosystem restoration with the UNCCD. Other joint work was conducted on gender, communication and capacity building. At Executive Secretary level, the Joint Liaison Group provided opportunities for joint initiatives, including in the context of the Joint Capacity Building Programme. At national level, efforts have been made for example by bringing experts in nationally determined contributions (NDCs), national adaptation plans (NAPs) and national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) together. Furthermore, some joint capacity building work has also been made on negotiation processes. In addition to these, it was pointed out that other cooperation initiatives outside of the secretariats also exist.

10. Jeroen Van Dalen, Programme Officer, Partnerships, UNCCD, discussed the current mandates within the UNCCD, including those arising from decision 8/COP.16 on promotion and strengthening of relationships with other relevant conventions and international organizations, institutions and agencies, alongside six additional references to synergies contained in other decisions related to capacity building, science-policy recommendations and knowledge sharing adopted at the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the UNCCD. Synergies also advance through specific initiatives, publications and tools, such as the two guidance reports on sustainable land management published in cooperation with the United Nations University, or the two knowledge platforms, the Drought Toolbox and the Sand and Dust Storms Toolbox, developed in collaboration with numerous UN agencies. It was also underlined that many opportunities to further synergies across the Rio Conventions on capacity building, monitoring, advocacy and thematic issues such as land use planning and food systems lie ahead. These include the Joint Liaison Group, but also the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration, the International Drought Resilience Alliance and the intergovernmental working group on the future strategic framework.

11. Alejandro Kilpatrick, Manager, Capacity-Building, UNFCCC, presented the Joint Capacity Building Programme, which aims to strengthen individual, institutional, and systemic capacities to enhance synergies between climate actions, biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management, while enhancing coordination and coherence in achieving the three Rio Conventions' objectives and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). He continued by highlighting the achievements of the Programme, which was launched in 2023 and became fully operational in 2024. These include numerous consultations with focal points, side events, test trainings, ultimately leading up to self-paced e-learning modules and master classes as well as a dedicated webpage. The integration of common thematic issues, such as access to finance, has been one of the main foci of the Programme. It was remarked that the Programme also helped other initiatives that are relevant to capacity building in the context of the Rio Conventions gain better visibility and reach more users. Moving forward, the Programme will identify practical avenues to strengthen regional and national capacity, including by working with the regional centres of the three Rio Conventions.

12. Pamela McElwee, Associate Professor, Rutgers University, spoke of the IPBES Nexus Assessment, for which she was one of the co-chairs, which looks at interlinkages among biodiversity, water, food, health and climate. It was remarked that cooperation also happens, informally, at the assessment development level, as many IPBES authors also worked on IPCC Reports, and further synergies through their knowledge and experiences in different processes. She emphasized the need for integrated responses and highlighted various solutions and response options that can help achieve policy coherence and enhanced cooperation. In particular, the Nexus Assessment contains five key messages: (1) the five crises analysed are interconnected but not our responses, (2) solutions exist, as detailed in more than seventy response options that have broadly positive impacts on water, food, health, biodiversity and climate change, including many nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches, (3) every actor has a role to play and enhanced collaboration is required, and (4) the goal of policy coherence is supported by evidence. While solutions exist, they are fragmented and sometimes are not addressing the underlying causes of the crises they aim to solve. Furthermore, challenges and barriers for integrated action remain in terms of policy design, institutional capacity and financing. The options identified consider these elements and were mapped against global frameworks, such as the SDGs, the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGBF) and the Paris Agreement, thus providing clear elements for synergistic implementation. It was also noted that the summary for policymakers of the Nexus Assessment is now available.

13. Exsley Taloiburi, Head of Multilateral Governance and Observer Engagement, Green Climate Fund (GCF), discussed GCF investments and their role, as an operating entity of the UNFCCC Financial Mechanism, in delivering climate action that catalyses synergies across climate resilience, biodiversity, and land restoration. He emphasized the importance of private sector engagement and community ownership in project design and implementation. In practical terms, GCF investments are structured to deliver, for example, on the NDCs, while contributing to national biodiversity strategies and action plans, the KMGBF and land degradation neutrality. The Great Green Wall Initiative, as well as support to coastal resilience, synergistic implementation of climate and biodiversity objectives are some of the examples of supported activities and thematic areas under GCF investments. Private sector engagement in nature positive remains a priority, and it is encouraged through concessional loans and similar instruments. Other innovative financing instruments, such as green bonds, debt-for-nature swaps and payments for ecosystem services are also part of GCF strategy. He concluded by highlighting that indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as traditional knowledge and traditional land recognition, are also central to GCF investments.

14. Clarisse Kehler Siebert, Senior Policy Advisor, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, presented, in her capacity as Co-Chair of the Bern III Conference, as part of the Bern process, which aims to foster cooperation among multilateral environmental agreements to implement the KMGBF. It was remarked that cooperation and synergies are not new to the CBD as there is a standing agenda item on cooperation with other conventions and international organizations. It is under this decision that the Bern process was born in 2019. Specifically, the process was originally mandated by the

Conference of the Parties to better understand the contributions of other conventions and organizations towards the KMGBF. In 2024, the Bern III Conference focused on three main objectives: (1) foster collaboration in the implementation of the Framework, (2) sharing practical cooperation experiences and (3) foster a community of synergy champions. The Conference was attended by sixteen multilateral environmental agreements and numerous stakeholders. The mapping of multilateral environmental agreements, including UNCCD and UNFCCC, against the KMGBF was one important outcome of the conference to better understand the linkages and gaps and to see how each convention can champion certain targets. Of equal importance, a number of case studies were also considered to identify and assess practical examples of cooperation. The Conference concluded with an invitation to continue the Bern process at national level. Moving forward, a webinar series is being organized over summer 2025 leading up to an expert meeting which, *inter alia*, will consider inputs for the global report on collective progress toward the KMGBF. The Bern process also continues to support the development of knowledge products on cooperation, cross-mapping of conventions' plans and frameworks as well as national platforms that foster collaboration across focal points.

D. Discussion

15. During the discussion, participants highlighted the role of indigenous peoples and local communities in fostering synergies across the Rio Conventions, and the need to move beyond existing mandates and processes which should strive to deliver transformative outcomes. Participants emphasized the importance of co-producing knowledge that integrates traditional and local knowledge, the knowledge of indigenous peoples and scientific perspectives, questioning the prevailing assumption that only science is sufficient. The lack of local data and exclusion of rights-holders, especially of indigenous peoples, from decision making and from knowledge production processes were identified as key barriers. Ensuring their full and effective representation and participation at all levels and stages, supported by translation services and the recognition of indigenous peoples and of local communities, women and youth as equal partners, is essential to advancing inclusive and innovative solutions.

16. Several representatives highlighted emerging efforts to bridge knowledge systems and promote coherence. The UNFCCC's engagement with the G20 bioeconomy initiative was noted for integrating traditional knowledge with science and establishing agreed principles. The need to transform knowledge production systems to dismantle decision-making silos was also underscored. Moreover, it was clarified that current science-policy platforms do not produce, but rather gather knowledge, suggesting that academic institutions must take a more active role in co-production of knowledge. It was noted that mechanisms like the Global Environment Facility (GEF), which serves as the financial mechanism to all three Rio Conventions, play a central role in leveraging policy coherence through mainstreaming synergies across projects and closing the nature financing gap, while also recognizing the contextual specificity of coherence and the need for robust metrics.

17. Participants also discussed the need for investment strategies for example to reflect the complexity of nature-based solutions, which currently lack standardized metrics. It was also reiterated that a clearer understanding of economic trade-offs is needed to better evaluate the options identified by the IPBES Nexus Assessment.

E. Review of submissions to notification 2025-005 and the reflections of the Joint Liaison Group

18. Participants were guided through the preliminary documents, already shared in preparation for the Technical Information Exchange. The CBD Secretariat highlighted how the submission received in response to notification 2025-005 provided an overview of key elements for advancing policy coherence across the Rio Conventions, reflecting the strong interest demonstrated through numerous submissions, especially from observers.

19. Some topics were identified as recurring in several submissions. The list, although not exhaustive, includes: alignment of national strategies, nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based

approaches, monitoring, reporting and review, role of scientific assessments and evidence-based policy, knowledge management and capacity building, resource mobilisation, the role and rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, whole-of-society approach, the Joint Liaison Group, and a potential joint work programme under the Rio conventions.

20. On alignment of national strategies, such as NBSAPs, NDCs and Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) targets, there was overall agreement that coherence among these instruments is essential. However, submissions differed as in how they saw this coherence being applied in practice: while some advocated for one document of common issues with annexes on convention-specific elements, others referred to developing different documents in each of which commonalities would be highlighted. Funding and support on this matter was remarked by many as a crucial issue.

21. Nature-based solutions were highlighted, referencing both the United Nations Environment Assembly resolution and the global standard developed by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). Numerous submissions put great emphasis on social and environmental safeguards, while others stressed that these measures should create benefits for both climate and biodiversity, with the benefits in other areas also being recognised.

22. Monitoring, reporting and review were identified as a critical area, with proposals for common templates and indicators to ease reporting burdens. Many submissions reported capacity building as essential to support coherent planning and reporting.

23. The full engagement of non-state actors, particularly indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth, was acknowledged as essential, though many submissions noted persistent inequities in participation.

24. Scientific assessments and institutional capacity were also central to the discussion. Some submissions underlined the importance of ensuring the local relevance of global assessments for effective implementation.

25. Resource mobilization was underscored as a cross-cutting issue, with financing needs linked to nearly every topic raised. The importance of addressing harmful subsidies and enhancing engagement from the private and financial sectors was also noted.

F. Breakout Groups

26. Participants were divided into breakout groups based on their representation to discuss and recommend next steps for moving forward with enhancing policy coherence and cooperation across the three Rio conventions. Guiding questions included core themes for enhanced cooperation, primary actors, support needed for effective action, and short, medium, and long-term actions. For the purpose of this report, the breakout group discussions were collated according to their composition: Parties, international organizations, and observers.

1. Parties

(a) Core Themes

27. The discussions highlighted several interrelated challenges and opportunities in advancing the implementation of the Rio Conventions. A central theme is an overall lack of policy coherence at national and international levels. There was agreement that fragmented policy responses are insufficient to address the interlinked global climate, biodiversity and land crises. While many countries have developed biodiversity and climate strategies aligned with global frameworks, implementation is hindered by fragmented governance, conflicting sectoral priorities, and insufficient cross-sectoral coordination.

28. Parties also identified significant barriers in relation to capacity building, as some tools exist but their use and uptake is sometimes uncertain, while limited human resources continue to hinder cooperation processes at all levels. Monitoring, reporting and review systems were also often mentioned and while most Parties called for better alignment, some cautioned about differences in

the activities being reported. On finance, it was underlined that access to finance remains a considerable challenge, while aligning financial incentives could substantially synergize the implementation of the three conventions. In relation to this, some participants remarked that the siloed approach of some international public finance institutions remains a major barrier to the implementation of synergistic projects on the ground.

29. The main thematic areas mentioned included terrestrial, freshwater, coastal and marine ecosystem management, nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches (including ecosystem-based adaptation), ecosystem restoration, bioeconomy, food systems, agriculture and soil biodiversity. In these areas, Parties reported frustration about the lack of a common understanding and shared definitions among the conventions and their Parties, thus resulting in fragmentation and trade-offs in progress towards the objectives of the three conventions. A recurring example of these dynamics is the recognition of ecosystem management practices that contribute to carbon capture and storage but not necessarily to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. In this respect, it was recognized that sometimes the challenge is a lack of coordination among technical experts and that issue-specific technical exchanges could help in this regard. Some participants stressed that having joint indicators could also support a more harmonized understanding of such thematic issues. Furthermore, the identification of the shared drivers of crises could also further synergistic approaches. It was stressed that there remains a need to make the case for enhanced policy coherence saving costs at policy and planning stages and to mobilize more resources for integrated implementation. An assessment of such synergies in Rwanda providing potential cost savings of 50 million USD annually was mentioned to support this.

30. There was general agreement that some of the work will have to be done at national level, and national platforms with participation of different focal points for example in the development of NBSAPs could be beneficial in this regard. In addition, efforts will have to be made to enable discussions within the UNFCCC process, for examples on matters related to the Global Stocktake and the Global Goal on Adaptation.

(b) Primary Actors

31. There was overall agreement that synergistic implementation requires a whole-of-society approach involving a broad spectrum of actors. National Focal Points remain central to coordination efforts and the need to build a common narrative among the focal points of the Rio conventions was stressed. However, their capacity constraints necessitate broader institutional and financial support. Subnational and local governments, landowners, indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth, and the elderly were identified as critical yet often underrepresented stakeholders. It was remarked that national stakeholders and actors are equally relevant and that their participation should be fostered through relevant domestic mechanisms.

32. The private sector, particularly in land management and finance, plays a pivotal role and must be actively engaged; some participants stressed the importance to bring in landowners on relevant technical discussions. Science-policy bodies such as IPBES and the IPCC were also recognized as important actors to foster cooperation. Some Parties shared that synergies need to materialize not only at national level and among secretariats but that governing bodies also have a critical role to play. Technical experts, especially in the context of the thematic areas mentioned in the previous section, also are important actors to further synergies and dedicated discussions should be allocated for these technical exchanges to take place. As access to finance is often restricted by siloed approached in financing institutions, their participation and active engagement to advance cooperation remains essential.

(c) Supporting Effective Action

33. Participants called for strengthened institutional coordination, enhanced capacity building, and the use of existing practical tools and common metrics, or their development if not available. Some Parties saw the Joint Liaison Group as an important mechanism to facilitate cooperation among the Conventions, and called for a stronger mandate, leadership and involvement of Parties. Technical

exchanges, particularly at subsidiary body meetings, were proposed as a means to build consensus, foster a shared understanding of technical measures and share best practices. The need for integrated decision-making tools that account for ecosystem services and long-term benefits was highlighted. Participants also stressed the importance of public-private partnerships and co-designed approaches to ensure that voluntary markets and other mechanisms meet the needs of all stakeholders. Education and awareness-raising were identified as essential to shifting decision-making away from short-term economic considerations toward long-term benefits such as ecological and social well-being. Scientific assessments, such as those from the IPCC and IPBES, are also important in informing integrated approaches, but their uptake at national level remains a challenge.

(d) Ways Forward (Short, Medium, and Long Term)

34. In the short term, participants recommended initiating technical exchanges and pilot initiatives to build momentum and political consensus. These could include allocating space for technical discussions at official meetings of the three conventions and in particular the UNFCCC. It was also mentioned that UNFCCC COP30 is a key opportunity to advance the cooperation discussions with the support of the Presidency. This could also support a stronger mandate from other governing bodies. The upcoming global review of the KMGBF at CBD COP 17 was identified as a good opportunity to assess the state of play of synergies across the Rio Conventions, as both the UNFCCC and UNCCD will be invited to contribute. Some participants also suggested that a cross-mapping of how different conventions could contribute to the existing work programmes of the CBD could be a practical way forward. Others proposed to start implementing and scaling up the response options identified by the IPBES Nexus Assessment and the IPBES Transformative Change Assessment, and provide guidance on how these help countries advance progress towards the objectives of the Rio Conventions.

35. In the medium term, a phased approach to joint work was proposed, including the development of integrated strategies and guidelines on key issues such as alignment of NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs, LDN targets, implementation of concrete actions such as nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches and other response options such as sustainable food systems and ecosystem restoration. The Joint Liaison Group was also identified as a means through which synergies can be further strengthened in the future. Some Parties remarked that the Joint Liaison Group should be strengthened, including enhancing its mandate, developing a clear timeframe and considering the participation of the Subsidiary Bodies' chairs of the three conventions and representatives of the Bureaux. Some participants cautioned that Party representation in the Joint Liaison Group should be further considered. Others highlighted the resource constraints currently faced by the Secretariats. On a possible joint work programme, it was remarked that on the way forward, it will be important to take into account the current financial situation of the United Nations and not to add additional burden. Others mentioned that more clarity on implications of a joint work programme such as governance, scope and resource needs would be needed for example by assessing existing joint work programmes and plans. CBD, in consultation with JLG, could prepare a report including a summary on options for enhanced policy coherence among the three Rio Conventions, including information on legal, technical and logistical feasibility and resources required. While some participants said that such a programme is needed, others suggested the organization of mandated events, which would require less political support, and using the existing structures and tools more effectively. Other proposals included the development of common issue-specific frameworks, such as a common framework on food systems with the participation of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) or a common framework on ecosystem management.

36. In the long term, institutional and policy reforms are needed to achieve sustained policy coherence. This includes aligning national planning instruments such as NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs and LDN targets, and ensuring predictable and adequate financial support, particularly for developing countries. Some Parties also underlined the importance of aligning the work undertaken by financial institutions and implementing agencies, such as the GEF, UNDP and UNEP. A scoping process led

by an expert group could help identify the most effective pathways for integration, ensuring that future actions are evidence-based and aligned with the mandates of each Convention.

2. International organizations

(a) Core Themes

37. Representatives of UN agencies emphasized that effective cooperation across the Rio Conventions must begin with coherent national policy instruments. Despite shared global goals, many countries face persistent fragmentation across sectors, leading to conflicting targets and inefficiencies. The lack of coordination mechanisms, such as inter-ministerial platforms or national Rio Convention committees, further exacerbates this issue. Capacity constraints, notably in Small Island Developing States (SIDS), among others, limit the ability to integrate geospatial data, streamline reporting, and harmonize planning across biodiversity, climate, and land agendas. Funding remains fragmented and project-based, often misaligned with national priorities. Additionally, the need for clear, accessible language and a shared understanding of policy coherence was highlighted, along with the importance of addressing trade-offs and ensuring fairness in transitions. Themes such as combating deforestation, restoring ecosystems, and addressing land degradation were identified as common to all three conventions. Further, they also noted the need for policy coherence, integrated planning cycles, robust coordination systems, and interoperable data systems across the three Rio Conventions, and the link to other global objectives including the Sustainable Development Goals and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.

(b) Primary Actors

38. A wide range of actors must be engaged to ensure effective cooperation. Governments are central, particularly in their role as duty bearers responsible for policy coherence and implementation. United Nations agencies, Rio Convention secretariats, funders and donors, civil society organizations, indigenous peoples and local communities, women, and youth, are also critical stakeholders. The importance of stakeholder mapping was emphasized to avoid duplication and ensure inclusivity. Rights holders must be empowered as decision-makers, not merely participants, and international human rights and gender frameworks should guide engagement strategies. Coordination among these actors, both vertically (across governance levels) and horizontally (across sectors), is essential for sustained progress.

(c) Supporting Effective Action

39. To support effective action, countries require robust coordination systems, tailored capacity-building, and practical tools that are accessible to local communities. Communication must be clear and context-sensitive, avoiding overly technical language while preserving the complexity of the issues. Demonstrating the tangible benefits of cooperation, both in terms of costs and returns, is essential to build political and public support. Structured knowledge-sharing platforms, peer learning groups, and regular technical exchanges were proposed to facilitate continuous learning and innovation. Localized solutions should be encouraged, with flexibility to adapt to specific national and subnational contexts.

(d) Ways forward (Short, Medium, and Long Term)

40. Short-term actions should focus on defining policy coherence in practical terms, which could build on the work undertaken by UNEP as custodian of Sustainable Development Goal indicator 17.14.1 (policy coherence for sustainable development), launching pilot projects, improving communication, and mapping existing policies and coordination gaps, as started in the context of the Bern process through the Bern III Conference as well as through the implementation of UNEA Resolutions 6.4 and 6.6.

41. The medium-term priorities identified by participants include building national systems that facilitate cross-sectoral collaboration, adapting reporting tools to reflect coherence efforts, and

expanding inclusive capacity-building initiatives. A shift to programmatic funding over project-based approaches was also suggested.

42. Participants reported that long-term strategies involve institutionalizing cooperation with national planning processes aligned with global commitments, scaling up successful pilot models, and maintaining inclusive engagement over time.

3. Observers

(a) Core Themes

43. Protecting and restoring the integrity of critical ecosystems, including wetlands, forests, and marine environments, was identified as a foundational priority due to their role in supporting people's lives and livelihoods, biodiversity, climate resilience, and mitigation. Food systems emerged as a cross-cutting theme requiring coordinated policy responses, as did forest and landscape restoration and other integrated approaches. A recurring concern was the need to avoid trade-offs and negative synergies, particularly where climate actions may inadvertently harm biodiversity. The group also stressed the importance of grounding cooperation in national-level planning and implementation, supported by harmonized indicators, science-informed guidance, and transparent monitoring frameworks. They also identified the need to build on existing text across the conventions, such as in the Paris Agreement and related decisions concerning the Global Stocktake. The importance of the integrity of all ecosystems, both terrestrial and marine, was emphasized.

(b) Primary Actors

44. To enhance cooperation and policy coherence across the Rio Conventions, participants emphasized the importance of integrating indigenous peoples and local communities, women, and youth as central actors in planning and implementation. Governments and their agencies were recognized as having the ultimate responsibility for synergistic implementation of the Rio Conventions. UN agencies, multilateral development banks and other donors, science-policy bodies, subnational governments and local authorities, and convention secretariats play a facilitative role, supporting coordination and technical assistance. Indigenous peoples and local communities must be engaged as leaders and knowledge holders, with their rights – including to their lands, territories, waters, and glaciers – and traditional knowledge fully respected and integrated. Indigenous peoples and local communities, women, and youth should be involved from the outset of planning processes, not merely as stakeholders but as decision-makers. The private sector was also identified as a key actor, particularly in financing and implementation. Effective cooperation requires stakeholder mapping to ensure inclusivity and avoid duplication, with international human rights and gender frameworks guiding engagement.

(c) Supporting Effective Action

45. Participants identified several enabling conditions for effective action. Integrated planning cycles, common indicators, and interoperable data systems are essential to align biodiversity, climate, and land agendas. Institutional coordination must be mandated at both national and international levels, with designated leads responsible for cross-sectoral alignment. Participants also remarked that synergies in financial flows are needed to improve resource efficiency and avoid fragmented funding. Capacity building must be inclusive and tailored to local contexts, supported by peer-to-peer exchanges and knowledge-sharing platforms. Bridging vocabulary across conventions, such as clarifying terms like precautionary approach, was seen as critical to fostering shared understanding. Policy design should incorporate both scientific and traditional knowledge, with safeguards to ensure bottom-up participation and scenario mapping to prevent maladaptation and trade-offs.

(d) Ways Forward (Short, Medium, and Long Term)

46. Short-term actions include clarifying the roadmap for cooperation across timeframes, integrating existing frameworks, and developing practical tools such as a policy coherence handbook. Parties should facilitate peer exchanges, elevate cooperation at their Conferences of the Parties, and

empower national-level action through decisions across the conventions. Immediate steps also include mapping access to finance and technical support for underrepresented groups and initiating discussions on the role of the private sector.

47. Medium-term priorities involve adopting mutually reinforcing decisions to mandate a joint work programme, institutionalizing coordination roles, and scaling technical assistance to align national biodiversity and climate targets. Pilot initiatives should be launched to test interoperable indicators and data-sharing mechanisms.

48. Long-term strategies include launching and adapting a joint work programme supported by a multi-stakeholder platform, establishing feedback loops between local implementation and global policy, and designing finance strategies that embed biodiversity as a core pillar of climate and development finance. These efforts must be underpinned by inclusive governance and sustained engagement across all stakeholder groups including indigenous peoples and local communities.

G. Closing remarks

49. In his closing remarks, Tristan Tyrrell thanked the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH for hosting the meeting, and the European Union for their generous financial support. He thanked the presenters for their contributions and all the participants for their engaging discussions.

50. He concluded by noting that the discussions from the technical information exchange would feed into the report to the twenty-seventh meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), to be held from 20 to 24 October 2025 in Panama City.
