



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General
3 February 2026
English only

Subsidiary Body on Implementation

Sixth meeting

Rome, 16–19 February 2026

Item 7 of the provisional agenda*

Cooperation with other conventions and international organizations

Supplementary information on the implementation of decision 16/35 on cooperation with other conventions and international organizations **

Note by the Secretariat

I. Introduction and background

1. In paragraph 23 (e) of decision 16/35, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity requested the Executive Secretary of the Convention to report “on the aforementioned cooperation activities in support of the implementation of the Convention and the Framework” for consideration by the Subsidiary Body of Implementation at a meeting held before the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
2. Pursuant to this subparagraph, the Secretariat issued notification No. [2025-131](#) on 19 October 2025 inviting Governments, conventions, organizations and other stakeholders mentioned in decision 16/35 to provide information on actions, activities and initiatives on cooperation undertaken in support of implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. Fifteen submissions were received in response to this invitation. The full submissions are available online¹.
3. The present note summarizes and organizes the 15 submissions received against the operative paragraphs of decision 16/35² and is divided in two sections, with section II focusing on international level activities and section III on national level activities. It serves as supplementary information to document CBD/SBI/6/7 on Cooperation with other conventions and international organizations. It aims to report on actions and observations of 15 Parties and observer organizations, highlighting

* [CBD/SBI/6/1](#).

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

¹ Available online at the following web link: <https://www.cbd.int/notifications/2025-131>. Submissions were received from the European Union, Government of Germany, Government of Japan, Government of Mexico, Government of Niger and Government of Peru; the secretariats of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, the International Whaling Commission and the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention); and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the United Nations Environment Programme, the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women), the International Tropical Timber Organization and the Barnes Hill Community Development Organization Reloaded.

² In paragraph 23 (e) of decision 16/35, the Executive Secretary is requested to report “on the aforementioned cooperation activities in support of the implementation of the Convention and the Framework”. To correctly respond to the request, the note is organized/structured around the “aforementioned” operative paragraphs 1 to 22 of decision 16/35. This structure also served as guidance to invite submissions on cooperation activities, in [annex](#) of notification [2025-131](#).

potential patterns or trends in the cooperation actions identified by the submitters, effective practices and possible benefits associated with these cooperation activities³.

4. Additional submissions on cooperation activities will be invited through a notification during the remaining months of the intersessional period, and summarized in a complementary note, for the consideration of the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

II. Summary of cooperation actions at the international level

5. This section summarizes information on international-level actions undertaken at the invitation of the Conference of the Parties in paragraphs 1, 6, 10, 12, 19 and 20 of decision 16/35, as provided by Parties and observer organisations in their submissions in response to notification No. [2025-131](#) on 19 October 2025.

A. Decisions/guidance of other governing bodies on KMGBF (paragraph 1 of decision 16/35)

6. Submitters reported that governing bodies of other conventions and organizations have welcomed or recognized the Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGBF) and begun coordinating their strategies, work programmes, indicators and national reporting to support coherent implementation. Submissions seem to denote a trend in the integration of KMGBF targets into strategic plans, especially through NBSAP revision, coordination among national focal points, the development of coordinated indicators and capacity-building tools. Examples include: a convention that revised its strategic plan, harmonized its indicator framework with other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), coordinated national reporting with KMGBF goals, and encouraged wetland mainstreaming and cross-MEA collaboration; another convention connected its work on sustainable food systems with the KMGBF and embedded KMGBF follow-up milestones in its multi-year work programme; organizations whose work programmes and biodiversity mainstreaming strategies directly reference KMGBF targets, supporting countries with NBSAP revision, and developing sector-specific indicators (e.g., agrifood, forests), and; regional seas bodies that updated marine biodiversity strategies, expanded marine protected areas and other effective measures, and strengthened regional monitoring and data sharing.

7. Some submitters identified benefits of such cooperation efforts, including: greater coherence among biodiversity-related MEAs and national processes; improved national capacity for KMGBF implementation through regional trainings, technical guidelines, and targeted capacity building; better integration of sectoral instruments, such as One Health, into biodiversity planning; enhanced restoration, species conservation, ecosystem-based management, and effective mobilization of KMGBF-aligned funding.

8. In summary, submissions tend to indicate that governing bodies across conventions and organizations are increasingly coordinating strategies and reporting with the KMGBF, thus strengthening coherence, capacity and sectoral integration for implementation.

B. Cooperation in the implementation of Target 7 (paragraph 19 of decision 16/35)

9. Submissions from Parties and organizations highlighted that international cooperation on chemicals, pollution, and hazardous waste (Target 7) is supported by joint mechanisms, coordinated programmes across MEAs, and cross-sectoral technical assistance. Some submissions discussed about the use of integrated national or regional platforms connecting the BRS Conventions, FAO, UNEP, WHO, and coordination initiatives that strengthen joint planning, data systems, monitoring,

³ The identification of potential trends, effective practices and potential benefits is based on the submissions and is therefore limited in scope. In addition, the information provided in each submission varies in detail and in the way it was presented: some submissions were organized against the operative paragraphs of decision 16/35 and others were not. The Secretariat summarized and organized the information to the extent possible and for the purpose of this note only. The resulting text is indicative and may be subject to further interpretation, refinement, or analysis, without prejudice to the content of the original submissions.

and compliance. Among other examples: joint FAO–UNEP–BRS programmes that identify, safely store, and dispose of obsolete pesticides while improving traceability, data collection, and risk-prevention frameworks; technical support from UNEP, FAO and BRS regional centres enabling audits of high-risk sectors, biomedical waste improvements, and low-toxicity agricultural practices; joint biodiversity–chemicals/waste work programmes, including shared data products and pilot work on plastic pollution; FAO-supported CBD monitoring via development and testing of the Aggregated Total Applied Toxicity indicator for pesticide risk reduction; FAO/WHO stewardship of the International Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management and ongoing work toward a Global Alliance on Highly Hazardous Pesticides, FAO initiatives on agricultural plastics, including voluntary codes, circular approaches, and support for global plastic pollution negotiations; regional cooperation frameworks harmonizing biosafety/chemicals regulations and strengthening enforcement, and peer-to-peer capacity building.

10. Submissions noted that benefits drawn from such cooperation activities include: reduced chemical pressures on ecosystems, contributing directly to Targets 7 and 8; improved waste management (biomedical, hazardous, agricultural); stronger compliance and enforcement, including cross-border controls and surveillance for chemicals of concern; coherence across MEAs, with chemicals, biodiversity, agrifood and health sectors aligning standards and actions; accelerated phase-down of highly hazardous pesticides through coordinated global processes; support for NBSAP integration, especially regarding water quality, pollution control and sectoral legislation, and; capacity building for national authorities, laboratory strengthening, and producer awareness.

11. Overall, submissions tend to indicate that actions on cooperation among the chemicals and waste conventions, FAO, UNEP, WHO and related institutions drive more coherent, science-based implementation of Target 7, enforcement and safer agricultural practices while reducing chemical pressures on ecosystems.

C. Synergies and cooperation in the implementation of other targets of the Framework and/or elements of section C (paragraphs 6, 10, 12, 20 of decision 16/35)

12. Submissions broadly reported that international cooperation across chemicals, waste, biodiversity, climate and ocean-related frameworks is generating synergies that support implementation of numerous KMGBF targets and Section C.

13. A submitter highlighted the regional Nature Restoration Law, which sets legally binding ecosystem restoration goals for 2030 and 2050 across terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecosystems, while contributing to climate mitigation and adaptation and supporting the objectives of biodiversity-related conventions. Another example is “urgent species management actions” where various legislative instruments and the LIFE Programme provide for a coherent way to implement, inter alia, the CMS, AEWa and the Bern Convention. Similar synergistic approaches are applied through the Regreening Africa programme implemented by CIFOR–ICRAF, and the Global Platform for pollinators being set up by FAO to protect pollinators and improve pollination ecosystem services in line with target 11 of the KMGBF. One organization reported that collaboration with CITES provides technical inputs on listings and legal acquisition findings for aquatic species, while global stock status reporting aligns with ocean related SDG indicators, reinforcing Targets 4, 5 and monitoring elements of Section C.

14. A submitter indicated that sectoral commissions and permanent forums recognize the role of indigenous peoples and local communities as custodians of genetic resources, calling for joint workshops on digital sequence information, capacity building for ABS, and protection of intellectual property and cultural heritage, advancing Target 13 and Target 22. Submitters reported that a renewed memorandum and joint action plan link biodiversity conservation, land restoration and climate action, with governance led by indigenous peoples and local communities and FPIC as core elements; activities span drylands restoration, food and knowledge systems, and rights recognition, supporting Targets 2, 3, 10 and 22. The organisation indicated that FPIC operational guidance, e-learning, regional training for indigenous youth and a donor task force are mainstreaming rights

based safeguards across projects and funds, thereby embedding Targets 22–23 within broader implementation and financing architectures. It also reported that biocentric restoration led by indigenous peoples and local communities led is progressing across multiple countries with participatory monitoring aligned to the KMGBF monitoring framework and the UN Decade tools, linking community based indicators to national and global reporting under the Rio Conventions in support of Targets 2, 3 and 22.

15. Organisations indicated that the Target 2 Roadmap of the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration is mobilizing a broad coalition through task forces on monitoring, best practices, finance, science and youth, capacity building via technical and scientific cooperation centres, and development of restoration guidance and datasets to streamline planning, tracking and reporting for Target 2. Submitters indicated that blended finance mechanisms and regional seas frameworks are scaling up marine protected areas and other conservation measures, harmonizing indicators and strategic directions, and supporting 30×30 through coherent networks, transboundary cooperation and unified monitoring systems, thereby advancing Target 3 and enabling evidence based decision making. One organisation reported that cooperation under One Health and nature–health initiatives integrates environmental determinants of health, develops indicators for the Global Action Plan on Biodiversity and Health, and deploys country interventions and GEF funded support, contributing to Targets 5, 10, 11 and Section C (means of implementation and partnerships).

16. Overall, the submissions tend to illustrate that cooperation across conventions, regional initiatives and international initiatives and organisations generates coherent and mutually reinforcing approaches to implementation of KMGBF targets. In the examples provided, the coordination of data/knowledge, legal frameworks, monitoring systems and capacity-building efforts, and collaborative arrangements help countries address interlinked drivers of biodiversity loss, climate change and land and ocean degradation. Submissions also highlight the role of indigenous peoples and local communities in guiding restoration, safeguarding genetic resources and shaping equitable benefit-sharing.

III. Summary of cooperation actions at the national level

17. This section summarizes information on national-level actions undertaken in response to the invitations of the Conference of the Parties in paragraphs 5, 7, 8, 21 and 22 of decision 16/35⁴ as provided by Parties and observer organisations in their submissions in response to notification No. 2025-131 on 19 October 2025.

A. Synergies and cooperation in the implementation of the Rio Conventions and other conventions (paragraph 5 of decision 16/35).

18. Submitters highlight efforts to strengthen national cooperation among the Rio Conventions through integrated planning, shared implementation mechanisms and cross-sectoral technical support. Parties described how collaboration with the UNFCCC and UNCCD through international projects and national frameworks is enabling ecosystem restoration, reducing climate pressures on biodiversity and generating climate–nature synergies. It was noted that knowledge dissemination and information-sharing initiatives also reinforce cooperation by clarifying overlaps among UNFCCC, UNCCD and CBD processes and strengthening integrated policy practice at national and local levels. Some organizations observed that thematic alignment occurs in national planning even when not labelled as “synergy,” particularly in climate, restoration and land-use strategies that advance joint delivery across the Rio Conventions. Parties noted that interministerial land-use planning structures and framework legislation are helping align biodiversity, climate and land degradation neutrality commitments. National line ministries also provide technical assistance and training to subnational

⁴ In paragraphs 5, 7, 8, 21 and 22 the Conference of the Parties “Invites Parties” to take action. Submissions considered in this section were provided by Parties and also by organisations whose work support national-level actions.

governments on ecosystem monitoring, degraded area mapping and sustainable land-use decision-making, supporting shared objectives across the three Rio Conventions.

19. Some submitters reported that updated national biodiversity strategies now explicitly cross-reference climate adaptation, water, peatland, forests, circular economy and bioeconomy strategies. This interconnected approach operationalizes nature-based solutions and ensures that biodiversity targets are pursued in parallel with climate and land goals at national and regional levels. Organizations further contribute by providing technical guidance, such as on wetland conservation and restoration, to embed ecosystems into national KMGBF delivery, from target setting to monitoring, and to demonstrate their contribution to multiple biodiversity outcomes.

20. Overall, submissions tend to indicate that the benefits of these cooperation efforts on the Rio Conventions include greater coherence across national policies, improved capacity at both national and subnational levels, potentially enhanced access to international finance and more effective delivery of restoration, climate resilience and biodiversity outcomes.

B. Alignment of forest-related commitments with the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017-2030 (paragraph 7 of decision 16/35)⁵

21. One submitter noted that several instruments exist to support the conservation and sustainable management of forests, notably FAO-COFO, UNFF and the UN Strategic Plan for Forests, and ITTO. The submitter noted that as a Party, it provides policies on forests that encompasses these relevant instruments in the field, responding to the forest related elements of KMGBF targets 5, 9 and 10.

22. The submissions may denote a pattern of aligning national biodiversity strategies and voluntary national contributions with the United Nations Strategic Plan for Forests (UNSPF) by embedding forest-related targets directly into updated NBSAPs. This alignment involves integrating measures on deforestation, sustainable forest management, ecosystem services, restoration, land-use planning and sustainable value chains into national biodiversity planning in ways that simultaneously fulfil KMGBF targets and the six Global Forest Goals. Such integrated approaches ensure coherence between national forestry actions and international commitments, while facilitating cross-sectoral collaboration on issues such as climate, wildlife management, incentives and knowledge access.

23. In the submissions, examples of effective cooperation include NBSAPs that explicitly promote sustainable forest management and wood use consistent with UNSPF principles, supporting actions on restoration of rare forest types, diversification of forest development, legality and traceability in wood markets, and strengthened local forest governance. These measures are embedded in national forest implementation plans, creating mutually reinforcing links between biodiversity, climate and forest policy domains. Continuous national monitoring systems, including natural heritage inventories and land-use indicators aligned with IPCC categories, further reinforce this coherence by generating data for biodiversity reporting, forest loss reduction efforts, fire-risk planning and basin protection, thereby supporting both UNSPF Global Forest Goal 1 and multiple KMGBF monitoring elements.

24. An organization reported that a joint international initiative under the Collaborative Partnership on Forests helps countries understand how forest conservation, restoration and sustainable management contribute simultaneously to the KMGBF and the UNSPF. Its flagship publication provides policy pathways for mainstreaming forests in NBSAPs, and complementary analyses identify forest biodiversity threats, capacity gaps and response needs, guiding tailored support. Regional dialogues and webinars on Rio Convention synergies also highlight the central role of national focal points in integrating forest commitments across NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs and

⁵ Forest-related matters are addressed under CBD/SBSTTA/27/INF/10, which informed the twenty-seventh meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, which prepared [recommendations SBSTTA-27/4 and 27/5](#).

land degradation neutrality targets, with ongoing work on planning, finance and monitoring expected to offer practical recommendations for strengthened cooperation.

25. Overall, the submissions suggest that benefits of collaborative approaches include greater policy coherence across biodiversity, climate and forest agendas, improved national capacity for forest monitoring and planning, and more effective targeting of restoration and sustainable management measures. They would also enable more coordinated resource mobilization and better integration of forest-related actions within national and international reporting frameworks.

C. Alignment of water-related commitments and actions of the Water Action Agenda 2018–2028 with NBSAPs (paragraph 8 of decision 16/35)

26. Submitters described increasing alignment between water-related commitments under the Water Action Agenda and national biodiversity strategies and action plans through integrated planning and coordinated governance. In one case, fire-risk data is being repurposed to protect basins and headwaters, demonstrating how risk-management tools can jointly support water and biodiversity objectives.

27. A newly adopted National Water Strategy in one Party integrates actions across agriculture, conservation, urban development and industry, and is intentionally aligned with biodiversity strategies, climate adaptation plans and nature-based solutions, while promoting cooperation with the CBD, Ramsar Convention and Paris Agreement. Organizations further support alignment through participation in UN system-wide water initiatives and global water–climate dialogues that maintain visibility for water–biodiversity priorities. Another example from a Party is a regional Water Resilience Strategy which aligns the global water agenda with the three Rio Conventions as well as the Ramsar Convention. It provides for three actions: (1) to mainstream water in international processes, including the three Rio Conventions, (2) to enhance implementation of water-related goals and targets of the KMGBF and (3) to enhance regional engagement in the Ramsar Convention.

28. Overall, submissions tend to indicate that the benefits of these approaches include stronger policy coherence, improved data use and more integrated national planning.

D. Information exchange to streamline contribution to the programme of work on marine and coastal biodiversity (paragraph 21 of decision 16/35)⁶

29. Submitters reported an overall trend toward strengthening synergies in marine and coastal biodiversity work through structured information exchange across national, regional and UN-system initiatives. Some report that knowledge management platforms, monitoring centres and integrated coastal planning processes increasingly consolidate data from multiple institutions, enabling evidence-based decision-making and supporting more coherent implementation across programmes. One Party described how integrated coastal and marine zone planning is being advanced through technical assistance and coordination with subnational authorities, using tools that bring together territorial, environmental and ecosystem information to improve alignment among marine and coastal initiatives. Organizations also highlighted the establishment of new monitoring and evaluation facilities that draw on diverse institutional data sources to assess ecosystem status, thereby promoting cross-programme harmonization and streamlining contributions to the marine and coastal biodiversity agenda.

30. Submitters emphasized that relying on scientific processes developed under biodiversity frameworks helps countries translate technical advice into emerging global ocean agreements. One organization reported that UN agencies are providing direct technical support to small island developing States through whole-of-island approaches that integrate watershed, coastal and marine information. These efforts enhance coordination across ministries, communities and development

⁶ Matters related to marine and coastal biodiversity are formally addressed through decisions [16/16](#) and [16/17](#),

partners, while improving access to data, planning tools and training for marine and coastal management and restoration.

31. Overall, submissions tend to denote that cooperation efforts can yield benefits by improving the quality and consistency of data, facilitating unified planning processes and enhancing cross-agency coordination.

E. Initiative on biodiversity for food and nutrition (paragraph 22 of decision 16/35).

32. Submitters highlighted growing cooperation under the International Initiative on Biodiversity for Food and Nutrition, particularly through collaboration with FAO to advance the integration of biodiversity into healthy and sustainable diets. One organization described how the International Food Data Conference is being used to strengthen food composition data and analytical methods, including research on neglected and underutilized species, thereby creating a stronger evidence base for biodiversity-rich dietary guidance. Global evidence reviews under the Initiative are assessing links between biodiversity, diets and nutrition, identifying research gaps and informing policy development, with findings disseminated through international scientific fora to support global dialogue on biodiversity-based food system transformation. FAO's work to increase the nutrition sensitivity of GEF projects under GBF-related funding windows was noted as another mechanism for aligning food system interventions with biodiversity outcomes by emphasizing consumer demand and dietary choices.

33. Submitters reported on awareness-raising efforts, including communication materials, podcasts, testimonies and youth-focused initiatives such as the Local Heroes platform, to broaden public engagement and highlight practical solutions at the biodiversity–climate–nutrition interface. At the national level, one Party indicated that agricultural policies developed in cooperation with FAO and multiple MEAs promote conservation and sustainable use of plant and animal genetic resources, agroecology, phytosanitary surveillance, pastoral system resilience and agricultural research. These measures help safeguard agrobiodiversity, strengthen food security, reduce pollution and align national actions with biodiversity strategies and KMGBF targets.

34. Overall, submissions seem to denote that cooperation under the Initiative enhances the knowledge base linking biodiversity and nutrition, supports integration across food, agriculture and environment sectors, and amplifies public engagement.

F. Implementation of other options for action at the national level⁷

a) Awareness raising of ongoing process for the update or revision of national biodiversity strategies and action plans across various national policy and planning processes, sustainable development strategies, including for poverty eradication, and policy instruments relevant to MEA implementation (paragraph 14 of decision 16/35).

35. Submissions tend to reveal a general pattern of using broad, participatory processes and strengthened institutional coordination to raise awareness of ongoing revisions of national biodiversity strategies and action plans. One Party emphasized that public participation and intergovernmental dialogue have been central to communicating national priorities, with consultations across ministries, local authorities, civil society and research institutions helping clarify the links between biodiversity planning, development goals and poverty eradication efforts. Several contributors noted that national consultations tied to biodiversity planning and reporting processes have engaged a wide range of actors including universities, the private sector, community groups and youth, thus integrating local knowledge, gender perspectives and social priorities into policy instruments relevant to multilateral environmental agreements.

36. Some submitters also explained that coordination mechanisms among focal points of multiple environmental agreements are being strengthened as part of these awareness-raising efforts. These mechanisms improve coherence among biodiversity, climate, land and chemicals processes while

⁷ Such options for actions are proposed in decision 16/35, decision XIII/24 and in the Bern III Conference report, inter alia.

harmonizing national positions and enhancing transparency in decision-making. Inclusive governance approaches connecting local authorities, traditional leaders and community groups likewise help embed awareness of biodiversity strategy updates within wider sustainable development initiatives. Pilot activities combining ecological monitoring, youth engagement and nature-based solutions were cited as effective in communicating national priorities while supporting poverty reduction and green job creation.

37. Organizations reported disseminating information on biodiversity strategies and reporting obligations through workshops, publications and digital platforms, often in collaboration with national focal points and regional processes. One organisation highlighted that the Bern Process has played a key role in strengthening cooperation across environmental agreements, facilitating knowledge exchange, mapping targets and sharing lessons from country experiences. Case studies prepared under this process demonstrate how coordinated awareness-raising at international, regional and national levels can enhance dialogue among focal points, align monitoring and reporting systems and support mutually beneficial actions across environmental agendas. An organization reported preparing an analytical paper that maps interlinkages between the strategies of various agreements and the KMGBF, using a common data and reporting tool to standardize information across conventions. Developed with inputs from multiple secretariats, the paper is being updated to enhance information sharing and clarify areas where coordinated reporting and joint action may add value, including in the global review of Framework implementation.

38. Overall, submissions point to expanding awareness-raising on biodiversity strategy revisions into broader national planning, sustainable development frameworks and other policy instruments. These efforts seem to be beneficial by broadening participation, strengthening institutional coordination and promoting more coherent implementation of biodiversity commitments.

b) Collaboration among focal points of conventions in the preparation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans or national reports (decision XIII/24, annex 1, section B1)

39. One Party reported that collaboration among focal points of biodiversity-related and biosafety agreements has been strengthened through national consultations linked to the revision of its biodiversity strategy and action plans, and national reporting. The submission noted that coordinated engagement among sectoral ministries, research institutions, local authorities and civil society has supported the integration of biosafety priorities, local knowledge and social considerations, while a national mechanism among focal points of multiple environmental conventions promotes coherent planning and reporting.

40. One organisation indicated that regional capacity-building workshops help focal points of biodiversity, chemicals, climate and pollution agreements to work together more effectively in preparing national strategies and reports. These workshops were described as providing practical tools, promoting whole-of-government approaches and strengthening alignment across national commitments through shared learning, integrated planning and improved coordination between focal points. One submitter indicated that the Bern Process strengthened cooperation among conventions and promoted awareness of how national biodiversity strategies relate to wider policy and planning frameworks. A submitter emphasized that the process facilitated knowledge exchange, mapping of targets across agreements and communication of lessons learned from case studies.

41. One entity, party to several instruments, summarized all its biodiversity-related targets and made the summary available on its online reporting tool. Each target corresponds to specific elements of the KMGBF targets. Many of them contribute not only to the implementation of the targets of the KMGBF, but also to the mandates and objectives of other relevant conventions and international organizations. This way of presenting relevant instruments facilitates coherent implementation and collaboration between relevant leads for these policy actions. As result, the Party's 7th National Report will report on the progress made on these targets in a coherent and synergistic manner.

42. Overall, the submissions reported on effective actions that strengthen cooperation between focal points of different conventions, which seem to improve coherence in national biodiversity planning and reporting and support more integrated implementation of environmental commitments.

c) Awareness raising that enhances knowledge and understanding of the potential benefits of synergies, and information-sharing (paragraph 15 of decision 16/35).

43. The submissions describe efforts to raise awareness of the benefits of synergies among multilateral environmental agreements by developing shared analytical tools and information products. The submission suggests that the above-mentioned cross-mapping exercises effectively raise awareness of the practical benefits of synergies by improving accessibility of shared information, illustrating convergence among agreements and supporting more coherent and efficient approaches to cooperation and reporting.

d) Coordination processes, mechanisms or approaches to support collaboration among the national focal points of the Convention and its Protocols and national focal points of other conventions or organizations (paragraph 17 of decision 16/35).

44. In addition to the examples mentioned under b) above, submissions highlighted a trend toward strengthening national mechanisms that improve coordination among focal points of the Convention on Biological Diversity, its Protocols and other multilateral environmental agreements. One Party reported that enhanced use of national information systems, biosafety clearing-house platforms, ABS registries and participation in regional ABS networks is increasing transparency and legal certainty, particularly in ABS, biosafety and KMGBF reporting. Some contributors noted that national consultations associated with NBSAP revisions and reporting processes bring together focal points from multiple MEAs alongside ministries, subnational authorities, research institutions, civil society and the private sector, helping harmonize national positions, incorporate local and gender-responsive perspectives and reinforce institutional cooperation across biodiversity, climate, land, chemicals and wetlands agendas.

45. Additional examples from a Party include intersectoral coordination mechanisms involving the CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD, Ramsar and chemicals conventions, which have improved policy coherence, supported coordinated COP participation and promoted whole-of-government implementation. Land-use planning reforms in another Party created a national coordination architecture linking multiple ministries and subnational governments through shared datasets and ecosystem monitoring tools, thereby aligning biodiversity, climate and land degradation efforts. Organizations also noted that several MEAs maintain formal collaboration channels connecting administrative authorities with focal points of other UN bodies, with CEPA mandates encouraging joint communication, education and awareness efforts. Regional capacity-building workshops convened by UN entities further facilitate cooperation by bringing together focal points from multiple conventions to strengthen alignment of NBSAPs with the KMGBF and promote peer-to-peer exchange on integrated planning and reporting.

46. Overall, submissions tend to highlight that coordination processes yield benefits by improving information flows, enhancing policy coherence, expanding stakeholder participation and building shared technical capacity.

e) Cooperation through a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach, and strengthened engagement of subnational and local governments (paragraph 18 of decision 16/35)

47. Submissions describe a broad shift toward whole-of-government and whole-of-society cooperation approaches that engage subnational and local actors in biodiversity implementation. One Party reported that inclusive governance approaches involving local authorities, traditional leaders, women, youth and rural communities support participatory natural resource management, with pilot initiatives linking community-based conservation, ecological monitoring, agroecology and nature-based solutions. These efforts incorporate traditional knowledge while generating local green livelihoods. Several contributors highlighted that national biodiversity strategies are increasingly

developed through wide participatory processes involving sectors, subnational governments, Indigenous Peoples, civil society, academia and the private sector.

48. Parties also noted that subnational and local authorities receive technical assistance, training and information (for example, fire-risk maps and ecosystem assessments) to improve prevention, restoration and land-use planning, demonstrating an emerging whole-of-government model for addressing biodiversity threats. National strategies increasingly rely on whole-of-society engagement, mobilizing municipalities, nature user groups, business sectors, researchers, educators and the broader public through dialogues, forums and communication platforms. Organizations further reported that global and regional MEAs contribute by offering mechanisms such as wetland city accreditation, youth conferences and traditional knowledge programmes, which help enhance the capacity, visibility and participation of local governments, indigenous peoples and local communities.

49. Additional examples include UN initiatives supporting community-based restoration enterprises in small island contexts through capacity building, market linkages and alignment with national policies, enabling local governments and cooperatives to co-design restoration-aligned economic models and participate directly in decision-making. Observer organizations also mobilize indigenous peoples and local communities, farmers, beekeepers and civil society groups to strengthen procedural rights and environmental participation.

50. Overall, submissions tend to indicate that inclusive and cooperative efforts help deepen local engagement, strengthen institutional coherence across governance levels and enhance implementation through local knowledge and community stewardship.

G. Other actions at multiple levels

51. Some submissions describe a pattern of strengthening international and national cooperation to support integrated implementation of the Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and related environmental agreements, coherent with suggestions promoted through the Bern process and other guidance such as COP decisions. One Party reported engaging in multiple international initiatives that help reinforce national regulatory frameworks, improve management of biodiversity-related risks and enhance cross-sectoral policy coherence. Participation in global and regional forums, combined with structured domestic coordination among environmental, forestry and scientific institutions, helps ensure consistent interpretation of global decisions and alignment between international obligations and national priorities. National action is guided by integrated, inclusive and science-based governance approaches that link biodiversity, climate and land agendas, engage local authorities and communities and make use of national monitoring data to inform decision-making. Knowledge-sharing platforms and technical support from UN entities and regional organizations further strengthen national capacities in ecosystem restoration, agricultural biodiversity and climate–biodiversity linkages.

52. Overall, the submissions tend to indicate that multilevel cooperation, active participation in multilateral processes and integrated national governance approaches are key to generating synergies across biodiversity, climate, land, chemicals and waste commitments.