



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General

10 June 2026

English only

Informal Advisory Group on Technical and Scientific Cooperation

Sixth meeting

Online, 27 to 29 April 2026

Report of the Informal Advisory Group on Technical and Scientific Cooperation on its sixth meeting*

Introduction

1. The Informal Advisory Group on Technical and Scientific Cooperation, established by the Conference of the Parties at its fifteenth meeting to provide advice on promoting and facilitating capacity-building and development, technical and scientific cooperation, technology transfer, knowledge management and the clearing-house mechanism in support of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, held its sixth meeting online from 27 to 29 April 2026. A total of 27 of the Group's 31 members attended the meeting.

Item 1

Opening of the meeting

2. On behalf of the Executive Secretary, the Head of the Capacity-Building and Knowledge Management Unit, Erie Tamale, welcomed the participants and thanked them for their continued support and dedication to the work of the Group. He informed the Group of the ongoing functional review of the Secretariat and noted that the work on the clearing-house mechanism and knowledge management was likely to be transferred to a different unit, the Planning, Monitoring and Knowledge unit, while the work under technical and scientific cooperation and capacity development would be under the Capacity Development and National Implementation Support Unit. The actual names of the units might change.

3. Mr. Tamale explained that the meeting was convened to seek preliminary advice from the Group on various items, including progress in the implementation of the programme of work for the clearing-house mechanism and the knowledge management strategy, the use of long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development, the draft criteria for assessing the performance of the technical and scientific cooperation support centres and the global coordination entity, programme priorities and workplan of the global coordination entity, and options for mobilization of resources to support the work of the support centres. He noted that the Group would have the opportunity to review and provide further comments and advise through the online discussion forum.

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.

Item 2

Organizational matters

(a) Adoption of the agenda

4. The Informal Advisory Group considered and adopted the provisional agenda of the meeting, as contained in document [CBD/TSC/IAG/2026/1/1](#).

(b) Organization of work

5. The Informal Advisory Group considered the proposed organization of work, contained in the annex to the annotated provisional agenda ([CBD/TSC/IAG/2026/1/1/Add.1](#)), and decided to address agenda items 3 and 4 together, and to take up item 6 before addressing agenda item 5. The organization of work was adopted as amended.
6. The meeting was co-chaired by Mukondi Matshusa (South Africa) and Jan Plesnik (Czechia).

Items 3 and 4

Clearing-house mechanism: progress in the implementation of the programme of work for the clearing-house mechanism for the period 2024–2030 and the knowledge management strategy

7. Under agenda items 3 and 4, the Secretariat presented a consolidated progress report on the implementation of the programme of work for the clearing-house mechanism (CHM) for the period 2024–2030 and the knowledge management (KM) strategy to support the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework adopted by the Conference of the Parties in decision 16/9.
8. The Secretariat noted that the two workstreams were interdependent. Knowledge management guides how knowledge is generated, organized, shared and used; while CHM delivers the information services that enable information exchange, cooperation and accessibility. It was also noted that the CHM facilitates technical and scientific cooperation (TSC) by providing information services to enable users to find, access, and share (make available) information about existing knowledge, expertise, tools and resources, technologies or opportunities for joint research programmes, joint technology development ventures and others TSC activities and opportunities), but does not deliver technical and scientific cooperation *per se*.
9. The Secretariat reported progress under the relevant goals of the CHM programme of work and the corresponding objectives of the KM strategy, including the organization and analysis of TSC-related knowledge and service needs for future sharing through the CHM; information exchange; planning, monitoring, reporting and review; and capacity-building.
10. Under goal 2 of the CHM programme of work, the following accomplishments were reported:
 - (a) A redesigned central CHM portal was launched in 2025. The new portal is visually, functionally and technically aligned with the biosafety clearing-house and the access and benefit-sharing clearing-house, using a common source code for efficiency;
 - (b) Enhancements to the notification system that included addition of the option to tag submissions by targets of the Framework, CBD taxonomy, biomes, subject areas and other keywords to improve searchability and reuse. Since November 2024, 192 notifications had been issued, 775 submissions had been received, 151 submissions had been tagged using relevant targets or keywords, and 178 new organizations had been registered in the CHM system;
 - (c) Re-development of CBD website, including a new information architecture. Approximately 7,800 pages were reviewed, 1,800 pages were migrated and approximately 500 images and visual assets were created to support the new website. The remaining pages will be maintained through an archive site;

(d) Development of a machine-readable taxonomy framework to support consistent tagging and interoperability of knowledge assets across systems was in progress, covering goals and targets of the Framework and indicators of the monitoring framework and available in multiple languages to support interoperability.

11. Under goal 3 of the CHM programme of work, the Secretariat report progress on the enhancement of the online reporting tool and the decision tracking tool, and the launch of the Bioland 2.0 tool. It was noted that the reporting tool standardizes submissions of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAP), national targets, national reports and non-State actor commitments, supports multilingual entries, validation rules, dashboards, analyzers and map-based visualizations. The decision tracking tool has improved tagging, validation processes and planned linkages to notifications and action calendars. The Bioland 2.0 tool, an upgraded, user-friendly turnkey solution developed by the Secretariat, was launched to enable Parties create national clearing-house mechanism portals with an improved design, user interface, information architecture and interoperability with other internal and external systems (i.e. CHM portal, CBD website, GEO BON, UN Biodiversity Lab, etc.).

12. The Secretariat further reported on capacity-building activities undertaken in support of the online reporting tool, including global technical webinars, support through a dedicated help desk and inbox, and training activities organized in collaboration with UNDP and UNEP.

13. Some members of the Group suggested that the regional and subregional TSC support centres could play a more active role in organizing capacity-building activities, particularly on the use of the Bioland tool, the online reporting tool, and on knowledge management.

14. Under goal 4 of the CHM programme of work, the Secretariat reported progress on the implementation of the Knowledge Management for Biodiversity Initiative (KM4B), which included the organization of three regional workshops for Asia, Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean, which included participation of a total of 165 experts from 75 countries. Common challenges identified during the workshops included: fragmented data, weak coordination, limited interoperability and insufficient capacity. The participants also emphasized the value of peer exchange, communities of practice and knowledge inclusion approaches involving indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth and other relevant stakeholders.

15. The Secretariat also presented a forward-looking implementation framework aimed at moving from fragmented systems towards a connected, authoritative and user-centred knowledge system. The proposed operating model included user-facing CHM services, core CHM systems and content services, knowledge organization and interoperability, and technical and data integration. The proposed way-forward also outlined five strategic pillars: integrated reporting and country profiles; authoritative content and document services; and enhancements to the Bioland 2.0 tool, interoperability and validation workflows, and the notification management and governance system.

16. During the discussions, members of the Group commended the Secretariat for the progress achieved, particularly for the integration of the three clearing-house platforms and the redevelopment of the CBD website.

17. In response to questions and points of clarification, the Secretariat explained that at least 35 national CHM portals had been created using Bioland 2.0, with migration from Bioland 1.0 completed for the Parties concerned, and that reported technical issues were being addressed on an ongoing basis. It was also noted that links to reports from the regional KM4B workshops would be provided in the updated joint CHM/KM progress report. It was further reported that options were being explored, subject to the availability of funding, to organize a KM4B workshop for Central and Eastern Europe, in collaboration with GIZ and other partners.

18. The Secretariat also clarified that while detailed updates on the biosafety and access and benefit-sharing clearing houses were done through the respective Protocol processes, updates on the

shared technical and visual platform across all three clearing houses would be provided in the joint CHM/KM progress report.

19. Responding to questions on the CBD website revamp, the Secretariat explained that the web pages that were not migrated to the new site would be kept in an archive domain for historical reference but would not be maintained. The decisions on which content to migrate followed an extensive internal review and consultation with the content owners. It was also explained that relevant case studies, best practices, and searchable repositories formerly available on the website would be relocated to the central CHM portal to improve classification, tagging, and searchability.

20. On the use of the online reporting tool, the Secretariat clarified that submissions were being analyzed for the global report on the collective progress in the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, and that a methodology would be published. While the tool primarily supports submissions, efforts were planned to make the information more accessible and reusable through country pages and other user-facing products.

21. Some members observed that the proposed CHM/KM operating model was ambitious and highlighted the challenges associated with creating a coherent knowledge ecosystem in a rapidly evolving technological environment. In response to concerns raised about reliance on external information sources, the Secretariat noted that initial efforts would focus on a few selected, trusted sources, including national CHMs, the TSC support centres, relevant UN entities, and entities identified through the monitoring framework.

22. With respect to global indicators, the Secretariat noted that national adaptations would be provided in a technical information document and that the period between COP 17 and COP 18 would be used to strengthen implementation of the monitoring framework. It was further explained that the Bioland tool could support future national reporting by helping countries validate and use information more effectively.

23. The Secretariat noted an example of the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB)'s Bioland site, which aggregates information across member countries and demonstrates how regional platforms can support information sharing.

24. Some members of the Group emphasized that many interoperability and data harmonization challenges cannot be resolved through technology alone and require sustained peer-to-peer engagement and coordination.

Item 5

Technical and scientific cooperation mechanism

(a) Draft criteria for measuring the performance of the regional and subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centres and the global coordination entity

25. The Secretariat introduced the draft criteria for measuring the performance of regional and subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centres (TSCCs) and the Global Coordination Entity. The Secretariat presented the proposed six overarching criteria, including identifying and responding to technical and scientific cooperation and technology transfer needs of Parties; supporting action and implementation; facilitating access to knowledge products and technical tools; supporting knowledge sharing and peer learning; establishing and strengthening strategic and results-oriented partnerships; and mobilizing and leveraging financial, technical and in-kind resources.

26. The Secretariat also introduced the proposed assessment framework and approach, including an illustrative performance scale ranging from no progress to high performance. The Secretariat noted that the criteria and assessment framework would be further refined and strengthened based on guidance from the Informal Advisory Group and the TSCCs. It clarified that the criteria and framework would not be submitted for consideration by the subsidiary body on implementation or

the Conference of the Parties. Rather, they were intended to serve as a practical tool for the TSCCs to reflect on their performance, identify strengths and areas for improvement, and document lessons learned. They will also serve as an input to the independent evaluation of the TSC mechanism scheduled for 2029 before the nineteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

27. Prior to the discussions on the criteria, one member of the Group asked if it was acceptable for representatives of the TSCCs, who are also members of the Informal Advisory Group, to participate in the discussions. The Secretariat and the Co-Chairs noted that there was no real or perceived conflict of interest and observed that their involvement would be beneficial at this stage. It was also mentioned that the criteria would be further refined with input from all the TSCCs before being finalized.

28. Members of the Group noted that the six overarching criteria provided a good foundation for discussion. However, it was suggested that the assessment framework takes into account the contextual differences among the TSCCs, since some of them already had regional mandates and institutional structures before their designation as support centres while others were starting from a different baseline. It was also suggested that the following aspects be included in the assessment criteria: (i) engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities, youth, women and other stakeholders holding traditional knowledge including academia; (ii) contributions of TSCCs to Convention obligations, including national reports, NBSAP updates and monitoring; and (iii) the level of achievement made against the biennial work plans.

29. Members of the Group noted that some of the proposed criteria mixed outcomes and indicators. They also noted that the assessment framework could help prioritize actions that can accelerate implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and lead to impactful results, especially considering the high expectations and limited resources. The Secretariat invited members to provide additional concrete suggestions to further refine the criteria and make them clearer.

30. Members of the Group stressed the need to clarify the role of the TSCCs, noting that the Mechanism should primarily focus on supporting Parties in implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. They cautioned against framing the performance of the centres solely in terms of delivering specific outcomes or against specific indicators such as number of joint research programmes established or technological applications adopted. They also emphasized that assessment indicators should consider for differences in the size and geographic coverage of the centres. They further suggested that the criteria should capture the broad breadth of support across all 23 GBF targets, rather than unintentionally concentrating efforts on only a few targets.

31. The Secretariat noted that the first set of biennial workplans had largely focussed on operationalizing the centres, including setting up governance structures, and that more substantive technical cooperation activities were expected to be delivered during the next biennial work plans (2027-2028), subject to the availability of resources.

32. The Secretariat welcomed the suggestion for measurement of performance to consider not only by the number of Parties the TSCCs engage with, but also their engagement with indigenous peoples and local communities and other stakeholders. The Secretariat suggested that stakeholder engagement could be disaggregated by type of stakeholder, including indigenous peoples and local communities, academic institutions and NGOs, while noting that data collection requirements would need to be manageable.

33. Some members of the Group suggested that the criteria should also reflect the support centres' collaboration and coordination with existing global and regional initiatives. The Secretariat noted that such coordination was already be reflected under partnership-related criteria. It also cautioned that the TSC mechanism is intended to be demand-driven and bottom-up, rather than led by global initiatives. One member suggested that this point be revisited under the criteria for the global coordination entity, particularly in relation to its mandate to engage and work with relevant

international organizations, initiatives and partnerships to leverage their expertise and resources to support the regional support centres.

34. Some members underlined the importance of considering the different circumstances among the support centres, including, for example, the extent to which Parties in each subregion identified and communicated their needs to the centres. It was noted that some Parties had not yet expressed clear needs and that there should be a way to reflect this in the criteria. It was also noted that regional contexts differ with respect to indigenous peoples and local communities, women's groups and youth organizations.

35. Some members suggested that the wording of the criteria should include consideration of the uptake, utility and perceived value of the knowledge products and technical tools made available by the TSCCs rather than only the number of requests or number of tools developed.

36. Some members suggested that the performance framework should capture whether centres were supporting all countries in their respective subregions or focusing only where needs were greatest.

37. The Secretariat welcomed the observations and suggestions made and indicated that the criteria would be reviewed and refined in light of the discussion. It underlined the fact that the criteria and assessment framework were intended to be facilitative in nature, with the aim of supporting and strengthening the performance of the centres. The Secretariat further noted the importance of striking an appropriate balance between flexibility, facilitation and accountability.

38. The Co-Chairs noted that more time was needed to reflect on the comments and further review the criteria. They also emphasized that the criteria should remain aligned with the demand-driven nature of the centres' workplans and should reflect feedback from the countries and stakeholders served by the centres. They further suggested that the revised criteria be discussed with the support centres so that the final framework is practical, usable and capable of guiding the collection of relevant information.

39. The Secretariat indicated it would upload the criteria along with the workplans of the TSCCs submitted and invite members of the Group to submit further comments and make concrete wording suggestions through the online discussion forum.

(b) Programme priorities and workplan of the global coordination entity

40. The interim Global Coordination Entity introduced its programme priorities and workplan for the period 2025–2026, prepared pursuant to paragraph 16 of decision 16/3 and using a results-based template consistent with that applied for the TSCCs and the proposed criteria and indicators for assessing its performance. The Entity explained that the workplan retrospectively included activities undertaken since 2025 and the activities planned for the remainder of 2026.

41. The programme priorities for the biennium focused on:

- (a) Establishing the institutional and operational foundations of the global coordination entity and the Technical and Scientific Cooperation Mechanism;
- (b) Strengthening coordination and reporting across the network of the TSCCs;
- (c) Providing guidance and technical assistance, including tools and templates for planning and reporting;
- (d) Facilitating partnerships and contributing to resource mobilization efforts;
- (e) Improving communication, visibility and information-sharing related to the mechanism.

42. With regard to activities already undertaken, it was reported that 11 out of 15 host agreements between the Secretariat and the institutions hosting the support centres had been concluded, with the remaining agreements in advanced stages. Staffing capacity of the Entity had been strengthened with the recruitment of a Junior Professional Officer funded by the Republic of Korea and the hiring of a consultant, with support from the European Union, who helped to develop guidance materials and

templates and organized workshops for the support centres. The Entity also organized monthly online coordination meetings and one annual in-person coordination meeting for the TSCCs. It also established a helpdesk to respond to operational and technical requests from TSCCs. Progress was also reported in facilitating stakeholder representation in governance structures, fostering linkages between TSCCs and relevant initiatives led by different teams in SCBD, and enhancing communication through coordination platforms, social media outreach and the development of branding and communication materials.

43. The activities for remaining part of 2026, included finalization of the outstanding host agreements, recruitment of one staff for a year with funding support from the European Union, preparation of the progress report, based on the activity reports of the support centres and the global coordination entity, for consideration of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its seventh meeting and the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, development of workplan for the next biennium, preparation of the operational manual for the TSCCs and the global coordination entity, continued provision of technical assistance to the TSCCs, preparation of communication materials, further establishment of strategic partnerships, development and implementation of the strategy to mobilize resources, and organization of coordination meetings and side events.

44. Members of the Group welcomed the work plan and the progress achieved to date by the Global Coordination Entity under challenging circumstances. They also welcomed the proposed criteria and indicators for assessing its performance and stressed the importance of refining them. Some members emphasized the need to strike a balance between quantitative and qualitative indicators, to capture the effectiveness, quality, learning and value add, and to ensure that activities related to communications, coordination and partnership facilitation were adequately reflected.

45. Some members raised concern regarding the proposed criterion on success in mobilizing and leveraging financial resources, questioning how equitable access across regions would be assessed and noting that such support may be less applicable or feasible for Western Europe.

46. In response, the Entity clarified that the proposed criteria were not intended to be used to assess performance during the first biennium, which largely focused on institutional and operational set-up. It was explained that some aspects, such as communications and partnership development, were not yet fully reflected in the criteria and these elements would be incorporated. It was noted that the primary role of the Entity was facilitating connections between the TSCCs and potential partners, noting that not all connections would necessarily lead to establishment of partnerships. It was stated that successful collaborations would be reflected in the biennial activity reports of the TSCCs and the Entity.

47. Some members encouraged the Secretariat and the Global Coordination Entity to consider benchmarking and learning from the experiences of similar mechanisms under other multilateral environmental agreements, including UNFCCC, UNCCD and the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm (BRS) Conventions. The Secretariat confirmed that engagement with other MEAs was ongoing and noted that such benchmarking could help to further refine the assessment criteria.

48. Some members also suggested simplifying the wording of some criteria, particularly those related to knowledge sharing and learning, to avoid unnecessary complexity and improve clarity of assessment.

49. The Secretariat invited members to provide further written comments and concrete suggestions through the online discussion forum on the workplan for 2025-2026 to be submitted the COP Bureau and inputs on the criteria for assessing the work of the global coordination entity for the next biennial workplan, which will be submitted to SBI 7, as requested by COP in decision 16/3 (Annex II, paragraph 4).

(c) Options for mobilization of resources to support the work of the technical and scientific cooperation support centres

50. The Global Coordination Entity introduced a draft strategic plan for mobilizing resources to support the work of the regional and subregional TSCCs, in response to decisions 15/8 (paragraph 27(d)) and 16/3 (Annex II, paragraph 13), which mandate the Entity to play a role in mobilizing and channeling additional financial, technical and in-kind resources from a wide variety of sources, including from public and private grants and innovative financing instruments, to support the work of TSC support centres. It was noted that the TSC support centres operated in a fragmented and competitive funding environment and.

51. The objectives of the strategy included clarifying and strengthening the value proposition of the technical and scientific cooperation mechanism for donors and partners; facilitating access to more predictable, longer-term and programmatic funding for the support centres; improving coordination of donor engagement to reduce duplication and fragmentation; and strengthening the capacity of the support centres to mobilize resources effectively.

52. The draft strategy proposed a phased approach to resource mobilization. In the longer term, the objective was to secure core funding to support essential coordination, governance and operational functions of the centres. In the short term, the focus was placed on mobilizing project-based and in-kind support to achieve early, tangible results that demonstrate the value of the mechanism.

53. The Entity highlighted the comparative advantages of the TSC mechanism, including its demand-driven, regionally anchored structure, strong linkages with national focal points, reduced investment-risk, and explicit mandate to support implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, including Target 20.

54. The Entity described practical actions envisaged under the strategy, including mapping of potential donors and funding opportunities, co-development of proposals with TSCCs, organization of donor roundtables and dialogues, advocacy for dedicated funding windows under various funding mechanisms such as the Kunming Biodiversity Fund, facilitation of partnerships with United Nations entities and other implementing partners, and promotion of non-financial contributions such as secondments, peer learning and capacity-building.

55. Members of the Group welcomed the draft strategy and provided suggestions for further refinement. Members highlighted the growing importance of demonstrating impact and return on investment in donor engagement and encouraged the Global Coordination Entity to strengthen this aspect of the value proposition.

56. Members of the Group also noted the significant potential of non-financial and in-kind contributions, including engagement with academic institutions and other knowledge partners, as complementary avenues of support.

57. The Global Coordination Entity welcomed comments and suggestions made and indicated that they would be considered in the further development of the strategy.

Item 6

Progress in the implementation of the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development: preliminary findings of the survey on the use of the strategic framework

58. Under this item, the Secretariat presented the preliminary findings of the survey on the use of the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development, conducted pursuant to paragraph 16(h) of decision 15/8 and paragraph 5 of decision 16/3, which requested the Executive Secretary to undertake, in conjunction with the global review of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework including the means of implementation, a review of the strategic framework

to assess its use and, if necessary, propose updates to ensure its effectiveness in assisting Parties, for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its seventeenth meeting.

59. In response to the above requests, the Secretariat issued notification [2026-020](#) in February 2026 inviting Parties, other Governments, indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth organizations, and other relevant organizations and stakeholders to complete a survey on the use, relevance and effectiveness of the strategic framework. The survey closed on 1 April 2026, and a total of 74 responses were received.

60. The survey was divided into four main sections: (a) use of the long-term strategic framework in guiding capacity-building and development to support the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework; (b) relevance of the strategic framework; (c) effectiveness of the strategic framework; and (d) support provided or received to facilitate the use of the strategic framework.

61. In terms of the use of the strategic framework, 38 per cent of the respondents confirmed that they had used the guidance provided in the framework. Among these respondents, a majority applied it to design capacity-building and development interventions in support of the Global Biodiversity Framework. Some also used the long-term strategic framework to guide the integration of capacity-building and development into institutional processes and systems supporting the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, in the creation or revision of their national strategies, and the design of capacity development action plans at various levels.

62. Regarding the relevance of the strategic framework, 84 per cent of respondents found the guidance highly relevant to their national needs and priorities for capacity development in support of the Global Biodiversity Framework. They identified Section IV of the framework (key strategies to improve capacity-building and development) as the most relevant for steering capacity-building efforts, followed by Section III on guiding principles, especially on inclusion of gender, indigenous peoples and local communities and country-driven approaches, and Section V on mechanisms for implementation.

63. Many respondents reiterated the value of the strategic framework as a planning tool and the relevance and importance of the key strategies. They particularly found them useful in identifying priority areas for action, such as integrating capacity-building into national biodiversity planning processes, promoting partnerships and cooperation (including South–South collaboration), and aligning biodiversity capacity development with broader cross-sectoral policies.

64. Regarding effectiveness of the strategic framework, respondents were asked to identify which of the key strategies under Section IV of the framework had been most effective in guiding capacity-building interventions and how their application had contributed to tangible changes in capacity. Among the 27 respondents who answered this question, 25 (93 per cent) identified “promoting partnerships and networks for implementation” as the most effective strategy. This was followed by aligning capacity development efforts with broader cross-sectoral plans and programmes, institutionalizing capacity-building, and integrating long-term capacity-building into national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

65. Several respondents reported that the key strategies outlined in the long-term strategic framework had contributed in a meaningful way but noted that other factors also played a significant role. On the other hand, a significant number of respondents indicated that it was too early to assess the framework’s contribution and impact in enhancing coherence, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of capacity-building efforts at the national level.

66. In terms of what had worked, respondents highlighted internal knowledge-sharing, improved coherence and alignment with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, better coordination among institutions and stakeholders, enhanced integration of indigenous peoples and local communities, gender and youth perspectives; and stronger linkage between capacity development and implementation outcomes (not just trainings).

67. Regarding what had not worked, respondents cited limited awareness of the strategic framework; perceptions of the framework as being too high-level, lacking practical operational tools and indicators for measuring progress in capacity development, and capacity-building initiatives that are project-specific and not institutionalized. Respondents also highlighted some of the challenges including difficulties in integrating capacity development across multiple sectors, limited human and technical capacity, dependence on external financial support, and lack of or limited coordination among multiple institutions.

68. With regard to the support provided or received to facilitate the use of the strategic framework, a number of respondents noted that support was limited and focused on a few specific targets of the Global Biodiversity Framework, which restricted the wider application of the strategic framework. Of the 74 respondents, only 9 (or 12 per cent) confirmed having participated in the dedicated training on the use of the strategic framework, including sessions that were as part of the NBSAP dialogues organized by the Secretariat in 2023 and 2024. Those who attended noted that the training was helpful, but broader support was needed. Specifically, the training and other support provided helped respondents to better understand the strategic framework, integrate capacity development into NBSAP revision, align national priorities with global targets, strengthen technical coordination and knowledge sharing, and enhance regional cooperation and collaboration.

69. In general, the long-term strategic framework was regarded as a strategic and relevant document providing conceptual and practical direction. Respondents found it helpful during the NBSAP revision process, guiding national efforts in developing capacity development plans, and in designing projects and programmes including GEF initiatives. There was general consensus that more support was needed to enhance the uptake and effective use of the strategic framework, particularly in terms of dedicated and accessible funding for capacity development activities through the TSC support centres, development of simple and user-friendly operational tools (including practical case studies), peer-to-peer learning opportunities and strengthening the monitoring and reporting of capacity development outcomes, including through the national reports.

Item 7

Other matters

70. Under this item, the Secretariat presented the redesigned CBD website, outlining the strategic approach undertaken for its redevelopment, including improvements to information architecture, user interface, and content management. The Secretariat noted that the redesign was based on extensive internal consultations, user surveys and focus group inputs, and involved the review of over 7,000 pages, with approximately 1,800 pages migrated to the new platform.

71. The Secretariat highlighted that the new website adopted a more visual, user-centric design, and incorporated enhanced navigation through a structured menu architecture, intuitive URLs and integrated content presentation. It was also noted that the website was supported by the Drupal content management system and a web governance framework was developed to ensure ongoing content quality, periodic review and archival of outdated information.

72. During the discussion, members welcomed the improvements made to the website and acknowledged the scale of the work undertaken. Members of the Group raised various points and sought clarifications on specific aspects:

(a) The need to further enhance search functionality and improve discoverability of information, particularly for new users of the Convention;

(b) Clarification on the primary target audience of the website and how different user groups would be served;

(c) The importance of coordination with communication and outreach teams to ensure consistency and visibility;

(d) The need to ensure that key content, including information related to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, remains prominently accessible.

73. In response, the Secretariat explained that further improvements, including enhanced search capabilities and user guidance, were being considered as part of ongoing development. Members were invited to provide detailed feedback through a dedicated forum, with the Informal Advisory Group expected to act as a focus group to guide future enhancements.

74. Under this item, the Secretariat provided an update on the preparations towards the global review of collective progress in the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. The Secretariat explained that national targets and national reports formed the primary inputs for the global report, with national targets outlining planned actions and national reports providing information on implementation progress.

75. The Secretariat further noted that the reporting process placed increased emphasis on structured, quantitative and indicator-based information. It also highlighted the use of AI-supported analytical tools to assist in extracting key insights from national reports, while emphasizing that outputs were subject to validation to ensure accuracy.

76. In response to a question raised by one of the members of the Group, the Secretariat clarified that capacity-building was not treated as a standalone section but was embedded across all targets and reflected both at the target level and in the overall conclusions relating to means of implementation.

77. Members also highlighted the importance of aligning the workplans and performance assessment of the technical and scientific cooperation support centres with the gaps identified in the global report. The Secretariat agreed that the findings of the global report would provide an important basis for prioritizing technical and scientific cooperation activities at regional and subregional levels.

78. Members of the Group emphasized the relevance of parallel analytical initiatives and the use of AI in analysing national reports. They highlighted the importance of comparing outputs from different methodologies to improve robustness and ensure consistency of findings. The Secretariat acknowledged these efforts and encouraged continued collaboration and iterative refinement of analytical approaches.

79. Members also raised questions regarding the modalities for capturing data from non-State actors and international organizations. In response, the Secretariat noted that the Online Reporting Tool included provisions for capturing such contributions and that further refinements are being explored to enhance inclusivity and usability.

80. The Secretariat also informed members of the timeline for the global report, including the upcoming peer review process, and highlighted the distinction between the global report, which presents the state of implementation, and the global review, which will be reflected in decisions to be adopted by the Conference of the Parties.

Item 8

Conclusions and recommendations

81. The Informal Advisory Group agreed to further review the documents that were to be posted on the online discussion forum under the different agenda items to facilitate the preparation of documents that will be made available for consideration of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its seventh meeting.

82. Some of the action points identified for consideration by the Secretariat included following:

(a) Update the CHM/KM progress report to include relevant links, including reports from the regional Knowledge Management for Biodiversity workshops;

(b) Continue exploring options to organize a Knowledge Management for Biodiversity workshop for Central and Eastern Europe, subject to resource availability;

- (c) Review the preview version of the new CBD website through the discussion forum and provide feedback on usability, content migration and information architecture;
- (d) Further refine the proposed CHM/KM strategy, including the scope of external linkages and interoperability with national CHMs, TSC centres, UN entities and monitoring framework partners;
- (e) Post the draft criteria for assessing TSCCs and the global coordination entity in the online forum to collect additional inputs from the Group and engage with TSCCs on the revised criteria before finalization;
- (f) Make available the workplans of the TSCCs, where possible, for information through the discussion forum, to help members understand the operational context of the centres;
- (g) Post the draft strategy to mobilize resources in the online forum for further review and suggestions for improvement.

Item 9

Closure of the meeting

- 83. In his concluding remarks, Mr. Plesnik expressed his appreciation to the members of the Informal Advisory Group for their active participation and their useful comments and recommendations made during the three online sessions. He thanked his Co-Chair Ms. Matshusa for her chairing skills and the Secretariat for the ongoing support to the work of the Advisory Group.
- 84. The Co-Chair reminded members of the Advisory Group to continue engaging and provide additional comments through the online discussion forum to inform the documents being prepared by the Secretariat.
- 85. Erie Tamale, speaking on behalf of the Secretariat, thanked the co-chairs and all the other members of the Informal Advisory Group for their valuable inputs.
- 86. The meeting was closed at 10.30 a.m. on 29 April 2026.

Annex

List of participants

Parties	
Antigua and Barbuda	Tricia Lovell
Australia	Karel Mokany
Belarus	Galina Mozgova
Belgium	Abraham (Han) de Koeijer
Brazil	Marcelo Henrique Aguiar de Freitas
Colombia	Diana Pulido
Czechia	Jan Plesnik
European Union	Grégoire Dubois
Hungary	Kinga Öllerer
Indonesia	Gono Semiadi
Japan	Motohiro Hasegawa
Malawi	Martha Mphatso Kalembe
Morocco	Mostafa Madbouhi
Nigeria	Onyeka Kingsley Nwosu
South Africa	Mukondi Matshusa
Turkmenistan	Ejebay Kokanova
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Philip McGowan
Major groups	
CBD Women's Caucus	Pamela Tapia Diaz
Center for Indigenous Peoples' Research and Development	Biswash Praja
Organizations	
Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT	Carlo Fadda
ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity	Carlo Carlos
International Organisation of la Francophonie	Issa Bado
Science Panel for the Amazon	Paulette Bynoe
United Nations Development Programme	Christina Supples
United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre	Natasha Ali
World Wildlife Fund (WILDLABS)	Talia Speaker
Ex officio member (Consortium of Scientific Partners Co-Chair)	
Smithsonian Institution	Britta Garfield