



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General

20 June 2026

English only

Subsidiary Body on Implementation

Seventh meeting

Nairobi, 4–12 August 2026

Item 9 of the provisional agenda*

Engagement with subnational governments, cities and other local authorities to enhance the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

Information emerging from seventh national reports relevant to the role of subnational governments, cities and other local authorities in the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework**

Note by the Secretariat

I. Introduction

1. In paragraph 7 of decision [15/12](#), the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, to undertake a review of the role of subnational governments, cities and other local authorities in the implementation of the objectives of the Convention and its Protocols and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.
2. The present information note complements the review contained in the annex to document [CBD/SBI/7/9](#) and provides additional information emerging from seventh national reports and related analyses prepared for the global review of collective progress in the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.
3. The information presented below is preliminary in nature and reflects information available at the time of preparation of the present note. It is intended to complement, and not prejudge, the broader analyses and assessments being prepared in the context of the global review of collective progress in the implementation of the Framework.

II. Information emerging from seventh national reports

A. Multilevel governance, coordination and planning

4. Information emerging from seventh national reports suggests that implementation of several elements of the Framework frequently occurs through territorial, local and multilevel governance systems, including spatial planning, land-use planning, ecosystem restoration, protected and conserved areas, urban planning, waste management, sustainable use and participatory governance.
5. Reports reviewed in the context of the global review refer to actions undertaken through national, subnational and sectoral spatial planning processes that incorporate biodiversity, including

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

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

the use of biodiversity layers in land-use and urban plans, geographic information systems, ecosystem mapping, national biodiversity portals and marine spatial planning. Related examples also point to participatory land-use planning, community mapping, district-level planning and collaboration between local authorities and communities.

6. Information reviewed further suggests that subnational governments, cities and other local authorities often appear as implementation actors in practice, even where their contributions are not systematically captured in national reporting. This is particularly relevant where implementation depends on territorial planning systems, municipal infrastructure, local public-space management, community participation and coordination among national, subnational and local authorities.

B. Urban biodiversity and implementation of Target 12

7. Urban biodiversity is one of the areas where the role of cities and local authorities is most visible. Information emerging from seventh national reports indicates that Parties are taking action through urban greening, tree planting, creation of parks, rehabilitation of wetlands, stabilization of riverbanks, restoration of lakes and rivers, ecological corridors, and requirements for green and blue spaces in planning instruments.

8. At the same time, information reviewed for the global review suggests that action related to urban biodiversity remains more visible in planning and greening activities than in measurable biodiversity outcomes. Information emerging from seventh national reports further suggests that reporting tends to focus more heavily on urban greening and expansion of green spaces than on ecological quality, connectivity, blue spaces, accessibility, ecosystem services and native biodiversity in urban areas.

9. Relevant information also points to continuing challenges related to weak urban biodiversity monitoring, insufficient or uncertain financing for local authorities, fragmented governance across departments and levels of government, and legal or planning frameworks that may remain advisory or weakly enforced.

C. Governance, coordination and reporting challenges

10. Governance and coordination emerge as recurring issues in information relevant to multilevel implementation. Reports and related analyses refer to fragmented institutional mandates, limited technical and financial capacity, weak cross-sectoral coordination, and challenges in integrating biodiversity considerations into planning, budgeting, infrastructure, land-use and sectoral decision-making processes.

11. Available information also suggests that reporting systems are better suited to capturing national policies, plans and frameworks than the diversity of implementation taking place through local authorities, districts, municipalities, territorial planning systems, community governance arrangements and other subnational processes. This creates an important information gap, as implementation may be taking place across levels of government without being fully reflected in national reporting.

12. Data and monitoring limitations are also relevant to multilevel implementation. Information reviewed for the global review notes gaps in systematic urban biodiversity monitoring, insufficient indicators for the quality and connectivity of green and blue spaces, and limited data for assessing whether urban greening and related interventions contribute to biodiversity outcomes, ecosystem services, resilience or equitable access.

D. Partnerships, platforms and enabling approaches

13. Information emerging from seventh national reports and related analyses points to the importance of partnerships, participatory approaches and collaborative mechanisms in supporting implementation across levels of government. Examples include community-based approaches, co-

management arrangements, participatory land-use planning, local restoration initiatives and engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities and other stakeholders.

14. The review contained in the annex to document CBD/SBI/7/9 provides further information on institutional support arrangements, partnerships and relevant platforms, including CitiesWithNature¹ and RegionsWithNature,² and their role in supporting knowledge exchange, visibility, voluntary reporting and coordination of biodiversity action by subnational governments, cities and other local authorities.

III. Preliminary observations

15. Information emerging from seventh national reports and related analyses prepared for the global review suggests that implementation of the Framework is increasingly territorial and multilevel in nature. Subnational governments, cities and other local authorities appear particularly relevant in areas such as spatial planning, urban biodiversity, ecosystem restoration, protected and conserved areas, local infrastructure, waste management, stakeholder engagement and participatory governance.

16. At the same time, available information suggests that contributions by subnational governments, cities and other local authorities are not yet systematically captured in national reporting processes. This may limit the visibility of local and territorial action and constrain understanding of how implementation is progressing across levels of government.

17. Strengthening coordination, cooperation and engagement across levels of government, as appropriate and in accordance with national legislation and circumstances, may support more effective implementation, monitoring and reporting under the Convention and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

¹ <https://citieswithnature.org/>.

² <https://regionswithnature.org/>.