



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General
2 October 2026
English only

Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity Seventeenth meeting

Yerevan, 19–30 October 2026

Item 18 (a) of the provisional agenda*

Other scientific and technical issues related to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework: biodiversity and climate change

Mapping study on actions, gaps and overlaps for enhancing cooperation and policy coherence and synergies across the Rio conventions**

Note by the Secretariat

I. Introduction

1. At its sixteenth meeting in October 2024, in its decision [16/22](#), the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity requested the Executive Secretary to invite Parties, observers and other stakeholders, to submit their views on options for enhanced policy coherence, including a potential joint work programme of the Rio conventions, and to invite the executive secretaries of the other Rio conventions to collaborate on the organization of a technical information exchange to further explore options to enhance cooperation and policy coherence to support the implementation of the Conventions.
2. Following the implementation of those requested activities, the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at its twenty-seventh meeting in October 2025, in its recommendation [27/3](#), requested the Executive Secretary to share relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties and recommendations of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, and invite the executive secretaries of the other Rio conventions, and the current and incoming presidencies of the Conferences of the Parties of the three Rio conventions, to collaborate on the organization of technical information exchanges to further discuss options to enhance cooperation and policy coherence and synergies across the Rio conventions, and subsequently develop a multilevel road map with short, medium and long-term actions, including a mapping study to help to identify concrete actions, on the headline options for enhancing policy coherence provided in document [CBD/SBSTTA/27/4](#), as well as possible gaps and overlaps in existing national and international policies and existing coordination bodies that address the implementation of the Rio conventions, and to report its finding to Parties at the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
3. In accordance with the above request, four technical information exchanges were organised between April and June 2026. Furthermore, a consultant was engaged to carry out the mapping study on the basis of a desk review, strategic interviews and the outcomes of the technical information

* CBD/COP/17/1/Rev.1.

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

exchanges. The multilevel road map, as presented in [CBD/COP/17/11](#), was developed based on the mapping study and guidance provided by Parties during the technical information exchanges.

4. The annex to the present document contains the mapping study on actions, gaps and overlaps for enhancing cooperation and policy coherence and synergies across the Rio conventions. The annex is presented in the form and language in which it was received by the Secretariat.

Annex

Mapping study on actions, gaps and overlaps for enhancing cooperation and policy coherence and synergies across the Rio conventions

Consultant:
Edgar Fernández Fernández

Acknowledgements

The consultant thanks all participants in the four technical information exchanges¹ held between April and June 2026 for their engagement and contributions. Special thanks go to interviewees for their insights and to reviewers of a draft version of the mapping study for their feedback.

INTERVIEWEES:

Parties: Armenia, Australia, Brazil, European Union, Mexico, Nigeria, Panama, Türkiye

Non-State Actors: CAN Ecosystems, CBD Women's Caucus, Friends of Synergies, Global Environment Facility (GEF), Global Youth Biodiversity Network (GYBN), International Indigenous Forum for Biodiversity (IIFB), NBSAP Accelerator Partnership, NDC Partnership, Synergies Collaboration Platform (SCP), UNCCD Secretariat, UNFCCC Secretariat, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

REVIEWERS OF THE MAPPING STUDY:

Belmont Forum, Bureau pour la croissance intégrale et la dignité de l'enfant, Secretariat for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Climate and Development Knowledge Network (CDKN), Conservation International (CI), Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt, Environment and Climate Change Canada, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) International, FSC Indigenous Foundation, International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), Global Partnership on Forest and Landscape Restoration (GPFLR), Global Youth Biodiversity Network (GYBN), Grupo Laera, ProVeg International, International Union of Forest Research Organizations (IUFRO), Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), Rutgers University, Soka Gakkai International, Sunway University, SwedBio, Third World Network (TWN), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), Wetlands International, Women4Biodiversity, World Federation for Animals (WFA), World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)

Disclaimer

This mapping study was commissioned by the CBD Secretariat. The content is the sole responsibility of the consultant.

¹ <https://www.cbd.int/climate/activities.shtml>

I. Contents

I.	Introduction	1
I.	Contents	5
II.	Abbreviations and acronyms	6
III.	Introduction	10
IV.	Possible gaps and overlaps & concrete actions	12
1.	Alignment of national strategies and plans	12
1.1	<i>Possible gaps and overlaps</i>	12
1.2	<i>Concrete actions</i>	13
2.	Planning, monitoring, reporting and review	19
2.1	<i>Possible gaps and overlaps</i>	19
2.2	<i>Concrete actions</i>	20
3.	Nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches	33
3.1	<i>Possible gaps and overlaps</i>	33
3.2	<i>Concrete actions</i>	33
4.	Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making	45
4.1	<i>Possible gaps and overlaps</i>	45
4.2	<i>Concrete actions</i>	46
5.	Knowledge management and capacity-building	53
5.1	<i>Possible gaps and overlaps</i>	53
5.2	<i>Concrete actions</i>	53
6.	Resource mobilization	67
6.1	<i>Possible gaps and overlaps</i>	67
6.2	<i>Concrete actions</i>	68
7.	Contributions and rights of indigenous peoples and local communities	84
7.1	<i>Possible gaps and overlaps</i>	84
7.2	<i>Concrete actions</i>	84
8.	Whole-of-society approach	90
8.1	<i>Possible gaps and overlaps</i>	90
8.2	<i>Concrete actions</i>	90
9.	Cross-cutting/General	98
9.1	<i>Possible gaps and overlaps</i>	98
9.2	<i>Concrete actions</i>	100
V.	Resources	106

II. Abbreviations and acronyms

AF	Adaptation Fund
AHTEG	Ad hoc technical expert group
AR6	Sixth Assessment Report of the IPCC
BTR	Biennial Transparency Report
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CMA	Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
COP	Conference of the Parties
CSO	Civil society organization
CRIC	Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention
CST	Committee on Science and Technology
DaRT	Data Reporting Tool for MEAs
DLDD	Desertification, Land Degradation and Drought
DRR	Disaster risk reduction
EbA	Ecosystem-based adaptation
EBA	Ecosystem-based approaches
Eco-DRR	Ecosystem-based disaster risk reduction
ENACT	ENACT Partnership for NbS
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FEBA	Friends of Ecosystem-based Adaptation
FrLD	Fund for responding to Loss and Damage
FWG-LCIPP	Facilitative Working Group of the LCIPP
FPIC	Free, prior and informed consent
KMGBF	Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GBFF	Global Biodiversity Framework Fund

GGA	Global Goal on Adaptation
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
GM	Global Mechanism
GPFLR	Global Partnership on Forest and Landscape Restoration
GST	Global Stocktake
GYBN	Global Youth Biodiversity Network
HAC	High-ambition coalition
IFI	International Financial Institution
IGO	Inter-governmental organization
ILK	Indigenous and local knowledge
INFF	Integrated National Financing Framework
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
JCBP	Rio Conventions Joint Capacity-building Programme
JLG	Joint Liaison Group of the Rio Conventions
IIFB	International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity
IPBES	Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPLCs	Indigenous peoples and local communities
ISP-CWP	Intergovernmental Science-Policy Panel on Chemicals, Waste and Pollution
IUFRO	International Union of Forest Research Organizations
LCIPP	Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform
LDC	Least Developed Country
LDCF	Least Developed Countries Fund
LDN	Land Degradation Neutrality
LULUCF	Land use, land-use change and forestry
MDB	Multilateral Development Bank
MEA	Multilateral environmental agreement
MEL	Monitoring, evaluation and Learning

MRR	Monitoring, Reporting and Review
MRV	Measurement, Reporting and Verification
NAP	National Adaptation Plan
NBFP	National Biodiversity Finance Plan
NbS	Nature-based solutions
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NBSAP AP	NBSAP Accelerator Partnership
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution
NDC P	NDC Partnership
NDP	National Drought Plan
NFP	National Focal Point
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NZNPA IP	Net-Zero Nature-Positive Accelerator Integrated Program
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OECM	Other effective area-based conservation measure
ORS	Online Reporting System
ORT	Online Reporting Tool
PA	Protected area
PCCB	Paris Committee on Capacity-Building
PEDRR	Partnership for Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction
PRAIS	Performance Review and Assessment of Implementation System
RCC	Regional Collaboration Centre
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
SB	Subsidiary Body
SB8J	Subsidiary Body on Article 8(j) and Other Provisions of the Convention Related to Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technical Advice
SBSTTA	Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice
SCCF	Special Climate Change Fund

SCP	Synergies Collaboration Platform
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SPI	Science-Policy Interface
STC	Science and Technology Correspondent
TFFF	Tropical Forest Forever Facility
ToRs	Terms of reference
TSC	Technical and Scientific Cooperation
UN	United Nations
UNBL	United Nations Biodiversity Lab
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa
UNEA	United Nations Environment Assembly
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNEP-FI	United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative
UNEP-WCMC	United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WG	Working Group
WoGA	Whole-of-government approach
WoSA	Whole-of-society approach
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

III. Introduction

At its sixteenth meeting in October-November 2024, the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) adopted [decision 16/22](#) on biodiversity and climate change. Through this decision, the COP requested the Executive Secretary to:

- (a) Invite Parties, observers and other stakeholders to submit by May 2025 their views on options for enhanced policy coherence, including a potential joint work programme of the Rio Conventions, to be compiled by the Executive Secretary for the attention of the Joint Liaison Group (JLG) of the Rio Conventions;
- (b) Submit its compilation for consideration of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) at a meeting held before the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties; and
- (c) Invite the executive secretaries of the other Rio Conventions to collaborate on the organization of a technical information exchange in 2025 to further explore options to enhance cooperation and policy coherence to support the implementation of the CBD and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGBF), and of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Paris Agreement.

One year later at its twenty-seventh meeting in October 2025, through its [recommendation 27/3](#), the SBSTTA took note of the synthesis of submissions, the statement of the JLG and the report on the technical information exchange on enhancing policy coherence and cooperation across the Rio Conventions. The SBSTTA also requested the Executive Secretary to:

- (a) Share relevant decisions of the COP and recommendations of the SBSTTA, and invite the executive secretaries of the other Rio Conventions, and the current and incoming presidencies of the COPs of the three Rio Conventions, to collaborate on the organization of technical information exchanges to further discuss options to enhance cooperation and policy coherence and synergies across the Rio Conventions;
- (b) Subsequently develop a multilevel road map with short-, medium- and long-term actions, including a mapping study to help to identify concrete actions, on the headline options for enhancing policy coherence provided in document [CBD/SBSTTA/27/4](#), as well as possible gaps and overlaps in existing national and international policies and existing coordination bodies that address the implementation of the Rio Conventions; and
- (c) Report its findings to Parties at the seventeenth meeting of the COP.

The present document contains the mapping study requested by SBSTTA27. It is intended to inform the preparation of the multilevel road map that SBSTTA27 also requested from the Executive Secretary.

In line with SBSTTA27's request, the mapping study is structured around two components:

- Possible gaps and overlaps in existing national and international policies and existing coordination bodies that address the implementation of the Rio Conventions
- Concrete actions on the headline options for enhancing policy coherence provided in document [CBD/SBSTTA/27/4](#)

Document [CBD/SBSTTA/27/4](#) provides eight headline options for enhancing policy coherence, hereinafter referred to as "building blocks". The need for a ninth building block on cross-cutting actions emerged during the development of the mapping study and was added to the original eight building blocks. The nine building blocks are the following:

1. Alignment of national strategies and plans
2. Nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches
3. Planning, monitoring, reporting and review
4. Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making
5. Knowledge management and capacity-building
6. Resource mobilization
7. Contributions and rights of indigenous peoples and local communities
8. Whole-of-society approach
9. Cross-cutting

The timeframes used correspond as follows:

- Short term = until 2028
- Medium term = 2029-2030
- Long term = end of 2030 onwards

The gaps and overlaps and concrete actions in this mapping study are not exhaustive. They were identified and further organized and elaborated based on the four [technical information exchanges](#) on enhancing policy coherence, cooperation and synergies across the Rio Conventions that took place from April to June 2026, a series of strategic interviews with some key actors and a desk review of a variety of documents such as reports, briefings, submissions and COP decisions.

While acknowledging that collaboration, policy coherence and synergies are needed across all MEAs, including the biodiversity-related Conventions and pollution-related Conventions, this mapping study focuses on the three Rio Conventions, as per the mandate derived from the SBSTTA27 recommendation.

IV. Possible gaps and overlaps & concrete actions

CBD SBSTTA27 recommendation 27/3 requested the Executive Secretary, as part of the mapping study, to identify possible gaps and overlaps in existing national and international policies and existing coordination bodies that address the implementation of the Rio Conventions.

By “gap”, we understand a situation where something is missing between a desired state or endpoint and the actual, existing state, i.e., the difference between the desired state and the actual state.

By “overlap” we mean a situation where different actors dedicate financial, human, or other resources, without coordination, to the same types of activities with the same or similar purpose, creating duplication and inefficient use of those resources.

The actions in this section were identified in response to the SBSTTA27 request to identify concrete actions on the headline options (building blocks) for enhancing policy coherence provided in document [CBD/SBSTTA/27/4](#). Therefore, the list of actions is indicative only and should not be interpreted as prescriptive.

This section provides a non-exhaustive list of possible gaps and overlaps, as well as of concrete actions, identified during the development of the mapping study.

1. Alignment of national strategies and plans

1.1 Possible gaps and overlaps

GAPS IN EXISTING NATIONAL POLICIES

1.G1 *Absence of a high-level political mandate for national-level coordination on climate, biodiversity and land*

Description: Many countries are facing the absence of one of the first things that need to happen for advancing policy coherence and synergies at the national level: a clear high-level political mandate for institutions to coordinate between them and dedicate adequate time and resources to the process.

1.G2 *Absence of a permanent inter-ministerial or cross-sectoral coordination mechanism for Rio Convention policy coherence and between relevant services within the same or across different ministries*

Description: Many countries lack adequate coordination at the ministerial and/or technical levels between relevant services to achieve Rio Convention synergies and policy coherence within the same ministry or across ministries. As a result, climate, biodiversity and land strategies are developed in silos, missing an opportunity to align targets, actions and indicators in areas of convergence and address possible trade-offs in other areas. Planning, monitoring and reporting on biodiversity, climate and land issues are conducted by different ministries and institutions.

1.G3 *Absence of a coordination mechanism and clear guidance for national focal points*

Description: Sometimes, little attention and importance are given to collaboration between NFPs. NFPs can be overburdened with other duties in their ministries and miss opportunities to implement the Conventions coherently. Clear guidance is missing to systematize the NFPs’ work and bridge the possible collaboration and coordination gap between NFPs and between them, decision-makers, the technical level and different stakeholders.

OVERLAPS IN EXISTING COORDINATION BODIES

1.01 NbS and/or EbA as a potential overlap space between NDC Partnership, NBSAP Accelerator Partnership and other agencies

Description: If NDC Partnership and NBSAP Accelerator Partnership do not coordinate among them, the inclusion of NbS and/or EbA in countries' NDCs and NBSAPs could lead to a potential duplication of efforts in the provision of technical and financial assistance. There is currently no clear mechanism to share between them requests from countries that submit to one or the other partnership. They are currently working to find the most effective way to coordinate.

1.02 Overlap between UN programs and organizations providing technical support on NDC, NBSAP and LDN targets related aspects

Description: Notable examples are UNDP and UNEP. The [UN80 Initiative process](#) (Work Package 27, Action 35) is currently identifying potential areas of duplication of effort to eliminate them.

1.2 Concrete actions

ALIGNMENT OF FRAMEWORKS AND TARGETS AT THE CONVENTION LEVEL

1.A1 Adopt a set of coordinated, aligned post-2030 targets and frameworks across the Rio Conventions and the post-2030 SDGs

Description: Strengthen coordination at the Convention level, including alignment of post-2030 frameworks, to help ensure that targets are better aligned and complementary from the outset with downstream benefits for national planning and implementation. Given that the SDGs, the KMGBF and the Paris Agreement (CMA decisions) all have 2030 targets, a set of coordinated, combined post-2030 targets across Conventions and post-2030 SDGs or equivalents would help align national strategies and plans.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, IGOs, non-State actors

Good-practice examples: KMGBF alignment with SDGs

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review; resource mobilization; cross-cutting

CROSS-MAPPING OF CONVENTION-LEVEL TARGETS AND SDGs

1.A2 Cross-mapping of Convention-level targets and SDGs, including in post-2030 frameworks

Description: Cross-mapping of existing targets at the Convention level and of those targets with the SDGs is a very useful tool for national governments to identify opportunities for synergies and align their strategies and plans. This also applies to forthcoming post-2030 frameworks.

Time frame: Short to long term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, Secretariats of the Rio Conventions, IGOs, non-State actors

Good-practice examples: Platforms that enable cross-framework analysis, e.g., Rio Policy Radar, InforMEA cross-mapping of global goals ([Goals | InforMEA](#)) based on the Bern Process

cross-mapping of MEAs against the KMGBF goals and targets and against the SDGs ([Key entry points for cooperation and collaboration amongst MEAs](#))

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review; resource mobilization; cross-cutting

INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION

1.A3 *A high-level political mandate exists to coordinate development and revision of NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs, LDN targets and National Drought Plans (NDPs)*

Description: A national high-level political mandate exists to coordinate between the processes to develop or update the biodiversity, climate and land strategies and plans. Inscribing the mandate in a national policy, strategy, development plan, executive order, etc. could help institutionalize and mainstream policy coherence and synergies between the Rio Conventions. This would help overcome the barrier of civil servants not making enough time for coordination and alignment because they are too focused on their specific sectoral issues: “Dedicate time now for creating efficiencies afterward”.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National (scaling down to subnational levels)

Who is responsible: The highest national government level, relevant ministries, parliament

Good-practice examples: The main aspects of Panama’s Nature Pledge, unifying Panama’s NDC, NBSAP and LDN targets, were mentioned in [Executive Order 2 of 30 April 2026](#) (Articles 9, 10 and 11)

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review; resource mobilization; cross-cutting

1.A4 *Establish national coordination mechanisms (such as interministerial committees or task forces) for jointly developing and revising NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs, LDN targets and NDPs and regularly engaging NFPs, line ministries and stakeholders*

Description: A coordination mechanism needs to be in place for the departments/ministries and teams responsible for the NDC, NAP, and NBSAP planning and implementation. Start coordination within government to prepare strategies aligned with each other, despite the different timeframes of the Conventions. Strengthen institutional coordination by recommending mechanisms such as interministerial committees or task forces to oversee the alignment process through periodic meetings. These bodies would play a critical role in ensuring cross-sectoral dialogue and cooperation, including among NFPs, and in engaging non-State actors.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments (relevant ministries, NFPs)

Good-practice examples: 1) In the UK, processes and structures are in place to facilitate senior officials working across government departments to ensure alignment on issues relating to nature and climate. NFPs and leads working on Rio Conventions also meet regularly in a working group to collaborate. ([Effectively delivering on climate and nature: NDCs, NAPs and NBSAPs synergies. A checklist for National policymakers](#), p. 35). 2) Ongoing Net Zero Nature Positive guidance work (UNEP): knowledge on experiences, good practices and lessons learned on interministerial coordination and participatory, inclusive, and gender sensitive approaches to net zero nature-positive national planning, so that it can guide countries’ good governance plans.

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA; cross-cutting

1.A5 *Institutionalize regular coordination mechanisms among national focal points of the three Rio Conventions to ensure implementation plans are developed synergistically*

Description: Institutionalize regular coordination mechanisms among national focal points of the three Conventions (periodic meetings, inter-ministerial working groups), to ensure that NBSAPs, NDCs and national adaptation plans are developed synergistically. This could also include coordination mechanisms with NFPs of other MEAs to ensure a more holistic integration and policy coherence among all MEAs that the country has ratified.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments, Rio Conventions (and other MEAs) NFPs

Good-practice examples: 1) Türkiye's [2025 Rio Synergy Protocol](#), signed between the three Rio Convention focal point institutions, established a joint working group and an annual action plan. The working group meets twice a year with a rotating presidency. 2) The "Mexican Bern process" for updating Mexico's NBSAP involved MEA focal points, under a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach ([Towards successful policy coherence for biodiversity and climate. Learning from case studies](#), p. 20)

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review

1.A6 *Sector-specific coordination and mapping of opportunities across Conventions to enhance coherence in approach (e.g., agriculture, soils, forestry, ocean, wildlife, pollution, etc.)*

Description: Depending on national priorities, choose specific sectors/areas of work and coordinate across relevant teams/departments/ministries on coherent approaches across Conventions. Could be supplemented with guidance on approaches to certain topics/sectors at Convention level through joint work at JLG or other ways.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments (relevant ministries, NFPs)

Good-practice examples: 1) Brazil's deliberate effort to bridge the climate and biodiversity agendas across all sectors of government ([Towards successful policy coherence for biodiversity and climate. Learning from case studies](#), p. 18). 2) Madagascar's Interministerial Committee for the Environment, established to help integrate environmental and climatic dimensions into various sectoral policies, strategies, plans and programs, particularly in budgetary terms ([Building synergies between biodiversity and climate: Insights from countries on NBSAP and NDC planning and implementation](#), p.25)

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review; resource mobilization; cross-cutting

1.A7 *Identify priority non-environment ministries, agencies and non-State actors for Rio implementation that should be engaged in national coordination mechanisms*

Description: Identify which ministries, agencies and non-state actors should be involved to deliver coherent biodiversity, climate and land outcomes, with particular attention to agriculture/food systems, finance, development, infrastructure and trade, as well as vulnerable groups and rights-holders.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments (relevant ministries and NFPs)

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review; NbS/EBA; resource mobilization; WoSA; cross-cutting

1.A8 *Coordinate national planning cycles (for preparing and/or updating NDCS, NBSAPs, NAPs, LDN targets, NDPs)*

Description: Where possible, synchronize national planning cycles for operationalizing effective alignment of national strategies to achieve strategic and practical advantages, better deploy limited institutional and technical capacity, as well as reduce administrative and reporting burdens

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments (relevant ministries, NFPs)

Good-practice examples: 1) Armenia's recently approved NBSAP for 2026-2031 and the NDC 3.0 were designed in alignment, shifting focus from fragmented compliance to delivery on the ground. 2) Brazil's 2023-2025 process to simultaneously revise its NBSAP and its National Climate Change Plan ("*Plano Clima*", providing the basis for the development of Brazil's updated NDC), which enabled better alignment of goals, avoided overlaps and fostered synergies between the biodiversity and climate agendas ([Towards successful policy coherence for biodiversity and climate. Learning from case studies](#), p. 18).

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review; resource mobilization; cross-cutting

STRATEGY CO-CREATION AND PARTICIPATION OF NON-STATE ACTORS

1.A9 *Institutionalize stakeholder co-creation and inclusion of ILK in the development and revision of Rio Convention strategies, including youth, IPLCs, women, civil society, academia, the private sector and local actors, from the beginning of strategy design*

Description: Institutionalize stakeholder engagement and co-creation since the early stages of the development and revision of strategies related to the Rio Conventions, to win acceptance and ensure that measures are well-adapted to their respective geographic, ecological, socioeconomic and cultural contexts. Ensure mechanisms for engaging IPLCs and ILK during the development of coordinated national strategies through participatory mechanisms and enforcement of safeguards.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments, NFPs

Good-practice examples: 1) [Colombia's participatory process](#) for updating its NBSAP, leading to its Biodiversity Action Plan 2024-2030, included more than 16 thousand people in the consultation process, 23 regional meetings and 23 signed biodiversity pacts. 2) The [Local Biodiversity Outlooks](#).

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA; cross-cutting

LANDSCAPE PLANNING AND GOVERNANCE

1.A10 *Encourage landscape planning (as the basis for developing well-aligned national implementation plans) based on accurate data and maps*

Description: Good landscape planning is the basis for developing well-aligned national implementation plans. It relies on accurate data and maps, analysis of existing (global) data platforms, and the capacity for ground-truth findings to identify high-integrity ecosystems for protection and degraded areas where integrity can be optimized and/or economic activities can take place. Not all countries have sufficient capacity, and targeted support and peer-to-peer learning may help.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National, international

Who is responsible: National governments, bodies of the Rio Conventions, secretariats, JLG, academia, implementing agencies, development and financial institutions

Good-practice examples: Rwanda is a leading example of integrated landscape restoration planning. Using the Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology ([ROAM](#)), it combined GIS and spatial data to identify restoration priorities and produce a national strategy that simultaneously supports land restoration, climate action and biodiversity conservation targets

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review; NbS/EBA; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA; cross-cutting

1.A11 *Develop community-led integrated landscape restoration/management plans that explicitly bridge all three Rio Conventions mapping actions across KMGBF targets, NDC mitigation and adaptation commitments, and LDN targets*

Description: Develop and pilot community-led integrated landscape restoration /management plans, including by using the Global Partnership on Forests and Landscape Restoration (GPFLR) principles, the UN Decade Standards of Practice for Ecosystem Restoration and FAO FERM tools to map how restoration and land-use activities contribute simultaneously to KMGBF targets, NDC mitigation and adaptation commitments, and LDN targets, with multi-stakeholder partnerships that include IPLC, women, youth and local government co-design from the outset.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National, local

Who is responsible: National and subnational governments; IPLC networks, women and youth organizations, GPFLR, FAO, CSOs

Good-practice examples: 1) Mexico's ejidos and indigenous community-led territorial planning integrates forest management, agriculture, watershed protection, and restoration across entire landscapes. These locally-governed plans deliver multiple benefits by supporting CBD and KMGBF objectives, UNFCCC climate adaptation and mitigation commitments, and UNCCD LDN targets. 2) FAO's [Guidelines for Integrated Land Use Planning](#), designed to align with CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; planning, monitoring, reporting and review; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

1.A12 *Embed CSOs, IPLC networks, women's and youth organizations into integrated landscape governance across all three Rio Conventions*

Description: Establish formal seats for CSOs, IPLC networks, women's and youth organizations in landscape-level governance bodies that oversee integrated implementation of NBSAPs, NDCs and LDN targets at the landscape scale.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: Local, national

Who is responsible: National governments, landscape governance bodies, IPLC networks, CSOs

Good-practice examples: 1) UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration flagships; 2) Panama's Nature Pledge is a national platform aligning biodiversity, climate and land commitments through government ministries, IPLCs, youth, women, civil society, academia, and the private sector;

Linkages to other building blocks: Contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

COORDINATION BETWEEN SUPPORT PARTNERSHIPS

1.A13 *NDC Partnership and NBSAP Accelerator Partnership to continue exploring ways, or a system, to work more coherently*

Description: NDC Partnership and NBSAP Accelerator Partnership have started exploring together how to work more coherently, for example when they receive requests on common topics like NbS. Until now, they have reached out to each other only when they cannot find providers for those types of requests. They need to identify a common space in which they can work together, as well as the respective modalities.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: NDC Partnership and NBSAP Accelerator Partnership

Good-practice examples: Identification of areas of [prospective collaboration](#) already initiated between NBSAP AP and NDC P

Linkages to other building blocks: Resource mobilization

2. Planning, monitoring, reporting and review

2.1 Possible gaps and overlaps

GAPS IN EXISTING NATIONAL POLICIES

2.G1 *Gap in monitoring the implementation of environmental and social safeguards on the ground*

Description: The GEF, as well as other mechanisms and processes, use checklists of safeguards with which the proponents of projects have to comply and which have to be addressed in the project description. However, at the national level, institutions lack the capacity to implement them and/or are not even aware that these safeguards exist. The absence of monitoring processes for how safeguards are implemented contributes to the existing gap in environmental and social integrity data related to implementing actions under the Rio Conventions at the national level.

2.G2 *Limited mechanisms to monitor and measure meaningful stakeholder participation across the Rio Conventions, both at national and international levels*

Description: While participation of youth, IPLCs, women and civil society is recognized in many policy frameworks and decisions, there are still limited indicators and accountability mechanisms to assess whether participation is meaningful, inclusive and reflected in implementation and decision-making processes, as well as monitoring/reporting processes.

2.G3 *Absence of interoperable data on climate, biodiversity and land degradation*

Description: Existing datasets on climate, biodiversity and land degradation are governed separately, with inconsistent taxonomies and access standards. Separate monitoring and reporting frameworks, indicators and reporting cycles under each Rio Convention create inconsistent datasets. Data is very fragmented across different sources and ministries, and is not shared.

GAPS IN EXISTING INTERNATIONAL POLICIES

2.G4 *Limited mechanisms to monitor and measure meaningful stakeholder participation across the Rio Conventions, both at national and international levels*

Description: While participation of youth, IPLCs, women and civil society is recognized in many policy frameworks and decisions, there are still limited indicators and accountability mechanisms to assess whether participation is meaningful, inclusive and reflected in implementation and decision-making processes, as well as monitoring/reporting processes.

2.G5 *No monitoring, reporting, or sharing of information from Parties at the international level on efforts to enhance policy coherence and synergies at the national level*

Description: Parties to the Rio Conventions do not have a mandate to report information on synergies and policy coherence in implementing the three Conventions. The Conventions' secretariats do not have a mandate to collect this information from Parties' reports and summarize it, even if Parties may voluntarily include it in their mandatory reports.

2.G6 *Separate monitoring and reporting frameworks, indicators and reporting cycles across the Rio Conventions*

Description: Traditionally, monitoring and reporting frameworks of the three Rio Conventions have been developed in silos, without any coordination between the Conventions' bodies and without any explicit intention to align in any way with the frameworks of the other two Conventions.

OVERLAPS IN EXISTING COORDINATION BODIES

2.01 *Different MEA reporting systems (ORT, ORS) and supporting knowledge management platforms around reporting processes*

Description: “Enter(collect) once, reuse multiple times” is difficult in practice without interoperability (e.g., as illustrated by the [Data Reporting Tool for MEAs \(DaRT\)](#) experience), both at the national level (implementation reports) and at the site level (PAs, OECMs, World Heritage, Ramsar Sites, etc.) and some alignment in national strategies and reporting structures. However, efforts to create useful, interoperable data and reporting tools and systems among MEAs have led, to varying degrees, to some overlap between those tools and systems. E.g., DaRT, developed by UNEP, was intended as a private national working space to connect national data to different reporting systems: the Online Reporting System (ORS), hosted by UNEP-WCMC since 2014 and used by several biodiversity-related Conventions for national reporting, and the Online Reporting Tool (ORT), managed by the CBD Secretariat and used by the CBD for national reporting. It was intended to reduce reporting duplication and serve as a joint workspace for MEA focal points. However, DaRT was not used as intended. Potential users showed low uptake because they perceived it as extra work, and interoperability issues limited seamless integration into ORS and ORT: for instance, using both systems required separate logins, increased coordination, and additional manual work to prepare corresponding national reports.

2.2 Concrete actions

INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION

2.A1 *Establish a permanent national working group or task force to oversee and regularly coordinate the aligned implementation of monitoring and reporting obligations under the Rio Conventions (and other MEAs)*

Description: The working group or task force would include the Conventions’ NFPs and civil servants from relevant technical departments of ministries and agencies and would help identify opportunities to develop common indicators and shared, interoperable data, monitoring and reporting systems across the Rio Conventions (and other MEAs). It would work closely with and inform the national coordination mechanism responsible for aligning national strategies and plans across the Conventions.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments, relevant ministries and NFPs

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization

2.A2 *Formally clarify and recognize monitoring and reporting coordination responsibilities (and associated training and capacity-building needs) among ministries and departments*

Description: Formally clarifying and recognizing through appropriate policy instruments the monitoring, reporting, and coordination responsibilities among ministries and departments, as well as the associated training and capacity-building that is needed for these responsibilities, is an important enabler for effective monitoring and reporting.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: National and subnational

Who is responsible: National and subnational governments

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; resource mobilization

HARMONIZED INDICATORS AND INTEROPERABLE DATA AND MONITORING AND REPORTING SYSTEMS

2.A3 *Develop a shared set of core indicators that can be used consistently across CBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD monitoring and reporting processes*

Description: Identify common components in the three Conventions and define common indicators.

Time frame: Short to medium term (maybe long term for post-2030 strategic frameworks)

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions

Linkages to other building blocks: All

2.A4 *Each Rio Convention to consider and integrate indicators from monitoring frameworks of the other two Conventions and the SDGs*

Description: When developing or revising their monitoring frameworks, each Rio Convention could consider indicators already contained in monitoring frameworks of the other two Conventions and the SDGs and integrate those that are also applicable to it.

Time frame: Short to medium term (maybe long term for post-2030 strategic frameworks)

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions

Good-practice examples: At its 67th meeting, in May 2026, the Standing Committee of the Convention on Wetlands adopted the [Indicator Framework for the Fifth Strategic Plan 2025-2034](#) of the Convention, whose development, where appropriate, was intentionally aligned to the indicators or the KMGBF Monitoring Framework and other indicators used at the global level by UN organizations and in the context of the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration. The Indicator Framework is accompanied by guidance and a reporting template for National Reports due by December 2027. By then, it will be possible to see if it has worked well, including from the perspective of Parties' ease of reporting

Linkages to other building blocks: All

2.A5 *Undertake an analysis of opportunities for alignment of indicators for MEA/Rio Conventions monitoring frameworks*

Description: An analysis of current and future opportunities for aligning indicators of the Rio Conventions, including as part of a broader analysis of opportunities that includes other MEAs, could provide a basis for developing a shared set of core indicators for the Rio Conventions or for each Convention to consider integrating indicators from monitoring frameworks of the other two Conventions and the SDGs.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: JLG, the Bern process

Good-practice examples: Initial analysis made under the Bern Process, at the [Bern III Conference](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

2.A6 *Map existing and potential common indicators across the Rio Conventions and harmonize and use them to align national strategies and targets, as a foundation for shared data and aligned monitoring and reporting*

Description: Progressively align and map national strategies and targets across the Rio Conventions (and other MEAs) and the SDGs using harmonized indicators to enable shared data systems (including metadata) and coherent, streamlined monitoring and reporting

Time frame: Short to long term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments, Rio Conventions NFPs (through existing coordination platforms and mechanisms)

Good-practice examples: Panama's [Nature Pledge](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

2.A7 *Develop shared and interoperable data and monitoring, reporting and review (MRR) systems, anchored in formal national coordination mechanisms across the Rio Conventions*

Description: This action would combine **technical** and **institutional** alignment to enable coherent and efficient MRR processes across biodiversity, climate and land agendas. At the technical level, it would promote: harmonization of indicators, methodologies and reporting formats across NBSAPs, NDCs and LDN targets; integrated national data platforms that allow data to be collected once and used across Conventions ("measure once, report many times"/"use once, reuse many times"); alignment with global frameworks. At the institutional level, it would establish or strengthen: inter-ministerial coordination mechanisms; regular alignment of reporting cycles, assessments and review processes; shared analytical capacity and data governance arrangements. Together, this ensures that MRR systems are simplified, interoperable and policy-relevant, reducing duplication while improving decision-making and coherence.

Make existing platforms connected or interoperable so data/ information reported under one MEA can be accessed and reused by others (e.g., facilitated by shared logins). Such a system could maximize the use of existing reporting outputs and reduce duplication across Conventions. It could allow Parties to validate and draw from a shared evidence base, streamlining reporting processes while maintaining national ownership and accountability.

Time frame: Short, medium and long term

Scale: National and international

Who is responsible: National governments (environment, agriculture, planning and statistics authorities; Rio Convention NFPs, other sectors), Rio Convention Secretariats, IT/ data teams

Good-practice examples: 1) The Online Reporting System (ORS) hosting reporting for several MEAs. 2) Learn from experience with the [Data Reporting Tool for MEAs \(DaRT\)](#), developed by UNEP. It was initially intended to address barriers to synergistic reporting (e.g., different reporting systems, timings, indicators, templates), but it did not work because each Convention requests different information. It was perceived as a burden. DaRT did not manage to find correspondences between the different reports, and MEA secretariats have not done so either. DaRT is currently not funded, and it may be difficult to continue as a standalone workstream. Therefore, relevant elements could be integrated into UNEP's broader digital transformation efforts. Countries with existing access may still be able to use it, although it is not being updated. 3) FAO Target 2 Road Map aligning restoration monitoring and reporting across Conventions: The [Framework for Ecosystem Restoration Monitoring \(FERM\)](#), curated by FAO, provides a shared platform through which countries can compile and report data, including geospatial information, on areas under restoration to CBD reports, and is currently undergoing integration with UNCCD's PRAIS platform.

4) [FAO Biodiversity Knowledge Hub](#) integrating data, indicators and methodologies for KMGBF implementation

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; knowledge management and capacity-building

2.A8 *Establish a task force to review existing national data management systems and develop recommendations for supporting data harmonization and interoperability between these systems and reporting platforms for Rio Conventions*

Description: Task force to review existing national data management systems and provide guidance to develop and strengthen these. Consider options for supporting interoperability between national data management systems and reporting platforms for Rio Conventions (PRAIS, ORT + BTR submission tool)

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, JLG

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building

2.A9 *Identify common challenges and opportunities in monitoring and reporting under the Rio Conventions and produce recommendations for how to better align metrics, monitoring and reporting moving forward*

Description: A shared analysis on challenges and opportunities, as well as a set of recommendations, could be produced by the secretariats of the Rio Conventions as part of their activities under the JLG.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: JLG

Good-practice examples: [ICCD/CRIC\(10\)/22](#) Note by the UNCCD Secretariat on “Synergies in reporting under the Rio Conventions”

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building

2.A10 *Develop national integrated environmental information systems*

Description: Establish or strengthen national data management platforms that consolidate environmental data across the three Rio Conventions into a single, accessible system. This would enable coherent monitoring and reduce duplication in data collection.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments and/or environment agencies

Good-practice examples: 1) Italy's [National Environmental Information System \(SINA\)](#), managed by ISPRA (Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e la Ricerca Ambientale), integrates multiple environmental datasets into a single national platform. 2) Madagascar's [Environmental Management Information System \(EMIS\)](#), managed by the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, compiles data and information from across the three Rio Conventions, including indicators, documents, and events. 3) Saint Lucia's [National Environmental Information System \(NEIS\)](#) centralizes information on indicators and reports to the three Rio Conventions.

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building

2.A11 *Ensure coherence in national reporting through developing and using common datasets, databases and maps across reports to the Rio Conventions (and other MEAs) and building capacities to use them*

Description: Countries are facing the issue of weak baselines of data, fragmented data systems, and limited capacity in monitoring and evaluation. However, significant efficiency gains can be achieved by developing and using common datasets, databases and maps across reports to the Rio Conventions (and other MEAs), identifying differences in the datasets used and building capacity to use them. Ensure that data systems integrate relevant datasets managed by sector ministries and agencies, including those responsible for agriculture, forestry, water, fisheries, natural resources, land-use planning, and other sectors contributing to Rio Convention implementation.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National level

Who is responsible: Government ministries responsible for the implementation of the Rio Conventions (in collaboration with national statistical offices and relevant sector ministries and agencies responsible for agriculture, forestry, water, fisheries, land-use planning, natural resources, energy and other relevant datasets), regional and international organizations

Good-practice examples: 1) Armenia's [National Geoportal](#), part of Armenia's National Spatial Data Infrastructure, with base maps that cover all land use. 2) Spain uses the same nationally generated land cover map series as the basis for reporting to the three Rio Conventions ([The Land Story](#), p. 28-29). 3) UNEP-WCMC's [National Monitoring Support Initiative](#) (focused on KMGBF monitoring) supports project countries also to take a cross-convention perspective

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building

2.A12 *Support the collection and use of existing high-quality data through existing platforms that can be utilized for reporting across the Rio Conventions*

Description: Support the collection and use of high-quality data through existing platforms to support countries in identifying, prioritizing, and reporting progress on land-use pathways that deliver simultaneous climate, biodiversity, and land benefits. A global, regional or national knowledge support service could help NFPs and others navigate the landscape of competing platforms from different actors.

Time frame: Short to long term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Secretariats of the Rio Conventions, Data/Platform service providers, national governments

Good-practice examples: 1) Operationalizing spatial frameworks like [Trends.Earth](#) for LDN monitoring and the [Climate Positive Land Use Strategy](#) (CPLUS). These are already being used to support joint planning and monitoring between the UNCCD and CBD. 2) [UN Biodiversity Lab](#) (UNBL) is also relevant here, e.g., its KMGBF monitoring framework data collection, displays of spatial headline indicators, and workspaces that support the consolidation of national data and is being used by Parties under CBD. UNBL is also working closely with the Trends.Earth team around data sharing and interoperability. UNBL also has data collections on ecosystem restoration and NbS for climate change that could be further developed in line with specific UNCCD and UNFCCC decisions

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building

2.A13 *Create common or compatible forest, soil, water and ocean indicators across Rio Convention reporting processes*

Description: Develop (or identify) a limited set of forest, soil, water and ocean-related indicators to reduce reporting burdens and strengthen coherence across the KMGBF monitoring framework, the Paris Agreement transparency arrangements, the Global Goal on Adaptation indicators and the UNCCD indicator and monitoring framework. The aim is not to create new indicators, but to identify and flag comparable indicators to ensure coherence across Conventions. This could also apply to other key thematic issues spanning all three Rio Conventions, e.g., food systems.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Rio Convention secretariats, subsidiary bodies, Parties, NFPs, scientific bodies, relevant UN data platforms

Good-practice examples: Climate Data for Adaptation and Resilience Typology ([Climate DART](#)) as a possible mechanism

Linkages to other building blocks: All

2.A14 *Develop and integrate common indicators on stakeholder participation and contributions (including youth, IPLCs, women, and civil society) within national and international monitoring and reporting frameworks under the Rio Conventions*

Description: Because contributions of stakeholders like IPLCs, youth, women and civil society remain largely invisible, if their participation is not measured, it is difficult to recognize, support, or improve it.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National and international

Who is responsible: National governments, NFPs, Parties to the Rio Conventions

Good-practice examples: The WRI [Systems Change Lab](#) has some governance indicators they track

Linkages to other building blocks: All

2.A15 *Map IPLC indicators across the Rio Conventions for identifying gaps and develop guidelines for including biocultural indicators in monitoring systems*

Description: Several monitoring indicators are used across the Conventions, e.g., indicators for the GGA and indicators for the KMGBF. Mapping which indicators come from IPLCs or reflect ILK can show where gaps remain. Guidelines on how to include biocultural indicators in these and national monitoring systems would help countries that want to expand their approaches.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: JLG can coordinate; other partners like the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership

Good-practice examples: [Biocultural indicators](#) research

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; contributions and rights of IPLCs

2.A16 *Introduce common ILK knowledge indicators and align existing indicators related to IPLCs in monitoring frameworks of the Rio Conventions, after recommendation by the JLG*

Description: One solution would be to alleviate the different monitoring frameworks by ensuring a common set of indicators. For example, the KMGBF monitoring framework ([CBD COP decision 16/31](#), Annex I) has a headline indicator (22.1) on land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous peoples and local communities, and another one (22.b) about representation and participation in decision-making by indigenous peoples and local communities, still in development. Something similar could apply to the Paris Agreement and the UNCCD.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, JLG

Linkages to other building blocks: All

2.A17 *Scale up implementation of the CBD Target 2 Roadmap by promoting the use of the FAO Framework for Ecosystem Restoration Monitoring (FERM) as a common platform to harmonize data, track progress, and support reporting on ecosystem restoration across Conventions*

Description: The Target 2 Road Map, established in 2023 and formally launched with a renewed mandate at CBD SBSTTA-27, following [CBD COP decision 16/35](#), is a global partnership to monitor progress towards restoring 30% of degraded ecosystems by 2030 under Target 2 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. It is led by FAO, as custodian for the Target 2 headline indicator on area under restoration, and is developed in collaboration with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Society for Ecological Restoration (SER), the Landscape Alliance, and other partners. The Road Map is organized around a Leads Group that sets strategic direction, a Coordinator responsible for day-to-day management, and four working groups covering indicator development and monitoring guidance by ecosystem type, data and FERM, national and regional capacity development, and Indigenous Peoples restoration monitoring. Expected outcomes include targeted capacity development, harmonized monitoring guidance, an interoperable data-sharing framework centered on FERM, active engagement of Indigenous Peoples, and documented synergies and harmonized reporting recommendations across the Rio Conventions ([CBD/CBI/6/INF/4](#)).

Time frame: Short and medium

Scale: International and national

Who is responsible: UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration, CBD, UNCCD, UNFCCC, FAO, UNEP, Society for Ecological Restoration (SER), Landscape Alliance, GPFLR, WWF

Good-practice examples: The alignment of FERM with the CBD's Online Reporting Tool (ORT) helps countries access default data and facilitates data flow and reporting templates, offering a working example of how such alignment can support reporting across Conventions

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans

TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC INPUTS

2.A18 *Invite IPCC, IPBES and UNCCD's SPI to host a joint technical workshop on best available experience and evidence across the Rio Conventions on transparency, monitoring, reporting and review*

Description: This could include the identification of evidence and experience on: any common challenges or gaps in monitoring and reporting under the Rio Conventions, including in relation to indicators and metrics and the needs of reporting and accounting frameworks under the CBD, UNFCCC, Paris Agreement and UNCCD; ways to better understand the contribution that native ecosystems play in addressing climate change, biodiversity loss and land degradation (this could help to develop policies, financial incentives, and better business cases for investment in nature-based solutions to address climate change, land and biodiversity); ways to enhance the measurement and economic valuation of the benefits arising from addressing biodiversity loss and climate change in synergistic ways - including to support better recognition and investment.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: COPs of the Rio Conventions (to invite IPBES, IPCC and UNCCD's SPI to host the workshop)

Good-practice examples: The IPCC-IPBES co-sponsored workshop in 2020

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making

2.A19 *Commission international panels of experts to evaluate the potential value-add of building synergies in monitoring and reporting across Conventions, including the potential to improve the cost-effectiveness of reporting, and identify common themes, metrics and standards of production*

Description: Compile all relevant submissions on potential indicators under KMGBF, UNCCD and Paris Agreement processes, with a focus on ecological integrity, ecosystem resilience, climate risks to biodiversity, and ecosystem-based adaptation, to identify where specific indicators or metrics already provide concrete linkages. This process would support identifying commonalities (e.g., on ecosystem integrity and resilience, connectivity, ecosystem services) and related indicators, and suggest production standards across these (i.e., resolution, units, etc.).

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, JLG/ Rio Convention Secretariats to commission

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; WoSA

2.A20 *Encourage use of ILK for reporting across all targets under the Rio Conventions*

Description: ILK has a wealth of information relevant to reporting for the Rio Conventions, but it is often used only for reporting on limited targets, such as target 22 of the KMGBF. Monitoring and reporting frameworks that encourage use of ILK can institutionalize this approach for reporting across all KMGBF targets and targets under the other Rio Conventions.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: International, national and local

Who is responsible: COPs should indicate where ILK-focused reporting can inform targets, and related agencies/donors can support national processes to find pathways to support this

Good-practice examples: The UNESCO-supported [National ILK Outlook](#) has shown this is feasible for the three pilot countries of the study

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

2.A21 *Facilitate use of science-policy interface assessments to help guide NbS and/or EBA monitoring*

Description: Both recent IPCC and IPBES assessment reports have stressed the important benefits of NbS/EBA and laid out criteria for realizing these (e.g., benefits across not only biodiversity and climate, but also water, food, health, equity, etc). These reports can be used to identify key indicators for monitoring and reporting on NbS/EBA, alongside other existing tools and guidelines, e.g., through the issuance of fact sheets on NbS/EBA and key performance indicators (KPIs).

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: IPCC and IPBES secretariats, UNCCD secretariat (for UNCCD's SPI)

Good-practice examples: UK report on [NbS metrics](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

MONITORING COHERENCE OF POLICY FRAMEWORKS AND SYNERGISTIC IMPLEMENTATION

2.A22 *Develop mechanisms and indicators to measure and assess how coherent policy frameworks for implementation of the Rio Conventions are and how synergistic implementation has been*

Description: Like a national Rio Conventions synergies stocktake.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: Rio Conventions NFPs

Good-practice examples: Experience of Rwanda on Rio Conventions cross-delivery and the establishment of a steering committee for chemicals-based and Rio Conventions, with a mandate to evaluate the synergistic implementation of these Conventions ([UNEP/EA.7/INF/6](#), p. 40)

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building

REVIEWS/STOCKTAKES

2.A23 *Assess opportunities for further alignment of upcoming global reviews (CBD KMGBF), global stocktakes (Paris Agreement) and reviews of the implementation of the UNCCD and its Strategic Framework*

Description: When considering modalities and procedures for upcoming global reviews under the CBD, GSTs under the Paris Agreement and reviews of the implementation of the UNCCD and

its Strategic Framework, Parties to the Rio Conventions can consider and adopt measures for their respective reviews/stocktakes to inform and be informed by the reviews/stocktakes and work under the other two Rio Conventions. This could include aspects such as timelines, reports, science-policy interface contributions, etc.

Time frame: Short, medium and long term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making

SYNERGY PRINCIPLES

2.A24 *Develop synergistic implementation principles to underpin monitoring and reporting synergies across the Rio Conventions*

Description: These principles could provide the basis and rationale for synergistic monitoring and reporting, e.g., just as the principles of real, additional, environmental integrity and no double counting have become the foundations of much climate reporting. However, few “synergy principles” currently exist to drive more aligned monitoring and reporting. This could be addressed by each Convention developing, on its own, a set of principles that could help encourage synergies within each of their own mandated areas

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions

Good-practice examples: The Kyoto Protocol’s CMP includes a biodiversity accounting principle in [decision 16/CMP.1](#), para 1(e), that LULUCF activities should contribute to the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of natural resources. On this basis, Parties were required to report, for example, on whether they were converting natural forest to planted forests

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans

COMMUNITY-LED (INCLUDING IPLC-LED, WOMEN-LED, YOUTH-LED) MONITORING

2.A25 *Establish formal mechanisms to integrate community-led and traditional knowledge monitoring systems into national monitoring and reporting processes*

Description: Governments could create official pathways for community-generated data, youth-led monitoring initiatives and traditional knowledge systems to inform national reports and global reviews/stocktakes under the Rio Conventions

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments, NFPs, IPLC organizations, women’s organizations, youth networks, grassroots organizations

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

2.A26 *Hold local to national dialogues and undertake other capacity-building activities on community-based monitoring to create the capacity of IPLCs, women, youth and citizen*

scientists and national and subnational staff to work together and create awareness of NFPs

Description: IPLCs, women, youth, citizen scientists, etc. are on the ground accessing spaces and species, with data and knowledge needed across the Rio Conventions (and other MEAs). Equip these communities and national and subnational staff to work together and build effective, high-quality data/information flows. The dialogues could also help make NFPs aware of existing data from community-based monitoring and address concerns about the quality and management (ownership, etc.) of data from IPLCs.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National, local

Who is responsible: National and subnational governments, capacity-building providers

Good-practice examples: 1) [Vanuatu's Traditional Knowledge Strategy and Traditional Knowledge Indicators Booklet](#). 2) [Australia's indigenous monitoring platform](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

2.A27 *Establish community-based monitoring units at restoration and other sites, co-designed with women's and youth groups and IPLC representatives using protocols that blend traditional knowledge with standardized Rio Conventions indicators*

Description: Build capacity of IPLCs, women, youth and grassroots organizations to monitor conservation, sustainable use and restoration activities in a way in which they can learn and that is compatible with and can be integrated into national monitoring and reporting systems under the Rio Conventions.

Time frame: Short, medium, long term

Scale: National, local

Who is responsible: NFPs, IGOs, implementation agencies

Good-practice examples: The FAO [Indigenous Peoples' Biocentric Restoration Global Programme](#), active in Brazil, Peru, Ecuador, Costa Rica, Bolivia, Nepal, India and Thailand, has developed a participatory Indigenous-led monitoring system. The system was co-designed with Indigenous Peoples' organizations, elders, women and youth through "Schools of Life," and blends ancestral ecological knowledge with digital monitoring tools, with links being established to the Framework for Ecosystem Restoration Monitoring (FERM) under Target 2 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

2.A28 *Provide long-term financial, technical and institutional support to women-led community-based monitoring systems and grassroots evidence initiatives, and establish dedicated reporting and participation channels for women's organizations within reporting processes under all three Rio Conventions*

Description: Women's experiences and territorial knowledge are still too often excluded from official monitoring systems, indicators and assessments. Support is needed to strengthen the visibility and use of women-led and community-based knowledge systems.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: Local, national, international

Who is responsible: Financial institutions, implementing agencies, national governments, gender focal points

Good-practice examples: One example is the [CBD Women's Caucus Gender and Biodiversity Data initiative](#), developed in collaboration with the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). Other relevant examples include Gender and Environment Data Alliance (GEDA), as well as work under the CBD Article 8(j) programme. However, these efforts remain fragmented and peripheral to the core evidence systems informing Rio Convention negotiations and COP decisions.

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

MONITORING IMPLEMENTATION OF SAFEGUARDS ON THE GROUND

2.A29 *Develop indicators, processes and capacities to monitor how existing environmental and social safeguards related to the Rio Conventions are being implemented on the ground*

Description: A huge gap exists in monitoring the implementation of environmental and social safeguards related to the Rio Conventions on the ground. For example, the GEF has developed a checklist for approving projects that include required safeguards. However, national institutions lack the capacity to implement them and are not aware of these safeguards. Developing the appropriate monitoring frameworks and processes would help to close this gap.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National, international

Who is responsible: National governments, Parties to the Rio Conventions, funds and operating entities of the financial mechanism of the Rio Conventions, other financial institutions

Linkages to other building blocks: All

CUSTODIAN AGENCIES

2.A30 *Leveraging custodian agencies for specific indicators to advance coherence across the Rio Conventions*

Description: The use of custodian agencies (specifically IGOs) can be effective in delegating technical expertise for thematic priorities in an effort to advance coherence. For example, for indicators that span all three Rio Conventions, designating an IGO to house reporting on those indicators can help ensure alignment. These agencies can be a particular Convention Secretariat itself, or another IGO within the multilateral system.

Time frame: Short to long term (aligned with the identification of relevant indicators that span the three Rio Conventions)

Scale: International

Who is responsible: IGOs/UN Agencies

Good-practice examples: UNCCD, as custodian agency for SDG indicator 15.3.1, on proportion of land that is degraded over total land area, provides [methodological guidance](#) for countries reporting on this indicator

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building

MAKING THE CASE/ARGUMENTS FOR SYNERGISTIC MONITORING AND REPORTING**2.A31** *Document the cost of multiple independent reporting in countries and regions and the potential resource savings associated with synergistic reporting*

Description: Commission a study on the cost of reporting, based on multiple countries' experiences/surveys from different regions. Building on the idea that joint reporting mechanisms should lead to significant resource savings for countries and their constituencies (in terms of human effort), the idea is to formally demonstrate the multiple benefits of defining at least some common indicators, methodologies or data sources to inform national progress on the implementation of the Rio Conventions

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Secretariats of the Rio Conventions/JLG to initiate the process, GEF or other funders to support the study

Good-practice examples: The Economics of Land Degradation project estimated annual savings of 25.38 million US dollars for [Rwanda](#) from implementing an integrated monitoring and evaluation system for land restoration, among other savings from coordinated implementation of land-focused activities under the Rio Conventions

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; resource mobilization

COMMUNICATION/AWARENESS**2.A32** *Improve communication/awareness of existing tools to facilitate data and monitoring and reporting alignment across the Rio Conventions*

Description: A wealth of tools exist or are being developed to support Parties and non-State actors in sharing and integrating data and monitoring and reporting across the Rio Conventions, but not all interested Parties and stakeholders are aware of them. Further efforts should be made to communicate and make potential users aware of these tools.

Time frame: Short term (& ongoing as new tools are made available)

Scale: International, regional, national

Who is responsible: Rio Convention secretariats, JLG, NFPs, technical support and capacity-building providers

Good-practice examples: SCP's [COP30 Summary Brief on initiatives and programmes supporting synergistic implementation of the Rio Conventions](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building

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

3.1 Possible gaps and overlaps

GAPS IN EXISTING NATIONAL POLICIES

3.G1 *Lack of consistency in operationalizing ecosystem functioning across Rio Conventions implementation, both at the national and the international levels*

Description: Existing national and international policies often refer to ecosystem restoration, NbS or land management, but implementation guidance and monitoring still tend to prioritize area, carbon, productivity or habitat extent. A gap remains in how planning, finance, monitoring and review reflect ecosystem condition, ecological interactions, ecosystem integrity and animal-mediated processes. This weakens coherence because biodiversity, climate and land outcomes depend not only on ecosystem area, or carbon stored but on whether ecosystems are functioning and resilient.

GAPS IN EXISTING INTERNATIONAL POLICIES

3.G2 *Lack of consistency in operationalizing ecosystem functioning across Rio Conventions implementation, both at the national and the international levels*

Description: Existing national and international policies often refer to ecosystem restoration, NbS or land management, but implementation guidance and monitoring still tend to prioritize area, carbon, productivity or habitat extent. A gap remains in how planning, finance, monitoring and review reflect ecosystem condition, ecological interactions, ecosystem integrity and animal-mediated processes. This weakens coherence because biodiversity, climate and land outcomes depend not only on ecosystem area, or carbon stored but on whether ecosystems are functioning and resilient.

3.G3 *Lack of a common definition and/or understanding of “nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches” among the three Rio Conventions*

Description: While decisions of the three Rio Conventions have referred to “nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches”, and while the UNFCCC COP, the Paris Agreement CMA and the CBD COP have referenced or noted UNEA resolution 5/5 by which UNEA members adopted an agreed definition of “nature-based solutions”, none of the Conventions has provided a definition of these concepts, and there is no common understanding among the three Conventions about their meaning.

3.2 Concrete actions

COMMON PRINCIPLES, SAFEGUARDS AND GUIDANCE

3.A1 *Develop, through an inclusive process, common principles and safeguards for high-integrity NbS and/or EBA across the Rio Conventions*

Description: Develop, through an inclusive process across the three Rio Conventions, and building on existing frameworks, a common set of mutually reinforcing principles to guide the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of high-integrity NbS/EBA. A common set of social and environmental safeguards would also be developed to ensure that NbS/EBA contribute positively to biodiversity, climate and land objectives while preventing harm to ecosystems and communities. A process for the development of social and environmental safeguards for the three Rio Conventions, based on the lessons learned from past safeguards implementation in biodiversity finance mechanisms, would include broad participation from rights holders who face the biggest impacts of the lack of safeguards or their bad implementation, especially IPLCs, women, youth and CSOs, as well as relevant sectoral stakeholders, particularly farmers', producers' and land managers' organizations.

The [CBD Voluntary Guidelines for the Design and Effective Implementation of EBA to Climate Change Adaptation and DRR \("Voluntary Guidelines for EbA and Eco-DRR"\)](#) contain principles and safeguards for implementing EBA, but not for NbS. However, CBD COP16 requested the Executive Secretary to develop a supplement to these guidelines, providing voluntary guidance for the design, effective implementation and scaling up of NbS and/or EBA to climate change mitigation and adaptation, including updating guidance on social and environmental safeguards, for consideration by the SBSTTA before COP17. SBSTTA27 noted the work undertaken towards the draft supplement to the Voluntary Guidelines and an expanded version of it, and requested the Executive Secretary to invite Parties, other Governments and observers to participate in a peer review of an updated expanded supplement, including the revised primer for policymakers, and, following the review, to make the further revised primer for policymakers available for consideration by CBD COP17.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, JLG

Good-practice examples: 1) Relevant existing frameworks include: The [CBD Voluntary Guidelines for EbA and Eco-DRR](#); the [IUCN Global Standard for NbS](#); and relevant UNFCCC and UNCCD decisions. 2) Guidelines by CSOs: [NbS Guidelines](#), containing case studies

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A2 *Incorporate human rights and the maintenance of ecosystem integrity into guidance containing common principles and safeguards for high-integrity NbS and/or EBA across the Rio Conventions, to be developed through a participatory process*

Description: Develop guidance showing how project design, implementation and monitoring of NbS and/or EBA can account for the respect of human rights (and thus contributing to protecting and realizing the rights of the people and communities dependent on ecosystems, including the right to a healthy environment) and the maintenance of ecosystem integrity (which includes a holistic view of ecosystem structure, function and composition, including species interactions and ecological processes that enable ecosystems to persist, adapt, recover and deliver benefits to people), and how these considerations can support outcomes that provide synergistic benefits for Rio Convention objectives.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, JLG

Good-practice examples: 1) [IUCN Global Standard on NbS](#); 2) [CBD Voluntary Guidelines for EbA and Eco-DRR](#); 3) IPBES assessments and indicators on ecosystem condition, integrity and nature's contribution to people; 4) [Scientific Consensus on Wildlife and Climate](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A3 *Recommend the CBD Voluntary Guidelines for EbA and Eco-DRR and its supplement to UNFCCC and UNCCD Parties for consideration, uptake and implementation*

Description: CBD COP decision 16/22 on Biodiversity and Climate Change already invites UNFCCC's bodies and Parties to consider using the Voluntary Guidelines for Parties to integrate biodiversity and social safeguards in mitigation and adaptation. However, such an invitation to the UNCCD's bodies and Parties is still missing, and the UNFCCC's bodies have not formally followed up. A similar invitation could be made by a CBD COP17 decision to the UNFCCC's and UNCCD's bodies and Parties regarding the Voluntary Guidelines and its supplement to be adopted at CBD COP17.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the CBD (through the COP)

Good-practice examples: CBD COP decision 16/22 Biodiversity and Climate Change, paras. 4, 12

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A4 *Anchor the application of the CBD Voluntary Guidelines for EbA and Eco-DRR and its supplement in decisions within the UNFCCC and the UNCCD*

Description: Similar to the CBD COP decision 16/22, the UNFCCC and the UNCCD COPs could anchor the recommended application of the guidelines and its supplement within UNCCD COP17 (which will, however, take place before the supplement is adopted at CBD COP17) and UNFCCC COP31 decisions. The supplement could be taken up, or at least welcomed/noted, by the other Rio Conventions COPs so it does not continue to be used in a silo by CBD focal points.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the UNCCD and the UNFCCC

Good-practice examples: CBD COP decision 16/22 on Biodiversity and Climate Change, paras. 4, 12

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A5 *Accelerate dissemination and uptake of the CBD Voluntary Guidelines for EbA and Eco-DRR and its supplement within UNFCCC and UNCCD processes by leveraging existing platforms*

Description: Leverage existing platforms, e.g., technical and scientific cooperation mechanisms, to share best practices and tools - especially important for UNFCCC where emphasis is on not creating new processes and platforms

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, secretariats, JLG

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A6 *Clear translation of the supplement to the CBD Voluntary Guidelines for EbA and Eco-DRR into a technical series document*

Description: Once agreed, the new supplement should be a helpful set of updated guidelines, and importantly provide clear principles and safeguards for NbS and/or EBA projects. However, the supplement may be very long and would need clear explanation to Parties and others to ensure uptake, which could be done through a CBD technical series document. This would also facilitate sharing across other parts of government to mainstream these approaches, principles and safeguards.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: The CBD Secretariat

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A7 *Mandate the regular updating of the CBD Voluntary Guidelines for EbA and Eco-DRR (2019) every 5 years, with input from all Secretariats*

Description: Regularly update the CBD Voluntary Guidelines for EbA and Eco-DRR to ensure contemporary science, principles and safeguards are available for Parties and implementation actors

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the CBD, CBD Secretariat

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A8 *Support the broad communication, dissemination and application of the CBD Voluntary Guidelines for EbA and Eco-DRR and its supplement, including through workshops and the regional and subregional support centres of the Rio Conventions*

Description: The CBD Voluntary Guidelines for EbA and Eco-DRR and its supplement should be used by a broad range of actors including policymakers and practitioners at national and subnational level. They should be widely communicated to policymakers and implementers. One opportunity to discuss how to use the guidance, and to raise questions/get expert support, could be to organize workshops. This could be done regionally and, ideally, also connected to UNFCCC meetings, where the guidance is less visible. The regional and subregional support centres of the Rio Conventions should make use of the Voluntary Guidelines and its supplement in supporting Parties in the uptake and implementation, e.g., by providing further guidance and toolkits at the regional and subregional level and capacity-building

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International, regional, national, subnational

Who is responsible: National governments, development agencies, CSOs, the JLG through the Rio Conventions JCBP, regional and subregional support centres of the Rio Conventions, other capacity-building providers

Good-practice examples: 1) The NBSAP AP focal points have helped to run workshops like these. 2) A request to the CBD Executive Secretary to share the Voluntary Guidelines and its supplement with CBD's regional and subregional TSC Support Centres with a view to promoting enhanced capacities and the effective uptake of scientific and technical guidance by Parties was included in the draft decision on biodiversity and climate change that SBSTTA27 recommended to COP17 ([CBD/SBSTTA/REC/27/3](#))

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A9 *Establish an ad hoc technical expert group (AHTEG) across the Rio Conventions to bring expertise on NbA and/or EBA and concepts like ecosystem integrity more formally into the Rio Conventions and inform common guidance*

Description: This AHTEG would allow a variety of stakeholders to formally contribute expertise on NbS/EBA to Party implementation under the Rio Conventions. For example, the AHTEG could help to explain and guide the use of concepts like ecosystem integrity, and how to protect and conserve it for benefits across the Rio Conventions as part of NbS/EBA. The AHTEG could provide technical input to the JLG of the Rio Conventions. It could also provide an expert foundation and advice for setting up a Joint Work Programme of the Rio Conventions, if Parties are interested in the future.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions (Rio Conventions governing and/or subsidiary bodies), secretariats, JLG

Good-practice examples: The AHTEG on indicators under the CBD helped to create the KMGBF monitoring framework with experts across society

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A10 *Compile an evidence note/synthesis on ecosystem functioning/integrity and translate it into implementation guidance*

Description: Prepare, based on evidence from IPBES and/or IPBES reports and other sources, a concise evidence note/synthesis mapping where ecosystem function/integrity (including wildlife-mediated processes) is relevant across the Rio Convention guidance processes, and where operational/implementation gaps remain. Based on the note/synthesis, develop accessible guidance for Parties on how ecosystem function/integrity can be reflected in national planning, restoration, NbS/EBA, monitoring, safeguards and financial criteria

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International, with national and regional application

Who is responsible: Technical and scientific bodies of the Rio Conventions, Rio Convention secretariats, JLG, academic institutions, expert CSOs

Good-practice examples: 1) [Scientific Consensus on Wildlife and Climate](#), launched at UNFCCC SB64; 2) IFAW [Wildlife guidelines for NDCs](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Aligning national strategies and plans; planning, monitoring, reporting and review; NbS/EBA; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; resource mobilization

3.A11 *Provide guidance on how to set up frameworks for addressing trade-offs when implementing NbS and/or EBA*

Description: NbS/EBA can not equally deliver for all needs - yet there are generally no platforms for facilitating dialogue on how to identify and tackle trade-offs, as well as no guidance on how to set up frameworks for addressing them. These platforms need to be locally to nationally relevant, as trade-offs are shaped by culture and history and are context-specific. Locally led and stewarded restoration initiatives that rely on multi-stakeholder partnerships provide valuable models, particularly in landscapes, as they negotiate multiple trade-offs among diverse interests and objectives.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: Local to national

Who is responsible: National and subnational governments

Good-practice examples: [UK land use framework](#) and development of [local nature recovery strategies](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A12 *Align definitions and accounting rules and guidance across the Rio Conventions to differentiate ecosystem condition, functionality and composition from a focus on carbon longevity only*

Description: Develop aligned definitions and accounting approaches across the Rio Conventions that distinguish ecosystem condition, composition and functionality from carbon storage and longevity alone. This should support assessment of whether ecosystems retain the species,

interactions and ecological processes needed to persist, adapt and recover over time, while recognizing that carbon outcomes are only one component of ecosystem integrity. The work should build on existing concepts and indicators under the three Conventions and relevant science-policy bodies, rather than creating unnecessary new reporting requirements.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, secretariats, JLG, academics and other experts

Good-practice examples: [UN System of Environmental-Economic Accounting-Ecosystem Accounting](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; planning, monitoring, reporting and review

MAINSTREAMING NbS/EBA

3.A13 *Integrate NbS and/or EBA, including landscape restoration, into long-term national development planning across agriculture, land-use, infrastructure, and spatial planning systems, through whole-of-government and whole-of-economy approaches*

Description: It is important that sectors other than the environmental sector are also informed by the possibility and benefits of applying NbS and/or EBA and that these approaches are considered by them when making decisions. This could also include landscape restoration, which, as a distinct application of NbS, requires dedicated principles, planning frameworks, and governance approaches to coordinate action across sectors and scales.

Time frame: Long term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions

Good-practice examples: 1) The [Essential Life Support Areas \(ELSAs\)](#) framework and tool available on the UN Biodiversity Lab has been developed with the support of Parties and both UNCCD and CBD Secretariats to support Parties to identify nature-based actions that deliver across the spatial KMGBF targets (including Target 8) and in line with the LDN mitigation hierarchy. Governments in more than 15 countries have used it to support work on NBSAPs, 7th National Reports, climate change NAPs, and other national policy documents and applications. 2) Rwanda's national Forest Landscape Restoration Strategy uses Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology ([ROAM](#)) to identify restoration opportunities across forests, agricultural land, watersheds, and other land uses, making the landscape the planning unit for restoration interventions.

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A14 *Embed NbS and/or EBA systematically in national frameworks, including in aligned NDCs, NAPs, NBSAPs, LDN targets and National Drought Plans, and streamline NbS and/or EBA implementation across projects and funding streams*

Description: NbS/EBA are tools that can achieve multiple outcomes and help break down siloed approaches. Integrate NbS/EBA into NDCs, NAPs and NBSAPs, LDN targets and NDPs as core delivery mechanisms supported by standardized reporting templates and metrics, while using and strengthening existing structures to enable countries to pursue integrated reporting without undue burden on capacity and budget.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments

Good-practice examples: Integration of NbS/EBA in Colombia's NDC, NAP and NBSAP ([Effectively delivering on climate and nature: NDCs, NAPs and NBSAPs synergies. A checklist for National policymakers](#), p. 27)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A15 *Support the strengthening of existing, or the establishment of new, government-centered technical assistance platforms to support national governments in scaling NbS and/or EBA*

Description: Strengthen existing, or where needed establish new, government-centered technical assistance platforms to provide coordinated, demand-driven support for scaling NbS and/or EBA. Using NbS/EBA as an entry point, these platforms would help countries align national planning instruments (including NDCs, NAPs, NBSAPs and LDN targets), strengthen institutional coordination, mobilize technical expertise and finance, and accelerate the integrated implementation of commitments under the CBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD, while reducing fragmentation and enhancing policy coherence across the three Rio Conventions.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National - International

Who is responsible: Parties, donors, NDC P, NBSAP AP

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; planning, monitoring, reporting and review; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization

LANDSCAPE AND TERRITORIAL SCALE

3.A16 *Direct more development and environmental funding to “living labs” to leverage the landscape/territory scale*

Description: Promote the landscape and/or territorial scale as the main level of action to design and implement NbS/EBA, based on participatory and interdisciplinary approaches. Involve all local stakeholders in such living labs to both frame their problems and co-construct the solutions.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: International, national

Who is responsible: Governing bodies of national and international financial institutions, donors

Good-practice examples: [Santés & Territoires](#) project

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

COMMUNITY-LED NbS/EBA

3.A17 *Prioritize and promote inclusive community-led NbS and/or EBA, co-designed and implemented by women, youth, IPLCs, through direct technical, institutional and financial support*

Description: Increase technical, institutional and financial support for locally-led initiatives that deliver biodiversity conservation, climate adaptation/mitigation and sustainable land management outcomes simultaneously. Promote NbS and EBA co-designed and implemented by women,

youth and IPLCs to deliver integrated, gender-responsive outcomes across CBD, UNCCD, and UNFCCC with simplified financing, inclusive implementation mechanisms, and harmonized gender action plans.

Time frame: Short, medium and long term

Scale: Local, national, regional, international

Who is responsible: National governments, NFPs, GEF, GBFF, GCF, Adaptation Fund, development partners, local authorities, CSOs

Good-practice examples: The [Nyandungu Eco-park](#) in Kigali, Rwanda, is a compelling government-led example of integrated NbS and EBA in action, restoring a degraded wetland ecosystem while simultaneously creating approximately 4,000 green jobs, improving community resilience to climate change, and conserving biodiversity

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

PRIVATE SECTOR AND MARKETS

3.A18 *Build confidence in nature markets by ensuring the integrity of markets and systems that support demand, confidence and the supply of nature projects, including to fund conservation across different land tenures (including private and IPLCs)*

Description: Increase private sector investment in biodiversity by ensuring the integrity of markets and systems that support demand, confidence and the supply of nature projects, including to fund conservation across different land tenures (including private and IPLCs). Mobilizing private sector investment is essential to scaling up biodiversity action. Market-based approaches such as nature credits can play a key role in unlocking this potential, and governments can help build confidence in the integrity of these markets. This action could generate significant additional investment in biodiversity action across public, private and IPLC land. Private investors should be increasingly able to identify high-impact opportunities, build partnerships and align biodiversity action with their own goals. Private and IPLC landowners could access this private investment, increasing the protection and restoration action happening across national jurisdictions. Third-party verification systems can support this and ensure independent auditing systems.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National and International

Who is responsible: National governments, global high-integrity assurance frameworks and mechanisms (as required)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A19 *Develop common co-benefit metric frameworks for NbS and/or EBA investments through climate and biodiversity markets*

Description: Climate markets and biodiversity markets currently operate with entirely separate verification and certification systems. As a result, co-benefits are verified by different bodies, reported to different Conventions, and monetized through separate instruments. One option could be to commission a technical review to assess existing co-benefit metric frameworks and identify a minimum shared set of indicators to verify and finance integrated NbS/EBA investments across the three Conventions.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, secretariats, JLG (through a dedicated AHTEG or joint expert group)

Good-practice examples: The [Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures \(TNFD\)](#) is developing metrics for nature-related risks and opportunities that span biodiversity and climate

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A20 *Invite IPBES to organize a workshop for considering the adequacy of global NbS and/or EBA project accounting standards and whether any common methodological guidance or frameworks are needed to help inform the tracking and assurance of high-quality, high-integrity NbS and/or EBA outcomes*

Description: The workshop would review current potential for nature markets to deliver high-quality NbS/EBA for joint synergies under the Rio Conventions, in line with the options identified in the Nexus Assessment and joint IPCC-IPBES Workshop report, and would consider whether any common methodological guidance or frameworks are needed to help inform the tracking and assurance of high-quality, high-integrity NbS/EBA outcomes. There would be a workshop report.

Time frame: Short term (for an initial exploratory discussion between Convention secretariats and IPBES Co-chairs)

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, secretariats

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A21 *Explore what role the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) should play in creating the global data architecture for high-integrity nature markets - to mobilize private-sector funding for NbS and/or EBA*

Description: High-integrity biodiversity credit markets depend on several data functions: a. Baselines and counterfactuals. b. Monitoring, reporting, and verification (MRV). c. Transparency and confidence. These three needs (baseline, MRV, transparency) could align directly with GBIF's strengths and could be explored further. Policy and finance initiatives already signal that GBIF could be part of the global nature data architecture: The Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD) has explicitly recommended scaling up GBIF to support corporate biodiversity data sharing. Corporate actors are increasingly publishing ecological data via GBIF to support disclosures and assessments. This indicates that GBIF could potentially move from a research infrastructure to a core nature market infrastructure component

Time frame: Short term (ongoing)

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Technical, global verification bodies

Linkages to other building blocks: All

MAKING THE CASE/ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF NbS/EBA

3.A22 *Provide good money "proof" of good investments to convince better of cost-effectiveness, through a study or a compilation of case studies*

Description: Provide robust economic evidence demonstrating the cost-effectiveness of investments in NbS/EBA, including landscape restoration, by quantifying their multiple environmental, social, economic and well-being benefits. Credible assessments of costs, returns, and co-benefits can strengthen the case for public and private investment and support more

informed financing and policy decisions. This could be done through a study or a compilation of case studies.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: CSOs, academia

Good-practice examples: [The Economics of Land Degradation \(ELD\)](#) initiative

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision making; resource mobilization

3.A23 *Initiate a technical dialogue series to increase the development of robust evidence and enhanced metrics for demonstrating NbS and/or EBA cost-effectiveness in delivering measurable outcomes across the Rio Conventions*

Description: The lack of standardized metrics for demonstrating the cost-effectiveness of NbS/EBA complicates business case development and may be preventing the widespread adoption of NbS/EBA. A technical dialogue series could address the need for better, simpler metrics to demonstrate the business case and cost-effectiveness of NbS/EBA for biodiversity, climate and land outcomes. Any such exchanges should be resourced and held in a format that avoids additional costs.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: A, or more than one, sponsoring organizations or Parties

Good-practice examples: Two series of informal land sector dialogues held informally between Parties to inform the technical LULUCF accounting rules for the Kyoto Protocol's first and second commitment periods (which also informed the general mitigation accounting guidance for the Paris Agreement). These were voluntarily hosted and funded by different countries

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy and evidence-based decision-making; resource mobilization

3.A24 *Compile, assess and communicate policy and MEL data on NbS and/or EBA to provide clear real-world evidence on what works and what does not*

Description: Compile, assess and communicate policy and MEL data to improve understanding of uptake and implementation of NbS across communities and understanding of what works, what doesn't, best practice, cost-effectiveness, etc.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National to International

Who is responsible: Implementing agencies, partnerships, data providers, policy analysts

Good-practice examples: [ENACT](#) Partnership for NbS; Oxford Nature-based Solutions Initiative ([NbSI](#)); [Climate Policy Radar](#); Friends of Ecosystem-based Adaptation ([FEBA](#)); [Global Mangrove Watch](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; resource mobilization

3.A25 *Harness health benefits from NbS and/or EBA, including through pilots to quantify the economic and non-monetary benefits*

Description: Increased evidence shows health benefits from NbS (protection from disasters/disease, benefits for mental/physical health from being in nature). Both UNFCCC and CBD have increased focus on health linkages, and NbS/EBA can be included in these actions. Pilots to quantify the economic and nonmonetary benefits can help make the case.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International to local

Who is responsible: Partners like [Wellcome Trust](#) could work with Rio secretariats to fund projects; WHO

Good-practice examples: 1) Friends of EbA [report on NbS for Health](#); WHO report on [NbS and Health](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A26 *Establish a multi-stakeholder working group to develop and advance an evidence-based work program on high-integrity integrated landscape and seascape approaches, NbS and/or EBA*

Description: Landscape approaches, including landscape restoration, are key delivery frameworks that complement NbS and/or EBA principles (including marine and coastal landscapes/seascapes). Recognizing that high-quality NbS/EBA, landscape and coastal restoration, and ecological connectivity are critical pathways for delivering coherent outcomes across the Rio Conventions, establish a multi-stakeholder working group to advance an evidence-based work program on integrated, high-integrity NbS/EBA and land-based action. The platform will prioritize solutions that deliver simultaneous climate, biodiversity, and land benefits, while ensuring environmental integrity, measurable impact, and strong social safeguards.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Lead: GPFLR, WWF, FAO, UNEP

Good-practice examples: UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration [flagships](#), high-integrity NbS initiatives (mangroves, forests, drylands), indigenous-managed territories and biocultural landscapes, large-scale restoration and connectivity initiatives, [Freshwater Challenge](#), [Wildlife Connect](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making

HIGH-LEVEL DIALOGUE

3.A27 *Convene a high-level dialogue on NbS and/or EBA, including integrated landscape approaches such as landscape restoration*

Description: This dialogue would provide a safe space for Parties and non-Party stakeholders to discuss opportunities and challenges related to NbS/EBA. Considerations could include co-benefits and unintended negative impacts.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, COP Presidencies, Rio Convention secretariats

Good-practice examples: The Paris Agreement CMA decision [1/CMA.7](#), paras. 56 and 57, on the convening of a set of Climate and Trade Dialogues, with the intent of taking a challenging topic out of the negotiations, and establishing a safe space for Parties to build trust and move towards long-term solutions

Linkages to other building blocks: All

NbS/EBA AS CONNECTOR

3.A28 *Recognize NbS and/or EBA as a central pillar of Rio Conventions' integrated delivery in relevant policy frameworks*

Description: Recognize NbS/EBA as an approach for delivering integrated outcomes across climate, biodiversity and land agendas. As a distinct application of NbS, landscape restoration delivers integrated outcomes at scale by coordinating action across ecosystems, sectors, and stakeholders.

Time frame: Short, medium, long term

Scale: International, National

Who is responsible: National governments, Parties to the Rio Conventions

Good-practice examples: UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration [flagships](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

3.A29 *Establish an inter-Convention task force or platform to leverage NbS and/or EBA as connectors between UNFCCC, CBD and UNCCD processes, for coordinated efforts and increased benefits*

Description: The implementation gap requires better synergies and policy coherence between UNFCCC, CBD and UNCCD processes. As NbS/EBA are central to driving these synergies, an inter-Convention task force or platform would help promote and scale up high-integrity, evidence-based NbS/EBA.

Time frame: Medium to Long term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, secretariats

Linkages to other building blocks: All

4. Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making

4.1 Possible gaps and overlaps

GAPS IN EXISTING NATIONAL POLICIES

4.G1 *Lack of incentives for actionable transdisciplinary research*

Description: Many countries lack policy guidance and funding incentives for national research councils and/or science foundations to support transdisciplinary, solution-oriented research that brings together academic and non-academic actors to co-design and implement integrated solutions for the Rio Conventions at the national level.

4.G2 *Gap between traditional knowledge and the policy uptake of this knowledge*

Description: Traditional knowledge struggles to reach policy and implementation platforms on an equal basis with Western knowledge. A UNESCO-supported [study](#) in three pilot countries found low uptake of indigenous and local knowledge (ILK) on biodiversity in policymaking. This finding can be extrapolated to ILK on climate and land. The study also identified gaps in ILK documentation, which contributes to its low policy uptake.

4.G3 *Gap between information from scientific assessments and the policy uptake of this information*

Description: There is a weak uptake of information from scientific assessments by policy, owing to deficiencies and difficulties in communicating and making those assessments accessible to different audiences at different levels, including the policy-making level and across sectors.

GAPS IN EXISTING INTERNATIONAL POLICIES

4.G4 *Limited formal collaboration between IPBES, IPCC and UNCCD's SPI*

Description: Formal collaboration between IPBES and IPCC has been almost limited to participation at each other's plenary sessions and regular provision of updates on relevant decisions of their governing bodies and on their current work. A co-sponsored workshop was held online in 2020, but the IPCC Plenary never formally recognized the resulting report. A recent invitation from the IPBES Plenary (decision IPBES-11/1, December 2024) for the IPCC to consider co-sponsoring a new workshop on biodiversity and climate change in the second half of 2026 has not yet received any formal response from the IPCC. Meanwhile, UNCCD's SPI has the mandate from the COP to coordinate with other intergovernmental science-policy bodies, including the IPCC and the IPBES. Two coordination activities included in an SPI [report](#) for COP16 are: the SPI's contribution to the scientific review of two IPBES thematic assessments, and the analysis of key messages in the Summary for Policymakers for the IPCC AR6 WGII and WGIII reports.

4.G5 *Gap in participation and representation of scientific communities from developing countries in science-policy panels*

Description: Traditionally, IPCC and IPBES authors have been dominated by physical and biological scientists from developed countries. However, both bodies have made and continue to make efforts to achieve greater balance. When selecting UNCCD's SPI members through an open call, the CST Bureau must consider gender, regional and disciplinary balance, and each of the five UN regional groups nominates one independent scientist from the same open call.

4.G6 *Gap in participation and representation of indigenous and local knowledge holders in science-policy panels*

Description: There is a disconnect between knowledge on the ground and more high-level scientific assessments, which are not grounded in experiences on the ground from IPLCs, women, youth and other local actors. A coherent science-policy-local knowledge systems interface is lacking because local actors at the territorial level are insufficiently represented in the science-policy panels advising the Conventions.

4.2 Concrete actions

JOINT SCIENCE-POLICY INTERFACES COLLABORATION

4.A1 *Establish a permanent collaboration mechanism between IPCC, IPBES and UNCCD's SPI*

Description: There is currently no permanent mechanism for collaboration between IPCC, IPBES and UNCCD's SPI. Until now, collaboration mechanisms have only been ad hoc. A permanent collaboration mechanism (something like the Rio Conventions JLG) could be tasked, inter alia, with developing common glossaries and organizing joint meetings or workshops. Examples of long-term outcomes include synergies in terminology and approaches, inclusion of different knowledge systems, and greater policy uptake. It would need to connect with scientific and technical advisory bodies of the Rio Conventions. Permanent collaboration arrangements should account for the different nature of the IPCC and IPBES as independent intergovernmental organizations, and the UNCCD's SPI as a limited-membership body under the UNCCD.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: IPBES and IPCC governing bodies, Parties to the UNCCD

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building

4.A2 *Foster various existing formal and informal opportunities for collaboration between IPCC, IPBES and UNCCD's SPI*

Description: This action responds to the barrier of different institutional mandates that make collaboration between IPBES and IPCC difficult, as well as to the different nature of UNCCD's SPI, which is not an independent intergovernmental organization but a body with limited membership under the UNCCD. It includes informal collaboration between IPCC and IPBES authors (e.g., on scenarios) and IPBES's invitation to the IPCC to co-sponsor a new workshop on biodiversity and climate change. Some suggestions point to formalizing collaboration through this type of workshop by including it in the work plans of the IPCC and IPBES, and to expanding the IPBES Nexus Assessment to include IPCC co-signing. Ways of involving UNCCD's SPI in IPCC and IPBES collaborations should also be explored.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: IPBES and IPCC authors, governing bodies and secretariats, UNCCD's SPI members and UNCCD's secretariat

Good-practice examples: 1) The 2020 [IPCC-IPBES co-sponsored workshop on biodiversity and climate change and its report](#); 2) the IPCC Special Report on Climate Change and Land ([SRRCL](#)), which, besides authors from the IPCC's traditional scientific communities, included authors from IPBES, UNCCD's SPI and FAO

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building

4.A3 *Explore appropriate ways of working between the IPBES, the IPCC, the UNCCD's SPI and the new Intergovernmental Science-Policy Panel on Chemicals, Waste and Pollution (ISP-CWP)*

Description: As the environmental crises are all interconnected, there is a need for the new independent intergovernmental science-policy panel (the ISP-CWP), the already existing intergovernmental science-policy panels (the IPCC and the IPBES) and the UNCCD's SPI to agree on working modalities for collaboration between them with a view to producing more accurate and comprehensive scientific assessments.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Governing bodies of the IPBES, the IPCC and the ISP-CWP, and the UNCCD COP

Good-practice examples: The 2020 [IPCC-IPBES co-sponsored workshop on biodiversity and climate change and its report](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building

SCIENCE-POLICY INTERFACES' NATIONAL FOCAL POINTS

4.A4 *Provide opportunities for communication and collaboration between national focal points for IPBES and IPCC and the Science and Technology Correspondents of Parties to the UNCCD*

Description: National-level communication between science-policy platform leads could help to advance policy coherence at the national level, as well as inputs provided internationally through the various processes. As there are no NFPs for UNCCD SPI, collaboration could occur through the [Science and Technology Correspondents \(STCs\)](#) of UNCCD Parties.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: NFPs for IPBES and IPCC, UNCCD Parties' STCs, IPCC Bureau, IPBES Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, UNCCD CST

Good-practice examples: Capacity-building organizations like BES-NET offer [trialogues](#) to bring NFPs together

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building

GLOBAL SOUTH SCIENCE

4.A5 *Promote science production in the Global South and its uptake by intergovernmental science-policy platforms*

Description: The intergovernmental science-policy panels and UNCCD's SPI would benefit from having more science made in the Global South. Regional and gender diversity would make scientific assessments more accurate

Time frame: Short, medium and long term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: IPBES, IPCC, national governments

Good-practice examples: 1) [IPCC Scholarship Programme](#) for Global South early career researchers; 2) [IPBES Fellowship Programme](#); 3) [IPBES Indigenous and Local Knowledge Task Force](#); 4) The IPCC Special Report on Climate Change and Land ([SRRCL](#)), which was the first IPCC report with more authors from developing countries than authors from developed countries

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building

CO-CREATION AND KNOWLEDGE DIVERSIFICATION

4.A6 *Systematically integrate ILK as an equal input as scientific knowledge into assessments and decision-making processes across the Rio Conventions and provide ILK holders equal opportunities for participation in scientific production and the provision of evidence for decision-making*

Description: Building trust among actors, where every actor feels valued and respected. Many assessments still rely heavily on scientific and technical information, while local observations and Indigenous knowledge often provide early evidence of ecosystem changes, land degradation, biodiversity loss, and adaptation needs. Traditional knowledge has often been seen as non-scientific and as requiring a separate box, making it difficult to contribute to scientific assessments and policymaking. There is a need to stop treating traditional knowledge as separate from scientific knowledge and ensure traditional knowledge holders are present in the spaces where science is discussed. There is still, however, a long pathway to bringing traditional knowledge holders to these spaces, which are in English and not fit for spiritual knowledge holders to come to speak in

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National, regional, international

Who is responsible: National governments, scientific production spaces, IPBES, IPCC, UNCCD's SPI, scientific and technical bodies of the Rio Conventions, research organizations, academia

Good-practice examples: 1) [IPBES Indigenous and Local Knowledge Task Force](#); 2) IPCC 2026 [Workshop on Engaging Diverse Knowledge Systems](#); 3) The [Local Biodiversity Outlooks](#); 4) IPBES 2025 [First ILK dialogue workshop for the IPBES Second Global Assessment](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: NbS/EBA; knowledge management and capacity-building; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

4.A7 *Develop funding schemes, guidance and spaces for transformative science and co-creation of knowledge within science-policy interfaces*

Description: Support the transformation of (some) current science-policy interfaces into spaces dedicated to true co-creation of knowledge. Develop funding mechanisms and safe spaces within IPCC and IPBES (among others) where policymakers and scientists, together with other types of stakeholders, can work together to frame research needs, pathways to address global issues, and solutions. This is also of relevance to the UNCCD's SPI.

Time frame: Medium to long term

Scale: Local/national and international

Who is responsible: IPBES and IPCC governing bodies, UNCCD's COP

Good-practice examples: 1) [The Montpellier Process - Nexus Action](#) initiative, co-curated by Cirad, Biodiversity-CIAT and Convene on food systems transformation; 2) [IPBES Indigenous and Local Knowledge Task Force](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

4.A8 *Mapping of ILK in science-policy interfaces' messages and how it has influenced policy action at different Rio Conventions and elsewhere*

Description: Undertake a study of key messages informed by ILK in recent science-policy interfaces' assessments and how these messages have influenced policy action at different Rio Conventions and elsewhere, to show the importance of ILK and the need for more co-creation and inclusion in science policy interfaces' messages

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: An academic institution

Good-practice examples: Some IPBES messages have already been mapped by [IIFB](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Contributions and rights of IPLCs

COMMUNICATION OF GLOBAL SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENTS

4.A9 *Provide and communicate key messages within Summaries for Policy-makers of science-policy interface assessments that speak specifically to policy-makers from each of the Rio Conventions*

Description: Science communication of key findings that support policy-makers from each of the Rio Conventions could help advance policy coherence and understanding of key scientific outcomes from different perspectives

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Communications divisions of IPBES and IPCC, UNCCD's SPI, Rio Conventions secretariats, NGOs, partner organizations interested in science-policy interfaces' findings

Good-practice examples: 1) UNCCD COP [decision 18/COP.15](#) tasked UNCCD's SPI with the analysis of IPCC's Working Group 2 and Working Group 3 contributions to IPCC's Sixth Assessment Report (AR6) so as to develop key messages and a concise set of policy-oriented recommendations relevant to the UNCCD and for consideration of UNCCD's Committee on Science and Technology (CST). 2) Review by UNCCD's SPI of relevant reports by the IPCC and IPBES is included in the multi-year [SPI work programmes](#). 3) GIZ support for the uptake of climate messages from the IPBES nexus assessment. 4) IUFRO assessments in the framework of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) joint initiative Global Forest Expert Panels (GFEP) and related products/communication, e.g., the 2022 [REDD+ study](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building

4.A10 *Develop and disseminate materials that explain the scientific assessments and findings in simple terms (tailored to the targeted audience), with translation to various languages*

Description: Key messages from science-policy interface assessments need to be communicated and made accessible to policymakers and broader audiences for information and sensibilization purposes. Both IPBES and IPCC have limited post-assessment uptake beyond traditional media launches. Partner organizations can help tailor post-assessment products to different audiences and work across science-policy interfaces to do so.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International, national, local levels

Who is responsible: Communications divisions of IPBES and IPCC, NGOs, international NGOs

Good-practice examples: 1) IPBES factsheets, e.g., [factsheet on the IPBES Nexus Assessment](#). 2) [Policy Briefs and communication material](#) developed by IUFRO's Science-Policy Programme for decision-makers and stakeholders explaining the findings of scientific assessments related to the scope of the Rio Conventions

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building

4.A11 *Develop online courses to share messages from scientific assessments and evidence to support policymaking*

Description: The Online courses would share knowledge and promote scientific assessments and evidence-based policy to enhance policy coherence and cooperation that supports the implementation of the Rio Conventions. Online courses can include information in a progressive complexity and in various languages. They can be hosted on the Conventions'/JLG platforms. Some certificates could be issued upon completion.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: JLG, IPBES/IPCC/UNFCCC/CBD/UNCCD contributors, academic institutions

Good-practice examples: [Learning for Nature](#) courses; UNFCCC [training programme for BTR expert reviewers](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building

4.A12 *Strengthen communication and update of findings and recommendations from science-policy interface reports at the national and subnational levels*

Description: Strengthen national structures (e.g., national coordination offices for the science-policy interfaces) to communicate and translate science-policy interface report findings at the national and subnational levels to enhance policy uptake and implementation and also support national research and science policy communities

Time frame: Medium to long term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National Focal points for IPBES and IPCC and UNCCD's STCs

Good-practice examples: German coordination offices for IPBES & IPCC ([Towards successful policy coherence for biodiversity and climate. Learning from case studies](#), p. 36)

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building

UPTAKE OF SCIENCE IN COP DECISIONS

4.A13 *Continue anchoring findings and the role of scientific bodies in decisions*

Description: Continue anchoring the role and findings of IPCC, IPBES and UNCCD's SPI within policy decisions. Creating this mandate also allows for decisions to be more evidence-based, and as there is a growing demand for data on climate, biodiversity and land issues, it is an ideal opportunity to link policy and the science-policy interfaces

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions

Good-practice examples: The UNFCCC's Belém Gender Action Plan ([decision 7/COP.30](#)) explicitly mentions the IPCC in 3 deliverables/activities, including "Promote synergies between the enhanced Lima work programme and its gender action plan, the work of the IPCC and work undertaken by Parties and relevant organizations in preparation for the global stocktake regarding gender- and age-disaggregated data"

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building

TRANSDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

4.A14 Fund implementation-oriented transdisciplinary research that translates scientific assessments into implementation-oriented solutions across the Rio Conventions

Description: Support implementation-oriented transdisciplinary research programs that connect IPCC, IPBES, UNCCD SPI, and Rio Convention scientific assessments with implementation priorities under NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs and LDN targets through equitable co-design, co-production and co-delivery involving researchers, policymakers, IPLCs, practitioners and other relevant knowledge holders. Research programs should integrate scientific and IPLCs knowledge systems, as appropriate, throughout project design, implementation, monitoring, review, evaluation and knowledge uptake, while facilitating the translation of research into evidence-informed policy and implementation.

Time frame: Short to long term

Scale: International (with regional, national and local implementation)

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, NFPs, research coordination platforms, research institutions, relevant scientific and technical bodies, IPLCs, implementation partners

Good-practice examples: Belmont Forum Collaborative Research Actions (CRAs): [Resilience](#), [Ocean 2](#), and emerging initiatives such as [Arctic 3](#), [Biodiversity 3](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs, WoSA

PARTNERSHIPS

4.A15 Strengthen multilateral research funding partnerships to respond to Rio Conventions implementation

Description: Strengthen alignment between priorities identified under the Rio Conventions, national implementation needs and existing international research funding and cooperation mechanisms. Build on established multilateral research partnerships and coordination platforms to support transdisciplinary, solution-oriented and actionable research that responds to concrete implementation challenges. These partnerships should facilitate coordination among research funders, policymakers, researchers, practitioners, IPLCs and other relevant knowledge holders and promote equitable co-design, co-production and knowledge uptake. They should also help identify research gaps, mobilize coordinated international research investments, reduce fragmentation among funding initiatives and enhance the contribution of funded research to implementation across the Rio Conventions.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International (with regional and national application)

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, NFPs, Rio Convention Secretariats and scientific and technical bodies, as appropriate; international research coordination platforms; national research councils and funding agencies; research institutions; and relevant knowledge-holder organizations

Good-practice examples: 1) Belmont Forum and its [Collaborative Research Actions \(CRAs\)](#); 2) [Biodiversa+](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

5. Knowledge management and capacity-building

5.1 Possible gaps and overlaps

GAPS IN EXISTING COORDINATION BODIES

5.G1 *Underfunding of potential providers of capacity-building, such as the Rio Conventions Joint Capacity-building Programme (JCBP) under the Rio Conventions Joint Liaison Group (JLG) and CBD's Technical and Scientific Collaboration (TSC) Support Centres*

Description: Secretariats of the Rio Conventions have received minimum funding for capacity-building on synergies under the JCBP, launched in 2024. The funding has now expired, and new funding is needed for the Programme to continue. CBD's Regional and subregional TSC Support Centres also lack funding.

5.G2 *Regional and subregional capacity-building centres across the three Rio Conventions do not necessarily have expertise across all topics relevant to related synergies*

Description: This is the case for the CBD's regional and subregional Technical and Scientific Collaboration (TSC) Support Centre, the UNFCCC's Regional Collaboration Centres and the UNCCD's Regional Coordination Unit. Because of their regional presence, these centres could play an important role in providing capacity-building tailored to the respective regions' and countries' needs, including by partnering with other capacity-building providers, such as UN agencies and specialized institutions. However, a lack of expertise on key topics related to synergies between the Rio Conventions within the centres themselves could hinder the ability to take advantage of them.

5.G3 *Requests for technical support from Parties to the Rio Conventions outpace available capacity, expertise and knowledge of technical support and capacity-building providers*

Description: Demand for technical assistance and creation of capacities for synergistic action across the Rio Conventions is bigger than the available capacity (both technical and financial), expertise and knowledge of technical assistance and capacity-building providers. E.g., the NDC Partnership has been able to provide support to only 46% of biodiversity- and desertification-related requests.

5.2 Concrete actions

LONG-TERM PROGRAMMING

5.A1 *Inscribe capacity-building on synergies and policy coherence between the Rio Conventions into long-term strategies and programs*

Description: One-off workshops and other capacity-building activities are not fit for creating long-lasting and transformative enhanced institutional knowledge and capacities required for enhanced policy coherence and synergies between the Rio Conventions. A long-term vision and a consequent sequencing of capacity-building activities through long-term strategies and programs is needed, with adequate long-term resourcing and institutionalized follow-up.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International, national

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, national governments, national and international capacity-building providers, partnerships, coalitions, IGOs

Good-practice examples: CBD [long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

SUPPORT CENTRES, INITIATIVES, PARTNERSHIPS FOR KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND CAPACITY-BUILDING

5.A2 *Make use of and strengthen existing support centres, programs, initiatives and partnerships for knowledge sharing and capacity-building*

Description: Support sharing of best practices, knowledge, matchmaking and actions tackling biodiversity loss, climate change and ecosystem degradation simultaneously and in an integrated manner, inter alia via the CBD TSC Support Centres, organizations, partnerships, initiatives and coalitions such as SCP, the NBSAP AP, the NDC P, the NAP Global Network, ENACT, FEBA and PEDRR and their respective members.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, national governments, funds and operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions, other financial institutions, donors

Good-practice examples: SCP with regular exchanges, summaries and knowledge products + GEF enabling activities

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; resource mobilization

5.A3 *Existing support centres, programs, initiatives and partnerships to liaise for more effective and efficient knowledge sharing and capacity-building, especially at the regional and the subregional levels*

Description: In general, potential overlaps exist in the provision of capacity-building by different providers. Better coordination among existing support centres, programs, initiatives partnerships that provide capacity-building would be a way to increase effectiveness and efficiency and to avoid duplication of efforts, using the regional level as an entry point by taking advantage of existing regional centres of the Rio Conventions, in-country facilitators of the NDC Partnership and the NBSAP Accelerator Partnership, and the existing mandate to UNEP's Executive Director to facilitate coherent and effective implementation of MEAs at regional and national levels, including through regional centres of MEAs

Time frame: Short term

Scale: Regional, subregional, international

Who is responsible: The regional centres of the Rio Conventions ([CBD regional and subregional TSC Support Centres](#), [UNCCD Regional Coordination Units](#) and [UNFCCC Regional Collaboration Centres](#)), and other capacity-building providers such as the JLG's JCBP, the NBSAP AP, the NDC P, the NAP Global Network, the HAC for Nature and People, UNEP, UNDP, FAO.

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; resource mobilization

5.A4 *Better resourced CBD regional and subregional TSC Support Centres to clearly integrate capacity-building for Rio Conventions policy coherence and synergies into their workplans*

Description: Capacity-building for policy coherence and synergies between the Rio Conventions needs to be clearly integrated into the workplans of the CBD TSC Support Centres, which require this type of support to be requested by Parties from the corresponding region. TSC Support Centres also need better resourcing to play an active role in supporting Parties (e.g., to access

and understand existing guidance on synergistic national planning and delivering NbS with safeguards).

Time frame: Short term

Scale: Regional, subregional

Who is responsible: Parties to the CBD, CBD regional and subregional TSC Support Centres, funds and operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions, other financial institutions, donors

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; resource mobilization

5.A5 *Strengthen and better resource the Rio Conventions Joint Capacity-building Programme (JCBP) under the Joint Liaison Group*

Description: Continuing the Rio Conventions JCBP is an important step to enhance policy coherence and foster synergies between Rio Conventions. Webinars, training and publications are very useful. It can be a key element in further strengthening capacity-building and development.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International, national

Who is responsible: Secretariats of the Rio Conventions, donors, Parties to the Rio Conventions

Good-practice examples: Training sessions of the JLG [Rio Conventions JCBP](#) (including e-learning)

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; resource mobilization

5.A6 *Leverage the regional and subregional support centres of the Rio Conventions to coordinate and scale NbS and/or EBA and other key synergies-related aspects across the Rio Conventions*

Description: Capacity-building programs could be scaled up through the regional and subregional support centres of the Rio Conventions, ensuring consistent access to expertise and addressing identified gaps. These centres could facilitate knowledge exchange, harmonized guidance and joint monitoring systems, enabling coherent implementation and reporting of NBSAPs, NDCs and LDN targets while strengthening regional cooperation. They could help build sustained technical capacity to implement NbS/EBA and other key aspects that enhance policy coherence and synergies between the Rio Conventions.

Time frame: Short, medium and long term

Scale: Regional and subregional

Who is responsible: Lead coordinating regional organizations, national governments, Rio Conventions NFPs, Rio Conventions secretariats

Linkages to other building blocks: All

CAPACITY-BUILDING AND GUIDANCE

5.A7 *Develop joint capacity-building programs that facilitate regular peer-learning exchanges between Rio Conventions NFPs, including through dialogues, webinars, workshops and training opportunities, using the regional level as an entry point, and including cross-*

government representatives working at the technical level, as part of a long-term capacity-building strategy

Description: Regional capacity-building and information and experience sharing events can help NFPs to, among others, understand existing guidance and actively discuss challenges. This would include sessions on all key topics for enhancing policy coherence and synergies between the Rio Conventions, such as the alignment of NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs, LDN targets, NDPs and other relevant national plans and strategies; an integrated approach to planning, monitoring, reporting and review; NbS and/or EBA; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization; the contributions and rights of IPLCs; and the WoSA. Sessions would be planned and sequenced according to a long-term capacity-building strategy that considers relevant timelines for planning, monitoring, reporting and review cycles under the three Conventions. Feedback from countries on their needs and challenges would shape the content and modalities of the capacity-building sessions across thematic areas. The above could be integrated into future programming of the JLG's JCBP and possible partnerships with the regional centres of the Rio Conventions and other capacity-building providers.

Ideally, these events could be held alongside other CB events to reduce the need for participants to travel. These events should not target only NFPs, but also cross-government representatives, especially those responsible for domestic decision-making on elements like planning and other technical aspects. Could take advantage of regional/subregional workshops by UNEP (in which they invite MEA NFPs from countries, as well as technical focal points, and in which they provide an opportunity for stakeholders to share best practices and exchange information). The international and regional levels are good spaces to share information and good practices, but the information has to come down to those who do the planning and other work at the technical level

Time frame: Short, medium, long term

Scale: International, regional

Who is responsible: Rio Convention NFPs, JLG JCBP, Rio Conventions regional centres, with support from UNDP/UNEP and other capacity-building providers such as NDC P and NBSAP AP

Good-practice examples: Work of the JLG [Rio Conventions JCBP](#) (currently underfunded)

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making

5.A8 *Develop and enhance capacity on policy coherence, including through peer-to-peer exchange and collecting/documenting case studies, good practices and learnings on efforts from countries to engage coherently and integrate WoSA across the Rio Conventions at the country level*

Description: Provide opportunities for peer-to-peer exchange. Work with countries implementing actions to enhance policy coherence and follow WoSA across the Rio Conventions to develop case studies and document good practices. A collection of good-practice examples and learnings would allow other countries to evaluate their feasibility by seeing what worked and did not work - and how they can implement within their own context. It is ideal to provide a variety of examples of how different countries are making progress, not only the most progressive ones, since there is no "one size fits all".

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International, national

Who is responsible: JLG through its JCBP, capacity-building providers, partnerships, coalitions, IGOs, UNEP, UNEP-WCMC together with countries, NFPs, WoS stakeholders

Good-practice examples: 1) Peer-to-peer exchange between [Vanuatu and Ecuador](#) facilitated by the NBSAP AP. 2) NBSAP AP [Good Practice Database](#). 3) Bern III Process [case studies](#). 4) [UNEP/EA.7/INF/6](#), with 20 case studies on how countries are addressing challenges and realizing synergies in MEA implementation; 5) NDC Partnership's [Best Practice Brief on Whole-of-Society-Approaches to Inclusive Stakeholder Engagement](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

5.A9 *Establish a Rio Conventions fellowship and mentorship programme*

Description: The purpose is to build long-term capacities and leadership on biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation, while strengthening understanding of synergies across the three Conventions.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National, regional and international

Who is responsible: Rio Convention Secretariats, GEF, implementing agencies

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

5.A10 *Organize joint training sessions on effective science-policy dialogue across the Rio Conventions*

Description: Training sessions bringing together policymakers and knowledge producers (including local, traditional and all other knowledge systems) would help rethink knowledge management. Mutual understanding is needed to build a common vision and methodologies (such as living labs) for effective science-policy dialogue.

Time frame: Short, medium, long

Scale: International

Who is responsible: JLG, through JCBP

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

5.A11 *Organize each year a pre-COP workshop for national focal points from science-policy interfaces and the Rio Conventions, rotating among the three Conventions, to foster capacity and shared learning*

Description: NFPs from science-policy interfaces and the Rio Conventions can learn from one another about what works in terms of nominations, outreach, uptake, etc, but there is no structured way to do so. A pre-COP workshop each year, rotating among the three Conventions, could help build capacity and foster shared learning.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Rio Conventions' secretariats, COP Presidencies

Good-practice examples: EU-funded [RESPIN](#) project and [BES-NET](#), both have capacity-building activities crossing IPBES and IPCC

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making

5.A12 *Organize cross-learning sessions by constituencies and caucuses to build capacities across the Rio Conventions*

Description: Some constituencies are already building capacities across the Rio Conventions for civil society and other stakeholders

Time frame: Short

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Observer organizations' constituencies and caucuses of the Rio Conventions; financial institutions

Good-practice examples: The CBD Women's Caucus, the UNFCCC Women & Gender Constituency and the UNCCD Gender Caucus have done cross-learning sessions specifically for the gender action plans, as well as a [policy brief on the UNFCCC Gender Action Plan and the CBD Gender Plan of Action](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

5.A13 *Complement successful capacity-building programs with topics related to the Rio Conventions*

Description: Multilateral organizations already have multiple capacity-building programs related to biodiversity, climate change, disasters, land degradation, and others. Complementing successful programs with topics related on policy coherence and synergies between the Rio Conventions could build on existing successes.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: Regional and international

Who is responsible: Agencies running successful capacity-building programs and the Rio Conventions secretariats

Good-practice examples: [UNESCO's Ocean Literacy programme](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making

5.A14 *Host regional workshops for policymakers to support Parties to identify how to use existing and upcoming guidance in their national context to develop and implement NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs, LDN Targets and NDPs in a consistent and mutually supportive manner*

Description: The workshops should support Parties across the CBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD to use existing toolkits, guidance and case studies developed or in development by a range of actors to support synergistic national planning. For example: the [Voluntary Guidelines for EbA and Eco-DRR](#) and its supplement; new guidance on how to prioritize ecosystem integrity; the [Guide for including Nature in NDCs](#); recommendations from the IPBES Nexus Assessment and other reports from the CBD AHTEGs on climate and biodiversity that provide advice and information to the UNFCCC, including the 2003 [CBD Technical Series 10](#), and the 2009 [CBD Technical Series 41](#), among others.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: Regional

Who is responsible: Rio Conventions secretariats, JLG, regional support centres of the Rio Conventions, implementing agencies, capacity-building providers

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; planning, monitoring, reporting and review

5.A15 *Expand/connect/align Paris Agreement's CBIT (Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency) approaches across all Rio Conventions*

Description: Similar initiatives to [CBIT](#) under the Paris Agreement can be established, expanded or aligned, as appropriate, for developing countries to: Strengthen national institutions for transparency-related activities in line with national priorities across the Rio Conventions; use relevant tools, training, and assistance for meeting the transparency-related provisions of the Paris Agreement/KMGBF/UNCCD; improve transparency across Rio Conventions (including on synergies) over time.

Time frame: Medium, long term

Scale: International, national

Who is responsible: Rio Conventions JCBP of the JLG, international financial institutions, national governments, capacity-building providers

Good-practice examples: [CBIT](#) under the Paris Agreement

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review; resource mobilization

5.A16 *Host joint technical workshops on Rio Convention synergies for finance and produce resulting guidance*

Description: The workshops should focus on how donor countries, MDBs, and IFIs can align their international finance and portfolios with the KMGBF, the Paris Agreement and the UNCCD, and identify synergistic actions. The workshops should also focus on how National Biodiversity Finance Plans can align and direct financial flows to synergistic actions and measures.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Rio Convention Secretariats, JLG

Linkages to other building blocks: Resource mobilization

5.A17 *Strengthen national capacities for reducing harmful incentives/subsidies and scaling up incentives/subsidies aligned with climate, biodiversity and land outcomes*

Description: Regional support centres of the Rio Conventions could provide support for governments trying to shift harmful subsidies, given their financial and technical capacities. Toolkits with best practices and lessons learned would help support this transition.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: Regional

Who is responsible: Regional support centres of the Rio Conventions

Good-practice examples: KMGBF Target 18 and CMA decision 1/CMA.5 on the GST1, para. 96, as entry points

Linkages to other building blocks: Resource mobilization

5.A18 *Train national agencies about the different types of financing mechanisms that can be used for implementing and monitoring NbS and/or EBA*

Description: These could be traditional mechanisms, or innovative ones, but the relevance is that agencies understand why and how to choose one over another.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments

Good-practice examples: Naturescapes [thematic reports](#) for the GEF Sustainable Cities Program

Linkages to other building blocks: NbS/EBA; resource mobilization

5.A19 *Capacity-building/development, co-designed with and for IPLCs, including training courses, and adequate funding for enabling IPLC representatives to participate at COPs and other meetings across all three Rio Conventions*

Description: Governments, civil society and IPLCs need expertise to work across all three Conventions. IPLC representatives who sit across all three Conventions would better understand the opportunities and barriers and would enable more coordinated and meaningful participation by IPLC constituencies across the three Conventions. This goes hand in hand with increased finance for participation, travel, accommodation, etc.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National, regional, international

Who is responsible: National governments, secretariats of the Rio Conventions, capacity-building providers chosen by IPLCs, implementing agencies, IPLCs, CSOs, operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions

Good-practice examples: The existing [Voluntary Funding Mechanism to Facilitate the Participation of IPLCs in the work of the CBD](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs

5.A20 *Capacity-building/development, co-designed with and for IPLCs, for improving their capacity to understand and communicate their needs, and to design and implement projects and monitor their effectiveness*

Description: This could be considered as a project to be supported and to be designed and proposed for funding.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National, regional, international

Who is responsible: National governments, secretariats of the Rio Conventions, capacity-building providers chosen by IPLCs, implementing agencies, IPLCs, CSOs, operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions

Good-practice examples: GEF-8 [Heart of Conservation Initiative](#), whose objective is to increase resources, organizational strength, and recognition for IPLCs' governance and stewardship of territories, lands, waters and resources to deliver International environmental benefits

Linkages to other building blocks: Resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs

5.A21 *Capacity-building/development, co-designed with and for IPLCs, focused on use of knowledge & tools to enable joint monitoring of progress against KMGBF targets and other nature-related goals and targets across the Rio Conventions*

Description: Capacity-building and training should be co-designed with and for IPLCs, carried out regionally /nationally with reporting modalities at the global level (e.g., during COPs). The focus should be on addressing existing and identified gaps in terms of use and understanding of existing tools and knowledge to measure progress against goals and targets across the Rio Conventions. Consider and incorporate traditional knowledge and associated tools.

Time frame: Short, medium, long term

Scale: National, regional and international

Who is responsible: National governments, secretariats of the Rio Conventions, capacity-building providers chosen by IPLCs, implementing agencies, IPLCs, CSOs, operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs

5.A22 *Targeted capacity-building for different groups of society*

Description: Building national capacity for all stakeholder groups, including women, youth, IPLCs, tailored to their needs, their roles and opportunities to enhance policy coherence and cooperation that supports the implementation across all Rio Conventions

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National, international

Who is responsible: International NGOs, NGOs, national governments

Linkages to other building blocks: Contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

5.A23 *Strengthen the digital literacy and technical capacity of rural women and local communities through inclusive, locally adapted training and tools for enhancing their participation in biodiversity/climate/land monitoring, climate reporting, and land management planning*

Description: Building this capacity not only empowers women and communities as informed actors but also enriches the quality, coherence, and inclusivity of national strategies and policy development across all three Rio Conventions.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National, international

Who is responsible: International NGOs, NGOs, national governments

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; planning, monitoring, reporting and review; WoSA

5.A24 *Develop common glossaries with existing diverging and shared definitions and terminologies from the Rio Conventions and science-policy interfaces*

Description: The Rio Conventions use different terms, and negotiators or implementers of one Convention are often not aware of terms and definitions in others. Conventions and sectors might be using the same term but with small differences. Recognizing these differences could support dialogue and build coherence. Terms do not need to be unified, but everyone should at least know what the other is referring to. Common glossaries with definitions and terminology relevant across different levels, Conventions and actors are needed (e.g., scientific communities, policy arenas,

local levels). They should be translated to the local level where implementation takes place. Identifying gaps and establishing common glossaries by science-policy interfaces (e.g., IPBES and IPCC, UNCCD's SPI) would help translate science into policy and practice and bridge gaps between NFPs and implementers.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Science-Policy Interfaces (IPBES, IPCC, UNCCD's SPI), secretariats of the Rio Conventions

Good-practice examples: Report undertaken by United Nations University for the UNCCD secretariat: "[Coherence and alignment among sustainable land management, ecosystem-based adaptation, ecosystem-based disaster risk reduction and nature-based solutions](#)", 2021

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making

5.A25 *Develop guidance and capacity-building activities and materials to facilitate the policy uptake in countries of response options from the IPBES Nexus Assessment for strategies across Rio Conventions*

Description: The IPBES Nexus assessment identified 71 response options that have synergies across biodiversity, climate, water, food and health. They were all evaluated with evidence of their impacts and effectiveness. Many also help meet multiple SDG goals. Building these options into national strategies provides a way to align NBSAPS, NDCs, NAPs, LDN targets, NDPs, etc.

Time frame: Short to medium

Scale: International

Who is responsible: IPBES, CBD Secretariat, JLG, capacity-building providers, implementing agencies

Good-practice examples: The UK's Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) undertook a [policy mapping exercise](#) to see which of the 71 response options from the IPBES Nexus Assessment were represented in UK policy and where additional support would be needed

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making

5.A26 *Develop joint guidance and capacity-building activities and materials for strengthening alignment in the development and update of NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs, LDN targets and NDPs*

Description: Develop guidance and capacity-building to improve coordinated policy development, identifying common objectives and shared indicators, accounting for Rio Convention planning timeframes and integrating participation processes, and identifying cross-cutting issues to be addressed in an integrated manner. This would include guidance on maximizing synergies and avoiding trade-offs.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International, national

Who is responsible: The JLG, with guidance developed through a party-driven process, such as a joint working group situated under the JLG

Good-practice examples: 1) FAO's [Target 2 Roadmap](#), which already brought the three secretariats together to support countries on monitoring and reporting. 2) The ongoing [NZNPA IP](#) work includes the development of guidance to offer an integrated approach to

designing/enhancing planning at the national level, to enable the development of cohesive strategies to deliver on climate and nature goals. 3) Lessons learned on [approaches and good practices from 10 countries](#) in enhancing synergies between NDCs and NBSAPs

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; planning, monitoring, reporting and review

5.A27 *Develop guidance aimed at cross-cutting national planning on the types of actions which support ecological protection, prioritizing the conservation and restoration of high carbon, high biodiversity ecosystems to maximize synergies*

Description: This guidance should be particularly aimed at cross-cutting national planning aligned to deliver commitments under the Rio Conventions, and should make clear how to: develop policies that prioritize the conservation and restoration of high carbon, high biodiversity ecosystems; design and fund programs which address threats to ecosystems which are vulnerable to climate change, and where the functions and services provided by the ecosystem are directly depended upon by IPLCs - including through risk assessment and risk management; design and fund programs which help to restore ecological integrity, including guidance on which types of restoration activities to prioritize; support the legal recognition of the tenurial and collective rights and governance of the Indigenous Peoples and local communities over their territories.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Developed through an AHTEG under either UNFCCC/CBD

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; NbS/EBA; resource mobilization; IPLCs

5.A28 *Continuation of assessments of synergistic approaches by UNEP as mandated by UNEA-6 and -7 resolutions*

Description: Fulfilling the UNEA-6 and -7 resolution mandates, collate and analyze tools, approaches, costs and benefits of synergistic/coordinated actions. Improve synergies initiatives through monitoring, evaluation and learning to use the best methods.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: UNEP

Good-practice examples: [UNEP/EA.7/INF/6](#) assessment of 20 national examples (UNEP and UNEP-WCMC)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE AND LEARNING SPACES

5.A29 *Foster cross-sector collaboration and knowledge exchange in relation to synergies and policy coherence between biodiversity, land and climate change issues via knowledge platforms or communities of practice*

Description: Create or use existing knowledge platforms or communities of practice to bring together public sector servants from different sectors, ministries and agencies – including environment, agriculture, energy, water, security, and urban planning – to share knowledge and learn from one another on matters relevant to Rio Conventions synergies at the national and subnational levels. This mutual learning could help to pave the way towards cohesive strategies

and policies that address multiple goals simultaneously. A public institution or by a trusted organization could host the platform.

Time frame: Medium to long term

Scale: National and subnational

Who is responsible: National and subnational governments

Good-practice examples: The [Knowledge Hub](#) online platform in the UK

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; resource mobilization

5.A30 *Connect and strengthen existing knowledge hubs, networks, partnerships, coalitions and communities of practice for knowledge exchange to support high-integrity NbS and/or EBA implementation and other levers of Rio Conventions synergies*

Description: Several communities of practice, partnerships, coalitions, knowledge hubs and networks programs and knowledge networks (e.g., SCP, ENACT, FEBA, PEDRR, NDCP, NBSAP AP, PANORAMA, NbS initiative, etc.) are already supporting knowledge exchange and practical examples, guidance and toolkits as well as matchmaking mechanisms for effective implementation of NbS/EBA and other levers of synergistic implementation of the Rio Conventions. Connect and strengthen them to facilitate the exchange and uptake of evidence, methodologies, implementation experience, lessons learned and innovative approaches relevant to policy coherence across the Rio Conventions, including the implementation of high-integrity NbS/EBA.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Rio Convention secretariats, JLG, financial institutions, implementing partners, research coordination platforms

Linkages to other building blocks: NbS/EBA; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

5.A31 *Create a space for and facilitate a structured exchange of best practices and lessons learned from initiatives that already integrate CBD, UNCCD, and UNFCCC implementation, particularly community-led, IPLC-led, women-led and youth-led experiences*

Description: IPLC's, women, youth and grassroots organizations are already implementing the three Rio Conventions in an integrated manner on the ground, but their contributions remain underrecognized. Creating a space and the conditions for sharing experiences, knowledge, evidence and lessons from these contributions with Parties and other stakeholders during meetings of the bodies of the Conventions would help to increase their recognition and their uptake by policy-makers

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, secretariats, JLG, implementing agencies

Linkages to other building blocks: All

KNOWLEDGE PLATFORMS

5.A32 *Support national knowledge sharing platforms and tools*

Description: Support countries to develop and maintain online portals, including clearing-house mechanisms, that provide information, support knowledge sharing and transparency about the Rio Conventions, and even facilitate peer-to-peer learning and validation. These national portals can collate national monitoring information on the Rio Conventions and provide real-time, AI-driven analyses of policy coherence based on national and regional targets/indicators. Integration with spatial data and decision-making platforms could be included. Cooperation between different portals and data harmonization are important, as the existence of many portals is not practical to use. Additional context: Aligned with Bern III Conference conclusion on enhanced MEA cooperation, knowledge sharing, and coherence for KMGBF implementation.

Time frame: Long term

Scale: National, but could also support sub-regional and local decision-making

Who is responsible: National governments, NFPs, civil society, in coordination with national and regional data providers

Good-practice examples: 1) Digitalization of biodiversity data systems in Antigua and Barbuda [case study](#) (p. 5-6). 2) UNDP AI-driven nature-climate policy coherence tool: demo information can be provided by UNDP on request. 3) UN Biodiversity Lab (UNBL) [STAC catalog](#), which enables the integration of data hosted on UNBL into national platforms, facilitating automatic updates and avoiding fragmentation of data. UNBL is also working with countries to explore how its custom metric functionalities could be used and integrated into national monitoring platforms. 4) GBIF [national portals](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; WoSA

5.A33 *Add additional themes that are synergistic in their nature to existing knowledge platforms*

Description: Make these themes searchable and usable within existing knowledge platforms and communities, linked to planning, monitoring, finance and implementation guidance. These could include, e.g., food systems transformation and ecosystem functioning/integrity.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Convention secretariats, SCP, NBSAP AP, NDC P, technical and scientific support bodies

Good-practice examples: [Climate Policy Radar](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; WoSA

SHARED, OPEN DATA

5.A34 *Develop and institutionalize shared, open policy data infrastructure that makes cross-convention analysis accessible*

Description: Platforms bring together NDCs, NBSAPs, LDN targets, etc., from different countries in one place, easing cross-framework implementation analysis. Priority should be to connect/strengthen what already exists.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National and international

Who is responsible: Implementing agencies, data infrastructure organizations

Good-practice examples: 1) UNESCO [Open Science Working Groups](#) for open data and open access information. 2) [Rio Policy Radar](#) (Climate Policy Radar); 3) NDC Partnership's [kNook](#); 4) [ECOLEX](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; WoSA

6. Resource mobilization

6.1 Possible gaps and overlaps

GAPS IN EXISTING NATIONAL POLICIES

6.G1 *Domestic finance mechanisms operate in silos*

Description: National budgets rarely integrate biodiversity, land and climate finance streams. General lack of integrated investment plans and subsequent coordination of efforts for attracting investments from different types of sources and financial instruments.

GAPS IN EXISTING INTERNATIONAL POLICIES

6.G2 *International finance mechanisms operate in silos*

Description: Most multilateral funds lack consistent guidance on cross-Rio eligibility and joint programming. Multilateral funds generally lack coordination, except for GEF-led efforts.

6.G3 *Lack of transparency in resources invested, leading to the risk of double counting*

Description: There is no common set of rules for the reporting systems of the Rio Conventions that would aim to avoid double or triple counting, including a common methodology for reporting on synergistic finance, that would ensure transparency in the traceability of financial flows and the indicators used for financial interventions targeting synergies between the Rio Conventions. While some upstream funding initiatives (e.g., from the GEF) improve institutional complementarity, they do not resolve the downstream lack of standardized, cross-convention financial accounting standards for Parties. The Conventions currently use no common reporting standard or unified tagging framework to track which financial flows count toward overlapping aims (e.g., an NbS project delivering both climate adaptation and biodiversity gains). Consequently, a critical tracking gap remains where identical national investments risk being double-counted across separate convention reporting platforms.

6.G4 *Absence of a mandatory Rio Conventions synergy screening at the project design stage in multilateral funds*

Description: Multilateral funds lack a mandatory screening of projects at the design stage to identify linkages between climate, biodiversity and land, including possible co-benefits that could be enhanced and for which additional funding sources could be found and trade-offs that could be addressed.

6.G5 *Lack of dedicated, simplified and accessible funding mechanisms in multilateral funds that allow youth, women, IPLCs and other grassroots organizations to access resources for biodiversity, climate and land action directly*

Description: Most finance related to the Rio Conventions remains structurally inaccessible to local organizations due to burdensome accreditation, co-financing and reporting requirements. Some positive developments, such as the GEF Small Grants Programme, remain limited in scale.

OVERLAPS IN EXISTING NATIONAL POLICIES

6.O1 *National implementation of the Rio Conventions can mean competition for limited available resources*

Description: Finance comes from the same pot (State budget), so overall budget constraints apply indistinctly across Conventions. The same "resource mobilization" exercise happens across Conventions, duplicating efforts and competing for scarce resources.

6.2 Concrete actions

FINANCIAL ALIGNMENT

6.A1 *Develop sustainable finance taxonomies for biodiversity, climate, land*

Description: Develop sustainable finance taxonomies that include biodiversity, climate and land aspects, guiding investors to support biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and adaptation, land degradation neutrality, and promote synergies between them. Climate is often included in taxonomies for infrastructure, fisheries, etc., but biodiversity and land are often neglected.

Time frame: Medium, long term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: Ministries of Finance in collaboration with Ministries of Environment

Good-practice examples: 1) [EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities](#). 2) [UN Framework Classification for Resources \(UNFC\)](#). 3) Mexico has established the [Sustainable Taxonomy](#), a public financial policy instrument designed to classify and identify economic activities that generate positive environmental and social impacts. Its objective is to provide a robust reference framework for mobilizing and redirecting both public and private financing toward sustainable projects, while improving market transparency and helping to mitigate the risk of greenwashing.

Linkages to other building blocks: NbS/EBA

6.A2 *Align and re-focus international financing to promote synergies as part of the continued reform process of the international financial architecture*

Description: The international financial architecture, including multilateral development banks, is undergoing continued reform. International financial institutions, including multilateral funds and development banks, should coordinate their funding portfolios, investment priorities and criteria to promote synergies for biodiversity, climate and land, eliminate trade-offs and accelerate the implementation of integrated response actions.

Time frame: Medium to long term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: MDBs and other IFIs, funds and operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A3 *Large multilateral funds to align with the three Conventions at project proposal, including by introducing a mandatory Rio Conventions synergy screening at the project design stage*

Description: A lot of work goes into designing large multi-annual projects, and at project design much can be achieved in terms of coherence. Nudging project proposals involving NbS/EBA to clearly state synergies and trade-offs related to degradation, restoration, biodiversity and climate action can help align mobilization of funds, from funding to implementation. This can also be linked to reporting, monitoring and evaluation.

All relevant projects should be checked at the design stage to see how they can support the three Rio Conventions together. This would help project teams identify not only the project's main objective, but also potential benefits for biodiversity, climate action and land degradation. The project would still have one main focus and one lead convention. However, if some activities also support the goals of the other 2 Conventions, they could be linked to additional funding sources.

This would make projects more coordinated, reduce duplication and create better opportunities for joint financing.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International, regional

Who is responsible: MDBs and other IFIs, funds and operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions

Good-practice examples: GEF [project categorization](#), but could be more explicit

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A4 *Include criteria for aligned action and for synergistic approaches to be supported in access to all Rio Conventions-related and other relevant multilateral funds*

Description: Ensure proposed/approved projects address goals and targets across climate, biodiversity and land use in a crosscutting and comprehensive way and that they include synergistic approaches such as participation in multi-stakeholder platforms and other cooperation/coordination activities that cut across the three Rio Conventions.

Successful programs or projects should demonstrate the potential impact of the proposed actions in addressing various environmental issues comprehensively. The IPBES Nexus Assessment report can serve as a reference for evaluating these projects

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: MDBs and other IFIs, funds and operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions

Good-practice examples: 1) [GBFF](#); 2) [TFFF](#); 3) GEF9 has a focus on [policy coherence](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A5 *Include criteria to prioritize/encourage projects that deliver co-benefits across the three Rio Conventions*

Description: Though there are efforts to prioritize projects that deliver for multiple Conventions, this needs to be scaled up and common across both public and private sectors. E.g., for X\$ there is an additional N\$ for cross-Rio work.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: MDBs and other IFIs, funds and operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions, donors

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A6 *Agree on guidance to the operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions on supporting synergistic finance*

Description: Parties to the Rio Conventions could adopt guidance to the operating entities of the Conventions financial mechanisms (e.g., GEF and GCF) on supporting the design of activities and/or programs oriented to promote policy coherence at different scales, aligning funding criteria across major mechanisms to maximize the impact of scarce financial resources, and supporting Parties to design funding proposals that support synergistic planning and implementation and meet NbS and or EBA objectives, principles and safeguards under all three Conventions.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions (governing bodies of the Conventions)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A7 *Integrate biodiversity, climate and land synergies considerations into regional development bank portfolios*

Description: Create additional/larger finance envelopes directed towards funding synergistic climate, biodiversity and land programs and actions and ensure all financing considers the objectives and goals of the Rio Conventions and applies adequate social and environmental safeguards.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: Regional

Who is responsible: Regional development banks

Good-practice examples: BirdLife Regional [Flyways Initiatives](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A8 *Governments to design public funding programs to promote coherence and synergies*

Description: Governments could design public funding programs to promote coherence and synergies for biodiversity, land and climate, while excluding funding for siloed activities that produce trade-offs.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments (e.g., Ministries of Finance, Planning, Environment, Agriculture)

Good-practice examples: Germany with a dedicated funding program focusing on biodiversity and climate, such as the [Action Plan on Nature-based Solutions for Climate and Biodiversity \(ANK\)](#) / Slovenia's [Climate Change Fund](#) promotes synergies at the level of implementation and can help enhance awareness and acceptance among stakeholders

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A9 *Identify and promote good practices of "do-no-harm" regulations across climate, biodiversity, land and other issues for improving the regulation of subsidies in potentially harmful sectors*

Description: Identify good practices of "do-no-harm" regulations across climate, biodiversity, land and other issues for subsidies in potentially harmful sectors such as agriculture, transport and trade. Promote the circulation of such good practices through technical assistance and other forms of development cooperation

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), UN Regional Commissions, UNDP

Good-practice examples: EU [CAP GAEC](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A10 *Map finance flows, subsidies and incentives that may undermine Rio Convention objectives in a defined country/region and suggest ways for positive, mutually reinforcing realignment without creating new funding pressure, as an example case study*

Description: Undertake a targeted mapping study in a defined country/region to identify where public finance, subsidies, incentives, project criteria, etc., create conflicts across Rio Convention objectives and suggest ways for positive, mutually reinforcing realignment without creating new funding pressure, as an example case study

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: National, regional

Who is responsible: National governments (e.g., Finance ministries), regional organizations, IGOs, CSOs

Good-practice examples: IISD's [Global Subsidies Initiative \(GSI\)](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A11 *Develop a national framework for identifying and phasing out and redirecting environmentally harmful subsidies as a cross-convention resource mobilization lever*

Description: Develop a national framework for identifying and phasing out subsidies harmful to biodiversity, climate and land degradation objectives across the three Conventions. The first step is a transparent mapping of existing harmful subsidies assessed simultaneously against the objectives of all three Conventions.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments, through relevant ministries acting jointly

Good-practice examples: KMGBF Target 18 as an existing anchor for cross-convention subsidy reform

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A12 *Reform harmful incentives/subsidies to align with climate, biodiversity and land outcomes, including by creating obligations across sectors to reduce, and eventually eliminate and re-direct, environmentally harmful subsidies in annual budget allocations*

Description: Optimize public and private finance targeting multiple crises and taking into consideration specific finance targets and modalities of the Conventions, including for positive incentives and subsidies/tax reform. Redirect and reinvest current harmful finance flows to meet Rio objectives. Align efforts between KMGBF Target 18 and UNFCCC pledges to phase down inefficient fossil fuel subsidies.

Governments could create cross-sector obligations to reduce, and eventually eliminate, environmentally harmful subsidies in annual budget allocations, following up on international commitments e.g., under the Paris Agreement and KMGBF. This should be complemented by other fiscal measures, such as tax incentives for biodiversity-, land- and climate-friendly practices or payments for ecosystem services. International backing can be leveraged, e.g., from the Coalition of Finance Ministers for Climate Action

Time frame: Medium to long term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments (e.g., Ministries of Finance, Environment, Land, Agriculture)

Good-practice examples: 1) KMGBF Target 18 and CMA decision 1/CMA.5 on GST1, para. 96, as entry points; 2) [ARTSI](#) Project (GEF-8); 3) Projects to redesign harmful subsidies in [Colombia, Ecuador, India and Thailand](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A13 *Build on relevant tools and tracking systems to make climate, biodiversity and land investments and co-benefits visible, in order to enable donors/funders to identify, assess and prioritize integrated investments going forward*

Description: Integrate information on synergistic climate, biodiversity and land investments and resulting outcomes into existing available tools and tracking systems to make them visible to donors/funders and incentivize new integrated investments.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: National to international

Who is responsible: National governments, Rio Convention secretariats, implementing agencies

Good-practice examples: [Protected Planet](#) (database of protected/conserved areas) by making biodiversity outcomes visible/measurable

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A14 *Convene safe-space dialogues on finance coherence across the Rio Conventions – building upon the recent CBD SBI study on the biodiversity and climate finance nexus, exploring pathways for mutually supportive environmental finance goals*

Description: These dialogues will aim to serve as a safe space for Parties to speak freely about challenges and opportunities, with the clear aim of rebuilding trust. This safe space could pave the way for more constructive discussions and, over time, inform negotiated outcomes.

Time frame: Short (CBD mandate at COP17) to long term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: CBD COP, Rio Conventions secretariats, partner organizations such as BIOFIN, UNEP-FI, etc.

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A15 *Convene regular international dialogues between Finance Ministers and relevant ministries for Rio Conventions synergies*

Description: Regular international dialogues between Finance Ministries and relevant ministries such as Climate, Environment and Agriculture could help pave the way for integrated national finance and investment plans and strategies that align resource mobilization with synergies between the Rio Conventions.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National, international

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, secretariats, COP Presidencies

Good-practice examples: [Coalition of Finance Ministers for Climate Action](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A16 *Continuous support of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), including through the continuation and reinforcement of its Integrated Programs under GEF-9 and its specific funding window and other dedicated initiatives for advancing policy coherence*

Description: The GEF is the financial mechanism for all three Rio Conventions and supports integrated actions that deliver benefits across climate, biodiversity, and land degradation objectives. Continued support for the GEF helps ensure that scarce ODA grant funding is directed to areas where it can achieve the greatest impact while leveraging additional resources and promoting synergies across the Conventions. The GEF's [Integrated Programs](#), which started as such under GEF-8 and will continue under GEF-9, provide an excellent vehicle to promote policy coherence approaches, including interministerial coordination and others. Also, the GEF has been advancing [policy coherence](#) through a STAR Competitive Window focused on policy coherence, under which it has approved four projects in Brazil, China, Indonesia, and Mexico, and through other dedicated initiatives

Time frame: Short, medium, long term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, contributors of the GEF

Linkages to other building blocks: All

NATIONAL FINANCE/INVESTMENT PLANS

6.A17 *Develop and align National Biodiversity Finance Plans (NBFPs), national climate finance strategies and other relevant financing instruments with NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs, LDN targets and NDPs*

Description: Promote coherence between biodiversity and climate finance planning by aligning National Biodiversity Finance Plans (NBFPs), national climate finance strategies and other relevant financing instruments with national planning frameworks, including NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs, LDN targets and NDPs. This would help strengthen coordinated resource mobilization, improve the efficiency and effectiveness of public and private investments, and support integrated implementation across the Rio Conventions

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments, UNEP/UNDP

Good-practice examples: [BIOFIN-supported NBFPs](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; planning, monitoring, reporting and review

6.A18 *Make use of Integrated National Financing Frameworks (INFFs) and country platforms to attract investments in a coordinated manner for aligned NDCs, NAPs, NBSAPs and LDN targets, integrating finance for synergistic actions that deliver across the Rio Conventions*

Description: In the outcome document of the Fourth International Conference on Financing for Development (FfD4) held in 2025, "[Compromiso de Sevilla](#)", countries committed to developing country-led and nationally owned sustainable development strategies, supported by INFFs, and putting in place or enhancing inclusive, country-led national coordination platforms to support these national plans and strategies. Country platforms are voluntary, government-led coordination mechanisms designed to foster collaboration between government and development partners to solve complex political, social and/or economic challenges based on a shared strategic vision and priorities. They aim to mobilize international partnerships and finance. Before the FfD4, country

platforms had already been used for the just energy transition in countries like South Africa, Indonesia, Vietnam and Senegal. The [Sevilla Platform for Action initiative](#), which aims to accelerate implementation of the *Compromiso de Sevilla* and country-led financing strategies, could provide an opportunity to attract public and private investments in a coordinated manner for aligned NDCs, NAPs, NBSAPs and LDN targets.

Building on the successes of BIOFIN, the BIOFIN methodology could be expanded to take into account synergistic actions across all Rio Conventions to support national expenditure review and resource mobilization. The resulting finance plan should consider all three Conventions and provide a coherent approach to mobilizing resources while promoting synergies across their objectives. The plan should align financial flows with the Conventions and ensure financing activities do not undermine their goals.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments, UNDP

Good-practice examples: [BIOFIN-supported NBFPS](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

FINANCE SAFEGUARDS AND INCLUSIVENESS

6.A19 *Align requirements for finance to be inclusive and fully respect human rights and relevant socio-economic safeguards at all scales*

Description: Also ensure that safeguards go beyond an optional “do-no-harm” approach and that they support the achievement of multiple targets as well as delivery and access mechanisms to meet the needs of IPLCs.

Time frame: Medium to long term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, MDBs and other IFIs, funds and operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A20 *Emphasize WOS and WOG approaches and policy coherence in GEF-9 program development*

Description: New GEF enabling activities and other projects can have a concrete focus on policy coherence, IPLC & WoS and WoG approaches, perhaps explicit components and funding on these areas. Projects can also integrate WoS approaches by including CSO, IPLCs and women in steering committees and as Rio Convention focal points at both the national and global project levels.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International (but nationally implemented)

Who is responsible: GEF, SCBD, implementing agencies

Linkages to other building blocks: WoSA

FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY-LED INITIATIVES, IPLCs, WOMEN, YOUTH

6.A21 *Establish dedicated, simplified funding windows, as well as readiness support programs for accessing, managing and reporting on funding, for locally- and community-led initiatives (by IPLCs, youth and women) across the Rio Conventions*

Description: Access to finance for communities and women means ensuring that they can easily obtain the financial resources needed to support their livelihoods and environmental actions. Create simplified and accessible funding mechanisms that allow youth, women, IPLCs and other grassroots organizations to directly access resources for biodiversity, climate and land action without excessive administrative barriers, since most finance related to the Rio Conventions remains structurally inaccessible to local organizations due to burdensome accreditation, co-financing and reporting requirements, as well as gender inequality in financial systems.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National, regional and international

Who is responsible: Funds and operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions, multilateral and bilateral donors, national governments

Good-practice examples: While still limited in scale, some initiatives outside the Rio Conventions provide useful examples of more accessible and community-responsive financing approaches: The [Global Alliance for Green and Gender Action \(GAGGA\)](#) combines public donor finance with feminist regranting mechanisms through women's funds and environmental justice organizations, supporting grassroots women-led climate and environmental justice work through flexible funding and capacity strengthening. The [Indigenous Peoples Assistance Facility](#) under IFAD also provides an important example, as Indigenous Peoples' organizations directly participate in governance and funding decisions. Similarly, the [Amazon for Life Fund](#), developed with the Coordinator of Indigenous Organizations of the Amazon River Basin (COICA) and the Inter-American Development Bank, has been recognized as an innovative model because Indigenous organizations co-designed both the governance structure and funding approach. These experiences demonstrate the importance of direct access, participatory governance and long-term accompaniment. However, even the strongest examples remain relatively marginal compared to the scale of finance that continues to flow through large government, multilateral development banks and private-sector channels.

Other funding initiatives often cited as positive developments but still limited in scale are: the GEF [Small Grants Programme](#), the GEF-funded [Heart of Conservation Initiative](#), and the UNDP-Italy [2026 Youth4Climate Call for Solutions](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

6.A22 *Increase the allocation of funds for IPLC, women and youth-led initiatives in multilateral funds and financial institutions*

Description: Existing funding opportunities for IPLCs, women and youth remain very limited in scale. Increasing funding allocations for these groups in multilateral funds and financial institutions would enable more projects and provide more resources for each.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Funds and operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions, multilateral and bilateral donors, MDBs and other IFIs

Good-practice examples: Since its design, the [TFFF](#) aims to provide at least 20% of the payments transferred to each tropical forest country to IPLCs

Linkages to other building blocks: Contributions and rights of IPLCs, WoSA

6.A23 *Develop and implement community-based funding programs that address biodiversity loss, climate change and land degradation*

Description: Providing funding support to NGOs that are taking actions that synergistically address these challenges, for example, land restoration initiatives that support biodiversity and carbon sequestration. The application process would require applicants to demonstrate how their project proposal addresses these challenges co-beneficially.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National, international

Who is responsible: National governments, funds and operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions, multilateral and bilateral donors, MDBs and other IFIs

Linkages to other building blocks: Contributions and rights of IPLCs, WoSA

6.A24 *Create impact for biodiversity, climate and land through small grants for local actors*

Description: Implementation of policies cannot be successful without local actors, and consequently they also play an important role in promoting coherence

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: National, regional, international

Who is responsible: Funds and operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions, multilateral and bilateral donors, national governments

Good-practice examples: German [Action Plan on Nature-based Solutions for Climate and Biodiversity \(ANK\)](#) / [IKI Medium-Small Grants](#) funding programs demonstrate that small-scale, easily accessible financial support for local governments and communities can have a great impact promoting measures for biodiversity conservation and climate change adaptation/mitigation, and that the demand for such grants is high

Linkages to other building blocks: Contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

6.A25 *Strengthen direct access for IPLCs, women, and youth through community-based and regional financing intermediaries*

Description: IPLCs need direct access to funding for implementation. At the same time, donors often require certain governance structures before releasing funds. Some IPLC groups aren't set up to receive funding. Therefore, they cannot access funding directly. It then has to go through an NGO or another intermediary, which can complicate things. This is an ongoing challenge. Increase the flow of biodiversity, climate and land finance through existing Indigenous Peoples', community-based, women-led, youth-led and regional funding mechanisms that already possess trusted governance structures, grant-making experience and strong territorial presence. These organizations can also serve as accredited intermediaries and implementing partners for larger environmental funds

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National, regional, and international

Who is responsible: Funds and operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions, multilateral and bilateral donors, national governments, philanthropic organizations, IPLC organizations

Good-practice examples: [International Funders for Indigenous Peoples \(IFIP\)](#); [Pawanka Fund](#); [Podáali Fund](#); [Global Alliance of Territorial Communities](#) financing initiatives; [community foundations](#) and regional philanthropic funds

Linkages to other building blocks: Contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

6.A26 *Support IPLCs to set up their own, self-managed funds*

Description: Creating their own, self-managed fund mechanisms helps IPLCs to become less dependent on other (intermediary) actors to receive and disburse funds earmarked for their activities

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: Local to international

Who is responsible: IPLCs, existing multilateral climate and biodiversity funds and funding institutions, governments, CSOs

Good-practice examples: [Nusantara Fund](#) (Indonesia), [Podáali Fund](#) (Brazil), [Shandia, Pawanka Fund](#) (global)

Linkages to other building blocks: Contributions and rights of IPLCs, WoSA

6.A27 *Reform financing mechanisms for gender responsiveness and inclusion*

Description: Reform financing access conditions and establish dedicated cross-convention funding windows within GEF, GCF, and the Adaptation Fund, with gender-responsive criteria, harmonized gender action plan commitments, and rights-based conditions as mandatory requirements across all financing windows. Financing mechanisms should explicitly track, report, and reward gender outcomes alongside environmental targets, ensuring that resource mobilization actively closes the gender financing gap and reaches women-led and IPLC-led NbS and/or EBA initiatives at community scale. Gender action plans of all three Rio Conventions can be used harmonized and support guiding financing eligibility, design, and accountability.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: GEF, GCF, Adaptation Fund, and LDCF, Parties to the Rio Conventions

Linkages to other building blocks: Contributions and rights of IPLCs; WoSA

FUNDING FOR NbS/EBA**6.A28** *Engage with Ministries of Finance to integrate NbS and/or EBA in public investment strategies and budget plans*

Description: To overcome the finance gap for NbS/EBA, Ministries of Finance should become a key partner for NbS/EBA implementation. They need to understand the concepts and their value for public investments.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: Ministries of Environment (and other relevant ministries) and Ministries of Finance

Good-practice examples: Mexico: [National Environmental Restoration Programme 2025-2030](#) / [Coalition of Finance Ministers for Climate Action](#) / [G20 Sustainable Finance Working Group \(SFWG\)](#) with recommendations for regulatory frameworks that may scale finance for NbS / [Mexican Sustainable Taxonomy](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Nbs/EBA

6.A29 *Develop national funding programs and support structures for national and subnational actors to implement and scale up NbS and/or EBA*

Description: Provide financial incentives and technical support to national and subnational actors to implement and scale up NbS/EBA, e.g., via national funding programs for NbS/EBA or integrating NbS/EBA into existing funding programs.

Time frame: Medium to long term

Scale: National to subnational

Who is responsible: National government (Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Finance), subnational governments

Good-practice examples: 1) Germany with Federal Action Plan on NbS for Climate and Biodiversity ([Towards successful policy coherence for biodiversity and climate](#), p. 32); 2) Examples from Mexico: [ECCBio](#) (Climate Change and Biodiversity Explorer), [SNIRA](#) (National Environmental Restoration System); 3) Brazil's National Native Vegetation Recovery Plan ([Planaveg](#))

Linkages to other building blocks: Nbs/EBA

6.A30 *Scale up finance and investments for NbS and/or EBA from all sources*

Description: Mainstreaming NbS/EBA will require significant scaling of finance and investments for nature, including domestic budgets, multilateral development banks, multilateral climate and biodiversity funds, bilateral development agencies, private sector actors, and philanthropic sources in the form of grants over loans. To close the funding gap and reduce pressure on nature, strategies should include reforming harmful subsidies, as well as embedding environmental costs in market prices, rethinking global debt structures, and increasing private sector investment

Time frame: Medium to long term

Scale: International to national

Who is responsible: National governments, financial institutions, funds, development agencies

Good-practice examples: Mexico's recently launched [Environmental Capital Fund](#) is a collaboration between the Ministries of Environment and Finance, the Development Bank of Latin America and the Caribbean (CAF) and the private sector. Resources may be allocated to projects focused on ecosystem restoration and conservation, natural capital protection, sustainable water and soil management, the circular economy, the bioeconomy, air quality, and climate action.

Linkages to other building blocks: Nbs/EBA

6.A31 *Promote greater detail on NbS and/or EBA at project design to create clarity and manage expectations*

Description: Ask public and private funding project proponents for greater detail regarding NbS/EBA (the what, when, how, for how long, with whom, for whom, etc.). This will create clarity and manage expectations; it will also help better understand the type of finance most suitable for the intervention.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International, national

Who is responsible: Funds and operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions, national agencies

Linkages to other building blocks: NbS/EBA

6.A32 *CBD COP17 to mandate SBI to continue its work on the biodiversity and climate finance nexus, building upon its recent study exploring pathways for mutually supportive biodiversity and climate finance goals*

Description: This continuation could entail a mapping of existing frameworks and guidance, with an aim to provide support for innovative finance approaches, such as biodiversity credits (likely to live under SBSTTA though), green bond structures, and debt-for-nature swaps - all of which are critical tools in bringing private finance flows to support NbS/EBA. The goal should be to use public finance strategically to de-risk projects, build robust project pipelines to catalyze investment at scale - this is especially critical in emerging and developing markets, and for sectors especially dependent on nature.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International, national

Who is responsible: Parties to the CBD

Linkages to other building blocks: NbS/EBA

INNOVATIVE FINANCIAL SOLUTIONS AND PRIVATE SECTOR

6.A33 *Pilot and scale up innovative financing solutions (e.g., blended finance) including impact investment for projects with biodiversity, land and climate co-benefits*

Description: In pursuit of "financing from all sources", public funds can be used as first-loss capital to attract private investment in restoration, conservation (etc.) projects and deliver synergistic climate, biodiversity and land outcomes and neutral (or modest) financial returns. This can engage new private capital from actors unwilling to take all the risk of "green" investment themselves.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National and regional

Who is responsible: Public development cooperation agencies, private investment (corporate, family funds); impact investment fund managers (public actors, non-profits, existing funds like GEF or GCF)

Linkages to other building blocks: NbS/EBA; WoSA

6.A34 *Continue to provide support to the development of innovative multilateral funding mechanisms at the crossroads of the Rio Conventions, like the Tropical Forest Forever Facility (TFFF)*

Description: The TFFF creates synergies between global climate finance, biodiversity preservation, and sustainable development by financially rewarding nations that keep standing forests intact. This innovative approach, which addresses a long-standing gap in international finance mechanisms, aligns public and private investments with local ecological conservation. Support for the emergence and consolidation of these initiatives at the crossroads of the Rio Conventions should continue.

Time frame: Short, medium and long term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, multilateral and bilateral donors, the private sector

Good-practice examples: The [TFFF](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A35 *Mobilize resources from emerging donors*

Description: In a context where legacy donors have limited resources, to reduce the risk of subtracting resources from the implementation of each Convention, emerging donors could be invited to support actions that promote policy coherence and cooperation. This may increase resources and nexus benefits.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Non-traditional donors

Good-practice examples: [GBFF](#), [G20 Global Land Initiative](#), [TFFF](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A36 *Establish a clear added "cost" for harmful commercial activities that is directly directed to IPLCs or affected communities*

Description: Establish an additional specific cost for harmful activities so as to generate ad hoc funding at the national level for affected communities only.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments

Good-practice examples: 1) Armenia, for affected communities with mining. 2) Nigeria, with an extra 7% cost for logging, which goes first into a trust fund and then to communities

Linkages to other building blocks: Contributions and rights of IPLCs, WoSA

6.A37 *Promote and make use of debt-for-nature/climate/land swaps to mobilize resources for activities that generate biodiversity-climate-land co-benefits*

Description: Global South countries are put in a position to either maintain/abide by their international debt commitments or decide to invest in their nature. A financial instrument like debt-for-nature/climate/land, where developing countries can pay their debts by conserving or restoring their ecosystems, is a must; otherwise austerity measures by international lending institutions (e.g., the IMF) can become permanent blockers. It can also become a bicephalous situation where one entity forces the economy in one direction, and then another entity (e.g., TFFF) invests in conservation.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: MDBs, IFIs, public and private banks, loan institutions, donors

Good-practice examples: Ecuador's [debt-for-nature swap for the Galapagos Islands](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

6.A38 *Using IPBES Business and Biodiversity Assessment to clarify the case for investment in biodiversity-climate-land action for business*

Description: Key takeaways from the report are that businesses both depend on, and harm, nature; that current business practices conflict with efforts to halt and reverse biodiversity loss; and that businesses and governments can act now to address their impacts on nature.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National to International

Who is responsible: Rio Convention Secretariats, IPBES communications office

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making

6.A39 *Require mandatory biodiversity, climate and land-related disclosure by large companies and financial institutions*

Description: Disclosure and data are fundamental to enabling private finance players to integrate biodiversity, climate and land aspects into decision-making, and a fundamental first step to mobilize private finance. This relates to KMGBF Target 15, para. 96 of the CMA GST1 decision, and [UNCCD's Business for Land Initiative](#)

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International and national

Who is responsible: Stock exchanges, financial regulators, legislators, global industry initiatives (ISSB, TNFD, etc.)

Good-practice examples: [European Sustainability Reporting Standards](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: WoSA

6.A40 *Provide guidance to, and clarify role of, private sector in the context of national climate, biodiversity and land goals*

Description: Governments can provide more clarity on how the private sector and private finance can contribute to climate and biodiversity goals. Specific tools can include sectoral pathways, scenarios, and elaborations in national climate and biodiversity strategies. These tools can also guide investment plans of private institutions.

Time frame: Medium term

Scale: National level, but ideally with interoperability/coherence internationally

Who is responsible: Joint effort by government departments

Good-practice examples: [Nature-Positive Transition Pathways](#) in the UK

Linkages to other building blocks: WoSA

6.A41 *Build national capacity within private actors interested in investing in synergistic biodiversity-climate-land projects*

Description: Build and strengthen capacity within private actors that are interested in investing in environmental challenges. There is already a lot of knowledge on carbon credits, and it is possible to learn from the challenges and bad examples. Also take advantage of private accelerators and private actors' interest to ensure NbS/EBA interventions consider synergies and trade-offs.

Time frame: Medium to long term

Scale: Local, national and international

Who is responsible: National governments, implementing agencies

Good-practice examples: UNCCD's [Business for Land \(B4L\) initiative](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: WoSA

6.A42 *Develop involvement strategies/road maps tailored to specific sub-sectors within the private sector*

Description: It is essential to strengthen the participation of the business and financial sectors in advancing the biodiversity and climate agenda. Financial institutions should carefully assess the environmental impacts of their investments and promote sustainable finance practices that support the objectives of the three Rio Conventions in an integrated manner. Likewise, companies should evaluate their impacts on biodiversity, climate and land, as well as the opportunities they have to contribute to those objectives. Governments could develop separate strategies/roadmaps for involving the business and financial sectors, taking into account their specificities.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments

Good-practice examples: In Mexico, as part of the implementation of KMGBF Target 15, BIOFIN Mexico, together with the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT) and the Ministry of Finance and Public Credit (SHCP), is currently developing a [road map](#) to foster collaboration with the financial sector and promote its active participation in biodiversity conservation and sustainable development efforts

Linkages to other building blocks: NbS/EBA

TRANSPARENCY, ACCOUNTABILITY AND DOUBLE COUNTING**6.A43** *Develop accountabilities to avoid double-counting*

Description: Synergies are an opportunity to potentiate the finance flows to nature, but should not be used as a way to double-count the amount of finance dedicated to climate, biodiversity and land action.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review

6.A44 *Develop a Rio Convention-specific outcome tagging to ensure transparency and avoid double counting, while encouraging relevant financial institutions to use the same tags for reporting*

Description: Develop a cohesive system for biodiversity, climate and land finance tagging specifically for the Rio Conventions to ensure transparency and avoid double counting, while encouraging relevant financial institutions to use the same tags for reporting. Align where possible with existing OECD tagging processes.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions

Good-practice examples: None. This would be a novel approach to ensure that finance tracking/tagging is consistent with Rio Convention needs

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review

6.A45 *Improve finance tracking and MRV across aligned objectives*

Description: Improve tracking of finance and Measurement, Reporting, and Verification (MRV) to ensure accountability and transparency at the programmatic and finance levels, along with tracking of relevant carbon, biodiversity, and land metrics. Traceable data is needed on financial flows, showing how much goes toward coherent efforts (e.g., NbS/EBA finance).

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review

6.A46 *Develop a "Rio Coherence Marker"*

Description: To track investments that are specifically targeted at increasing policy coherence and cooperation across the three Rio Conventions and beyond, a new "Rio Synergy Marker" could be developed on top of the three existing "Rio Markers". This could encourage additional, targeted resource mobilization.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: OECD

Good-practice examples: Existing climate, biodiversity and desertification "[Rio Markers](#)"

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review

7. Contributions and rights of indigenous peoples and local communities

7.1 Possible gaps and overlaps

GAPS IN EXISTING NATIONAL POLICIES

7.G1 *Insufficient recognition and protection of IPLCs' rights*

Description: Many countries still lack strong recognition of, and mechanisms in place to guarantee and protect, the rights of IPLCs, who are already implementing synergies on the ground.

7.2 Concrete actions

PARTICIPATION AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

7.A1 *Institutionalize knowledge and participation of IPLCs across national planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting under the Rio Conventions, including participation in national coordination platforms*

Description: The importance of IPLC participation is recognized as critical, but its application remains limited. To enhance IPLC participation, it should be institutionalized at the national level. This includes embedding IPLC participation in relevant national laws & plans and investing in inclusive governance capacities (e.g., capacity building for IPLCs, empowering local actors, raising awareness on IPLCs, etc.). It also includes establishing or strengthening permanent, rights-based mechanisms for the full and effective participation of IPLCs in the preparation, implementation, monitoring, review and reporting of national strategies and plans under the Rio Conventions, including their participation in national coordination platforms. Such mechanisms should recognize IPLCs as rights holders, knowledge holders, governance actors and implementation partners, and enable Indigenous and local knowledge to inform decision-making and reporting, subject to free, prior and informed consent and appropriate safeguards for knowledge ownership, access and use.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National and subnational

Who is responsible: National governments, Rio Conventions NFPs, subnational and local authorities

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; planning, monitoring, reporting and review; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building, resource mobilization, WoSA

7.A2 *Strengthen or establish national IPLC platforms for working with national and subnational governance bodies to implement climate, biodiversity and land strategies*

Description: Strengthen or develop IPLC platforms to align actions and collaborate across different levels by working with national and subnational governance bodies to implement climate, land and biodiversity strategies

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National and subnational

Who is responsible: National government and national IPLC representatives and organizations

Good-practice examples: Peru's [Indigenous Peoples Platform for Climate Change](#) as a key space for coordination and dialogue within Peru's environmental governance and an important instrument for national adaptation planning because it integrates Indigenous knowledge and practices. The Platform comprises representatives from the seven national organizations

representing Peru's Indigenous Peoples and the Ministry of Culture, as well as the Ministry of the Environment, which serves as its technical secretariat.

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; planning, monitoring, reporting and review; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building, resource mobilization, WoSA

PARTICIPATION AT THE CONVENTIONS LEVEL

7.A3 *Adopt the ToRs of UNCCD's two new caucuses, one on indigenous peoples, and one on local communities, at UNCCD COP17*

Description: UNCCD COP decision 5/COP.16 (par. 9(b)) requested the secretariat to support the development of relevant terms of reference for the creation of a Caucus for Indigenous Peoples and a Caucus for Local Communities, and to report on it at COP17.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: UNCCD COP

Linkages to other building blocks: WoSA

7.A4 *Adopt the modus operandi of the new SB8J at CBD COP17*

Description: CBD COP decision 16/5 established a subsidiary body on Article 8(j) and other provisions of the CBD related to indigenous peoples and local communities (SB8J) and requested the SB8J, at its first session, to further elaborate and finalize its modus operandi for consideration at COP17 with a view to its adoption.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: CBD COP

Linkages to other building blocks: WoSA

7.A5 *Initiate cooperation between UNFCCC's FWG-LCIPP, CBD's SB8J and similar processes or bodies under the UNCCD, and include it as an activity in LCIPP's programme of work for 2028-2030*

Description: With the recent establishment of SB8J under CBD and the forthcoming ToRs for the creation of a Caucus for Indigenous Peoples and a Caucus for Local Communities under UNCCD, there is an emerging opportunity for these bodies to communicate and cooperate for more effective and enhanced alignment between the Rio Conventions on matters related to the rights of IPLCs and their contributions to the synergistic implementation of the Conventions.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: FWG-LCIPP, Bureau of the SB8J, UNCCD's Caucus for Indigenous Peoples and Caucus for Local Communities, secretariats of the Rio Conventions

Linkages to other building blocks: Resource mobilization; WoSA

7.A6 *Convene and support informal joint meetings of IPLC constituencies and observer organizations working on the different Rio Conventions*

Description: Meetings of governing and/or subsidiary bodies of one Convention could provide an opportunity to organize informal joint meetings between IPLC constituencies and observer organizations on matters under each of the Rio Conventions, with appropriate financial support.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Secretariats of the Rio Conventions, donors

Linkages to other building blocks: Resource mobilization; WoSA

7.A7 *Conduct a mapping and analysis of IPLC participation and engagement across the three Rio Conventions processes/outputs and how they could further engage in a meaningful manner*

Description: There is a need for clarity on how IPLCs already participate and engage in the Rio Conventions processes and outputs (e.g., COP decisions, NBSAPS/NDCs/NAPs/NDPs/LDN targets) and how well this leads to implementation successes. A practical mapping and analysis would help to identify successful examples and learn why they work. It would also help identify gaps to highlight where IPLC engagement is missing and what steps are needed to fill them and make it more effective.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Rio Convention secretariats, JLG, FWG-LCIPP, SB8J, UNCCD Caucus for Indigenous Peoples and Caucus for Local Communities

Good-practice examples: The [technical paper](#) produced by the FWG-LCIPP on “Existing policies and practices for the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in climate change related bodies and processes under and outside the Convention” (July 2021)

Linkages to other building blocks: WoSA

RIGHTS

7.A8 *Implement IPBES Nexus Assessment response option F16 on access to natural resources and land*

Description: Promoting, enabling and securing equitable access to natural resources and land, and securing land tenure rights for vulnerable and marginalized groups, including IPLCs.

Time frame: Short term (ongoing)

Scale: All levels, especially national for legislative implementation

Who is responsible: National and local governments, IPLC organizations

Good-practice examples: Brazil's [legal recognition](#) of new indigenous territories

Linkages to other building blocks: WoSA

7.A9 *Recognize and respect more strongly Indigenous Peoples' rights, including land tenure rights, including in spatial planning and MRV*

Description: Encouraging transparent reporting under each Convention using the same GIS spatial layer to enable consistent, disaggregated reporting of land areas that recognizes,

formalizes and enforces the tenure rights to territories of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

Time frame: Short to long term (as it takes time to introduce new reporting requirements in the three Rio Conventions)

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments

Good-practice examples: 1) KMGBF Monitoring Framework Headline Indicator 22.1. 2) [FAO Governance of Tenure](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Alignment of national strategies and plans; planning, monitoring, reporting and review; WoSA

7.A10 *Operationalize and report on KMGBF Monitoring Framework Headline Indicator 22.1 regarding legal recognition and tenure security of lands and territories held or used by IPLCs*

Description: Headline Indicator 22.1 measures the proportion of lands and territories held or used by Indigenous Peoples and local communities (a) with legal recognition or legally recognized documentation and (b) where there is perceived security of tenure.

Time frame: Short, medium and long term

Scale: National (national data, but could be an aggregate of community-level data)

Who is responsible: National governments (for reporting)

Good-practice examples: FAO, WRI, and the Land Tenure Facility are charged with the development of this indicator under the CBD, bringing together data from [Landmark](#), [LANDex](#), and possibly additional resources

Linkages to other building blocks: Planning, monitoring, reporting and review: WoSA

7.A11 *Ensure women have equal rights to land*

Description: Ensure women have equal rights to land, despite barriers linked to cultural beliefs and gender norms

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments

Linkages to other building blocks: WoSA

7.A12 *Recognize the rights of nature for empowering IPLCs to have a stronger voice in how natural resources are conserved and managed*

Description: Rights of Nature is a concept that can help to provide for the worldviews and cultural perspectives of IPLCs. They can be given effect, for example, by establishing legal guardianship bodies led by local indigenous peoples that act on behalf of Nature's rights and interests.

Time frame: Medium, long term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments

Good-practice examples: In [New Zealand](#), for example, legal personhood has been granted to several different natural entities, including a national park, a river and a mountain, with a bicultural representative governing body to act on their behalf. Each country and situation will be unique;

however, New Zealand's experience is that recognizing the rights of nature can be an effective environmental management and conservation strategy, which can also elevate partnerships with indigenous peoples by reinforcing the importance of biodiversity to them, their role as guardians and the place of traditional knowledge in restoring nature.

Linkages to other building blocks: WoSA

SUPPORT FOR INDIGENOUS AND COMMUNITY-LED INITIATIVES

7.A13 *Much greater government (policy, programmatic and finance) support for Indigenous and community-led initiatives*

Description: Indigenous and community-led initiatives for nature conservation and restoration are widespread and offer great potential for more equitable, effective and lasting conservation, but they require much greater policy, programmatic and finance support. "Support initiatives led by indigenous peoples and local communities that address the interlinkages between biodiversity and climate change, based on their traditional knowledge, innovations, technologies and practices of customary sustainable use of biodiversity" (as per Task 2.3 of the programme of work on Art. 8j).

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments

Good-practice examples: Many community-led conservation initiatives, e.g., [case studies from Chile, Senegal, Sri Lanka and Thailand](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization

FINANCE (see also Resource Mobilization)

7.A14 *Enable IPLCs to participate as funded partners and, where appropriate, leaders in transdisciplinary research programs*

Description: Move beyond consultation-based participation by establishing funding and partnership arrangements that enable IPLCs to participate as funded co-investigators, knowledge holders, implementation partners and, where appropriate, consortium leaders in international transdisciplinary research programs. Funding mechanisms should provide equitable, direct and sustained support for participation throughout project co-design, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, knowledge governance and knowledge uptake. They should accommodate diverse institutional and governance arrangements, recognize Indigenous and local knowledge systems alongside other forms of expertise, and include appropriate provisions for fair compensation, capacity strengthening, free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), data governance, intellectual and cultural rights, and equitable benefit-sharing. Research funding organizations and international coordination platforms should pilot, evaluate and progressively institutionalize participation modalities and dedicated funding windows that reduce barriers to IPLC leadership and equitable participation.

Time frame: Short to medium term (with longer-term institutionalization)

Scale: International, regional and national

Who is responsible: Research coordination platforms, IPLC organizations, philanthropic partners, research institutions and national funding agencies

Good-practice examples: Belmont Forum Collaborative Research Actions: [Ocean 2](#), [Arctic 3](#) and [Biodiversity 3](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based policy-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization, WoSA

SHOWCASING CONTRIBUTIONS

7.A15 *Develop a global platform to showcase holistic IPLC management of biodiversity, land and climate, including a repository for cases on NbS and/or EBA based on ILK and IPLC actions*

Description: There are many case studies of IPLCs holistically managing lands with benefits for climate and biodiversity. Collecting and showcasing these holistic cases can provide examples for other countries to draw on in NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs, LDN targets and NDPs. The repository of cases would provide evidence on how NbS/EBA benefit from ILK and how NbS/EBA implemented by IPLCs provide multiple benefits at both local and national levels. This would highlight why IPLCs need to be at the forefront of funding for NbS/EBA.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International and local (global platform but local cases)

Who is responsible: JLG with partners like IUCN Panorama, Satoyama Initiative, or SCP

Good-practice examples: 1) IUCN [Panorama](#) platform of cases. 2) FAO's [Indigenous Peoples' Biocentric Restoration Global Programme](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: NbS/EBA; science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization; WoSA

8. Whole-of-society approach

8.1 Possible gaps and overlaps

GAPS IN EXISTING NATIONAL POLICIES

- 8.G1** *IPLCs, women and youth are excluded from participating in a meaningful and consistent way in decision-making bodies regarding the Rio Conventions, both at national and international levels*

Description: Participation of IPLCs, women and youth in national processes related to the Rio Conventions is limited to being observers, not decision-makers. They do not participate at the table where negotiations take place and decisions are made. IPLC authorities are not recognized as authorities of nations and territories.

GAPS IN EXISTING INTERNATIONAL POLICIES

- 8.G2** *IPLCs, women and youth are excluded from participating in a meaningful and consistent way in decision-making bodies regarding the Rio Conventions, both at national and international levels*

Description: Participation of IPLCs, women and youth in international processes related to the Rio Conventions is limited to being observers, not decision-makers. They do not participate at the table where negotiations take place and decisions are made. IPLC authorities are not recognized as authorities of nations and territories.

- 8.G3** *Absence of formal coordination mechanism between the different constituencies of IPLCs, women and youth across the Rio Conventions*

Description: IPLC, women and youth constituencies of each Rio Convention work in isolation. They engage in each Rio Convention separately, without a shared cross-convention strategy. Working in silos limits collective and coherent influence.

OVERLAPS IN EXISTING NATIONAL POLICIES

- 8.O1** *Gender, youth, IPLCs, etc. are addressed, at least in name, in multiple synergies initiatives, both at the national and the international levels: which to choose?*

Description: From a civil society perspective, multiple initiatives addressing the same group can be confusing or overburdening (although options can also help increase access). CSOs, NGOs, IPLCs can struggle to know which initiative would be most impactful to engage in.

OVERLAPS IN EXISTING INTERNATIONAL POLICIES

- 8.O2** *Gender, youth, IPLCs, etc. are addressed, at least in name, in multiple synergies initiatives, both at the national and the international levels: which to choose?*

Description: From a civil society perspective, multiple initiatives addressing the same group can be confusing or overburdening (although options can also help increase access). CSOs, NGOs, IPLCs can struggle to know which initiative would be most impactful to engage in.

8.2 Concrete actions

MULTI-STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

- 8.A1** *Institutionalize permanent and inclusive national multi-stakeholder coordination platforms bringing together governments, youth, IPLCs, women, civil society, academia,*

the private sector and other stakeholders across the implementation of the three Rio Conventions

Description: There is good evidence from literature and experience that multi-stakeholder platforms can be powerful in building shared understanding of problems and engagement for collective action. However, they are often ad hoc, related to single Conventions, or with time-bound mandates. Institutionalizing them and cross-walking across Conventions would help overcome these constraints. Interoperable data and shared monitoring systems should support the platforms to plan, implement and report on commitments jointly. This links participatory decision-making with integrated evidence and reporting, reducing duplication and strengthening coherent implementation across biodiversity, climate and land agendas.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments, Rio Conventions NFPs, national statistical offices and data agencies

Linkages to other building blocks: All

8.A2 *Ensure the inclusion/participation of IPLCs, youth and women in national delegations and/or in the development of national positions*

Description: IPLCs, youth and women individuals may participate in each Rio Convention's negotiations either as part of their national delegations or as part of an observer organization or constituency. Both have their pros and cons. In the first case, if negotiating, they must follow the national position, not their group's, but can build closer relationships and trust with their country's negotiators. In the second case, they can speak on behalf of their group's position and bring forward their group's asks, but will be excluded from negotiation and decision-making reserved for Parties. In either case, national governments can give IPLCs, youth and women the possibility to participate in and inform the development of their national positions for negotiations, including through consultations, dialogues and briefings before and during the negotiation sessions.

Time frame: Short, medium, long term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, NFPs, Party negotiation groups, IPLC, youth and women organizations, networks and individuals

Good-practice examples: 1) Sami indigenous people are given the possibility to be part of Norway's delegations for the negotiations or attend individually as observers, which they usually tend to prefer. When Norway sets its negotiating positions, Samis are closely involved. 2) Brazil is amplifying its consultations with different groups before each negotiation; it held consultations with IP organizations before COP30. 3) The GRULAC group opened its regional daily meetings for 15 minutes at the plastics treaty negotiations to allow for 3-minute inputs from 5 rightholders/CSO/Caucuses

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs

8.A3 *Strengthen the role of and collaboration between constituencies, caucuses and other observer organizations' engagement mechanisms across the Rio Conventions in driving forward synergies, including through adequate financial support for IPLCs, women and youth*

Description: Observer organizations' engagement mechanisms (such as [UNFCCC constituencies](#) and [UNCCD caucuses](#) on youth, gender, Indigenous Peoples and local

communities) can play a key role in identifying synergies and sharing and relaying them to civil society. These mechanisms bridge groups at national, international, and local levels, and can provide specific technical knowledge on thematic areas across the Rio Conventions. Enhancing synergies and collaboration between these mechanisms, in turn, strengthens synergies between the Conventions and provides a door for civil society to engage, understand and shape these processes. However, in practice, limited collaboration between observer groups of different Conventions remains largely informal and under-resourced, with no dedicated coordination mechanism.

Time frame: Short (ongoing)

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Constituencies, caucuses and other observer organizations engagement mechanisms of the Rio Conventions. Also Parties to the Rio Conventions and donors

Good-practice examples: The CBD Women's Caucus, the UNFCCC Women and Gender Constituency and the CCD Gender Caucus have collaborated in technical exchanges, capacity-building sessions and briefs focused on their constituencies, where they discuss the Conventions' synergies. Examples include [the comparative analysis of the CBD and UNFCCC Gender Action Plans](#), engagement through the [GEF Women and Gender Caucus](#) on environmental finance, participation in the [Women's Land Rights Initiative](#) to advance gender responsive policies/laws/initiatives in relation to land tenure, and collaboration within the [Gender and Environment Data Alliance \(GEDA\)](#) to advance gender-responsive environmental data and monitoring systems. They are planning specifically around the three COPs, including through side events, peer review processes, and the opportunity for further integration of their members across the Conventions. However, coordination remains largely informal and under-resourced, with no dedicated coordination mechanism.

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs

8.A4 *Establish a formal gender coordination mechanism between gender constituencies and caucuses, national gender focal points, and secretariats of the three Rio Conventions*

Description: The women and gender constituencies under the CBD, UNFCCC and civil society members of the UNCCD Gender Caucus are increasingly collaborating across the three Rio Conventions. However, current collaboration still depends largely on voluntary efforts, informal relationships and limited project-based funding, with no dedicated joint mechanism. Such a mechanism could help prevent contradictory or fragmented gender-related decisions across the Conventions, promote shared indicators and more coherent reporting systems, and reduce reporting burdens on women's organizations working across biodiversity, climate and land processes. It could also strengthen coordination, joint advocacy, capacity-building and resource-sharing among the women and gender constituencies of the CBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD, whose diverse memberships already include Indigenous Peoples, local communities and other civil society actors.

Time frame: Short

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Constituencies, caucuses and other observer organizations engagement mechanisms, national gender focal points and secretariats of the Rio Conventions (with Parties to the Conventions to promote the establishment of the coordination mechanism and donors to finance its work)

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs

8.A5 *Integration of IPLCs, women, youth, CSOs, the private sector and other non-State actor representatives into cross-Rio Conventions' AHTEGs or other expert advisory groups*

Description: If one or more cross-Rio Conventions AHTEGs or other expert advisory groups were to be established, this would be an opportunity to bring together different types of knowledge and different views from the whole of society.

Time frame: Short to long term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions

Good-practice examples: CBD expert groups (almost always) have representatives from IPLCs, women, youth and CSOs

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; resource mobilization; contributions and rights of IPLCs

8.A6 *Initiate cross-convention multi-stakeholder dialogues to assess existing actions, identify gaps, build synergies, and generate momentum for coordinated joint implementation across all three Conventions*

Description: Establish structured dialogues at national and regional levels, using regional centres as convening platforms, bringing together CBD, UNCCD, and UNFCCC focal points, women's caucuses, IPLC organizations, youth networks, and CSOs to assess existing actions, identify gaps, build synergies, and generate momentum for coordinated joint implementation across all three Conventions. Gender-responsive approaches and the harmonization of gender action plans across all three Conventions should be explicitly placed on the dialogue agenda.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National and regional, anchored in regional centres and connected to international convention processes

Who is responsible: CBD, UNCCD, and UNFCCC Secretariats, regional support centres of the Rio Conventions, NFPs of all three Conventions, national governments, CSOs and women-led organizations, women's caucuses, youth networks and IPLC organizations

Linkages to other building blocks: All

8.A7 *Place youth, women, IPLCs at the centre of cross-convention multi-stakeholder dialogues in the assessment of existing best practices and strengthen their capacity in resource mobilization to ensure inclusive and fair access to nature-related benefits*

Description: Place women, youth and IPLCs at the centre of cross-convention dialogues as active participants, not observers, systematically documenting and assessing existing women-led, youth-led and IPLC-led NbS and EBA best practices, mapping their biodiversity, climate, and land restoration co-benefits, ensuring that their contributions are visible, valued, and reflected in financing decisions and strengthen their capacity.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: National and regional, anchored in regional centres and connected to international convention processes

Who is responsible: CBD, UNCCD, and UNFCCC Secretariats, regional support centres of the Rio Conventions, NFPs of all three Conventions, national governments, CSOs and women-led organizations, women's caucuses, youth networks and IPLC organizations

Good-practice examples: GEF Small Grants Programme community-scale NbS and/or EBA projects co-led by women and IPLCs across Africa, Asia, and Latin America delivering cross-convention co-benefits with gender-sensitive design, but there is still a need to simplify conditions and adapt requirements to make them inclusive

Linkages to other building blocks: All

8.A8 *Ensure that IPLCs, women and youth representatives and organizations are fully engaged from the beginning in the design and development of any safeguards*

Description: IPLCs, women and youth, as vulnerable groups that can be affected by projects and actions undertaken for the implementation of the Conventions, need to be part of defining and developing safeguards (e.g., related to NbS and/or EBA or safeguards for funds and the operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions) from the beginning.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National, international

Who is responsible: National governments, Parties to the Rio Conventions, governing bodies of the funds and the operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions

Linkages to other building blocks: IPLCs

8.A9 *Formalize involvement of the private sector both at the national and the COP level, including through dialogues and roundtables*

Description: Create spaces for the private sector to engage in the quest for opportunities for making synergies work for the private sector and strengthen its role in cooperation that supports the integrated implementation of the three Rio Conventions. Modalities such as dialogues and roundtables could create space to show that implementing the Rio Conventions is not only about compliance but also about opportunities, and to hear from the private sector on its needs (e.g., de-risking policies).

Time frame: Short, medium, long term

Scale: National and international

Who is responsible: National governments (through ministries of finance and environment and other relevant ministries), Rio Conventions NFPs, COP Presidencies, Corporate Business, Business Associations (including on Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs)), Corporate Finance, IFIs, national and international NGOs, implementing agencies

Good-practice examples: UNCCD's [Private Sector Strategy 2021-2030](#) and [Business for Land Initiative](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: NbS/EBA; resource mobilization

8.A10 *Conduct a scoping study on private sector engagement and way forward*

Description: Building on the hypothesis that the private sector remains under-represented and low-engaged both in global policy arenas and in transformative changes expected from a truly effective WoSA, a joint scoping/mapping study could be commissioned by the secretariats of the Rio Conventions or the JLG, together with UNCCD's Global Mechanism (GM), to document precisely and in an up-to-date manner: current representation and engagement of the private sector in global policies and in drafting national policies (NDCs, NBSAPs...) worldwide - North/South benchmark would be useful -; progress of the private sector in implementing the

objectives of the Rio Conventions (notably from the Global Review report and other sources); pathways to move forward towards much stronger engagement and action related to the Rio Conventions objectives and challenges.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Rio Convention secretariats or JLG, UNCCD's GM

Linkages to other building blocks: NbS/EBA; resource mobilization

ACTION AGENDAS

8.A11 *Align Action Agendas across the Rio Conventions to accelerate coherent implementation*

Description: Strengthen alignment and interoperability among the Action Agendas of the CBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD as a practical mechanism to accelerate coherent implementation of the three Rio Conventions. Building on the Belém Joint Statement on the Rio Conventions, this action would operationalize agreed priorities through a joint short-term workplan focused on areas such as coordinated campaigns, interoperable platforms for commitments and reporting, shared engagement with non-state actors, and joint communication and visibility efforts. The JLG, in collaboration with the SCP and the COP Presidencies, could facilitate strategic coordination, ensure continuity across COP cycles and help transform political commitments into sustained collaborative action that contributes to implementing the Paris Agreement, the KMGBF and the UNCCD Strategic Framework.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International, regional, national (and subnational)

Who is responsible: COP Presidencies; Action Agenda Champions; JLG; Rio Convention secretariats; SCP; donors; CSOs

Good-practice examples: [Belém Joint Statement on the Rio Conventions](#) (COP30); UNFCCC [Global Climate Action Agenda 2026-2030](#) (High-Level Champions and Marrakech Partnership); [Riyadh Action Agenda](#) (UNCCD)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

8.A12 *Strengthen and consolidate the CBD Action Agenda as an implementation accelerator for the KMGBF and Rio Convention synergies*

Description: Strengthen and consolidate the CBD Action Agenda as the Convention's operational whole-of-society implementation platform for the KMGBF. Building on the foundations established since CBD COP14, Parties could support developing a more structured and effective Action Agenda for Nature and People (e.g., strengthened governance, strategic priorities, enhanced coordination across constituencies, and a potential multi-year Champion model aligned with the COP Presidency cycle). The CBD Action Agenda should strengthen collaboration and interoperability with the Action Agendas under the UNFCCC and the UNCCD to mobilize non-State actors, accelerate implementation and foster policy coherence across the Rio Conventions.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International, regional and national (and subnational)

Who is responsible: CBD Secretariat; CBD Parties; CBD COP Presidency; JLG (for coordination with other Convention secretariats); SCP

Good-practice examples: UNFCCC [Global Climate Action Agenda 2026-2030](#) (High-Level Champions and Marrakech Partnership); [Riyadh Action Agenda](#) (UNCCD)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

8.A13 *Incentivize whole-of-society implementation through the establishment of a Rio Convention stakeholder action platform, inspired by the UNFCCC Action Agenda*

Description: Inspired by the success of the UNFCCC Action Agenda, a similar platform for implementation efforts contributing to all three Rio Conventions would be immensely beneficial in driving action and incentivizing commitments from all sectors, including businesses. Outside formal negotiations, it would allow the Rio Convention secretariats to launch voluntary initiatives to accelerate progress on specific policy issues.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: International, regional and national (and subnational)

Who is responsible: Rio Conventions secretariats, JLG

Good-practice examples: the UNFCCC Action Agenda and its success in raising public awareness and understanding of the negotiation process

Linkages to other building blocks: All

CITIES AND SUBNATIONAL LEVEL ENGAGEMENT

8.A14 *Strengthen synergistic implementation of Rio commitments at city level*

Description: Develop tailored Action Plans aligned with local policy frameworks to link subnational actions to the regional and national level. Aim: addressing the climate and biodiversity crises synergistically, with cities e.g., committing to using NbS/EBA as a central tool to deliver co-benefits for climate change mitigation and adaptation, biodiversity, land, human health, and societal wellbeing

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: Subnational and national

Who is responsible: Cities and subnational authorities, Rio Conventions NFPs

Good-practice examples: [Berlin Urban Nature Pact](#). It creates a structured, replicable pathway for subnational actors to move from voluntary commitment to accountable implementation, while building a global peer network for knowledge exchange and collective impact.

Linkages to other building blocks: Cross-cutting

8.A15 *Strengthen regular and institutionalized cooperation between Rio Conventions NFPs and subnational governments, cities and other local authorities to enable successful, mutually supportive and resource-efficient implementation of the three Conventions from national to subnational levels*

Description: Aligning climate, biodiversity and land action requires strong institutional coordination not only between national ministries, but also between the national and the subnational levels

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National and subnational

Who is responsible: NFPs in cooperation with subnational governments and cities

Linkages to other building blocks: Cross-cutting

MATCHING GOVERNMENTS WITH THE WHOLE OF SOCIETY

8.A16 Create a matchmaking platform to match synergies needs with expertise

Description: Governments facing synergies needs could connect with actors across society (including CSOs, business and academia) with expertise and experience, as well as funders able to support the delivery of synergistic actions. This could focus on helping countries deliver the synergistic actions identified through their national plans, such as NBSAPs and NDCs. For example, this kind of platform could link governments seeking support on peatland restoration with experts and organizations with the skills and experience to advise and/or deliver peatland restoration projects, as well as those interested in funding such projects.

Time frame: Medium to long term

Scale: International, but ideally with regional matchmaking opportunities

Who is responsible: The JLG could host the platform, and the SCP could play a role in facilitating it, linking with the CBD's TSC Support Centres, the UNFCCC's RCCs and the UNCCD's Regional Coordination Units. The NBSAP AP and the NDC P should be involved in designing the platform and help use it.

Good-practice examples: The High Ambition Coalition (HAC) for Nature and People has modeled this approach through its [matchmaking platform](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: Knowledge management and capacity-building

COMMUNICATION/AWARENESS

8.A17 Develop national outreach and awareness programs on the Rio Conventions and opportunities for engagement targeting youth, IPLCs, women and local authorities, including materials in local languages

Description: Many stakeholders are expected to participate in implementation and decision-making processes, but they often lack access to information about the Rio Conventions, national commitments, and opportunities for engagement.

Time frame: Short, medium and long term

Scale: subnational, national

Who is responsible: National governments, Rio Conventions NFPs, CSOs, women's organizations, youth networks

Good-practice examples: GYBN national chapter outreach activities

Linkages to other building blocks: Science-policy interface and evidence-based decision-making; knowledge management and capacity-building; contributions and rights of IPLCs

9. Cross-cutting/General

9.1 Possible gaps and overlaps

GAPS IN EXISTING NATIONAL POLICIES

9.G1 *Insufficient mechanisms to identify, assess and manage trade-offs between biodiversity, climate and land objectives, both at national and international levels*

Description: Many policies emphasize synergies across the Rio Conventions, but there are fewer mechanisms to systematically assess and address situations where actions benefiting one objective may negatively affect another, such as climate mitigation measures that may impact biodiversity or local livelihoods.

9.G2 *Different topics that cut across all three Rio Conventions, including ecosystem integrity, water, agriculture and food systems, health, soils, wetlands, forests and oceans (marine and coastal ecosystems) - and more generally ecosystem conservation and restoration -, are addressed across policies related to the three Conventions (and other MEAs), but without coordination between them, both at the national and international levels*

Description: Many practical and thematic connectors exist among the three Rio Conventions, but are addressed through policies under each Convention that do not speak to each other. This creates overlap in mandates and action areas, but also a gap in research, analysis and coordinated implementation.

9.G3 *Lack of higher-level political attention to the need to address biodiversity loss, climate change and land degradation in an integrated manner, both nationally and internationally*

Description: Many countries still do not prioritize the Rio Conventions policy coherence and synergies agenda at the national and international levels, and the level of high-level political attention differs across the three international regimes. This is reflected in the number of Parties championing and promoting the synergies agenda at each Convention, and in the still modest but increasing number of countries that are making efforts to integrate the synergies agenda at the national level.

GAPS IN EXISTING INTERNATIONAL POLICIES

9.G4 *Lack of strong and coherent guidance on synergies and policy coherence from the COPs of the three Rio Conventions*

Description: Clear and coherent signals from the three COPs of the Rio Conventions have been missing. Not all three COPs have paid the same level of attention to the signals, requests and invitations from the other two COPs.

9.G5 *Insufficient mechanisms to identify, assess and manage trade-offs between biodiversity, climate and land objectives, both at national and international levels*

Description: Many policies emphasize synergies across the Rio Conventions, but there are fewer mechanisms to systematically assess and address situations where actions benefiting one objective may negatively affect another, such as climate mitigation measures that may impact biodiversity or local livelihoods.

9.G6 *No consistent decision-making process dedicated to advancing synergies across all three Rio Conventions*

Description: While the COPs of the three Rio Conventions recognize the importance of synergies between them, this has not resulted in a consistent decision-making process where the three Conventions collaborate with the same level of engagement to advance the issue. The GST decision encouraged Parties and non-Party stakeholders to enhance cooperation on the implementation of MEAs, particularly the Rio Conventions, to facilitate the achievement of the purpose and long-term goals of the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals in a synergistic and efficient manner. However, neither the COP nor the CMA has encouraged Parties and non-Party stakeholders to participate in the technical information exchange process on policy coherence and synergies that was established by a CBD COP16 decision. Finally, UNCCD COP16 also requested its secretariat to collaborate with the secretariats of the other two Rio Conventions to organize a technical information exchange. It encouraged Parties and observers to submit views and engage in the technical information exchange. Still, it was unclear how this linked to the process already initiated by CBD COP 16, and it did not include follow-up.

9.G7 *Lack of staff specifically dedicated to advancing synergies across the Rio Conventions within all three secretariats*

Description: Currently, only the CBD counts paid staff specifically dedicated to advancing synergies across the Rio Conventions.

9.G8 *Different topics that cut across all three Rio Conventions, including ecosystem integrity, water, agriculture and food systems, health, soils, wetlands, forests and oceans (marine and coastal ecosystems) - and more generally ecosystem conservation and restoration -, are addressed across policies related to the three Conventions (and other MEAs), but without coordination between them, both at the national and international levels*

Description: Many practical and thematic connectors exist among the three Rio Conventions, but are addressed through policies under each Convention (and other MEAs) that do not speak to each other. This creates overlap in mandates and action areas, but also a gap in research, analysis and coordinated implementation.

9.G9 *Some topics that cut across all three Rio Conventions, such as pollution, are not addressed in all three Conventions' regimes, reflecting a lack of coordinated approach on the matter*

Description: Pollution can cause GHG emissions, impact negatively on biodiversity, and reduce land health and fertility (e.g., excessive nitrogen fertilizer can create N₂O emissions and harm freshwater ecosystems, while light pollution harms human health, biodiversity and pollinators, and wastes energy). A lack of cohesive approaches to these issues may be driving inefficiencies and poorer outcomes.

9.G10 *Lack of higher-level political attention to the need to address biodiversity loss, climate change and land degradation in an integrated manner, both nationally and internationally*

Description: Many countries are still not putting the Rio Conventions policy coherence and synergies agenda among their priorities, both at the national and international levels, and the level of high-level political attention differs between the three international regimes. This is reflected in the number of Parties championing and promoting the synergies agenda at each Convention, and in the still modest but increasing number of countries that are making efforts to integrate the synergies agenda at the national level.

9.G11 *Lack of a formal cross-Rio Convention process to respond to and systematically advance the 71 response options for joint outcomes in the IPBES Nexus Assessment*

Description: There is a lack of formal momentum and commitment to build on the findings of the IPBES Nexus Assessment, and its 71 response options, to deliver sustainable win-win solutions across all three of the Rio Conventions.

GAPS IN EXISTING COORDINATION BODIES

9.G12 *Gap between the Rio Conventions Joint Liaison Group's (JLG) potential to deliver, according to its Terms of Reference and Modus Operandi, and what it delivers in practice*

Description: As stated in its Terms of Reference and Modus Operandi, the JLG has a broad mandate: 1) to enhance coordination between the three Rio Conventions, including the exchange of relevant information, and 2) to explore options for further cooperation between the three Conventions, including the possibility of a joint work plan. Its areas of activity include aspects such as developing technical papers to clarify and elaborate on specific policy and technical issues, and encouraging and promoting better coordination among NFPs and stakeholder groups. However, the JLG is not well resourced, and in practice there is little activity, despite the identified 2025-2026 Areas of Collaboration. As a result, the existing formal channel of cooperation between the Rio Conventions remains operationally confined to its historic information-sharing mandate. It lacks the political mandate, dedicated resources, and formal technical working structures needed to deliver on the second part of its mandate.

OVERLAPS IN EXISTING INTERNATIONAL POLICIES

9.O1 *Overlap between existing social and environmental safeguards related to the three Rio Conventions, including in financial mechanisms*

Description: Different environmental and social safeguards have been established by each of the Rio Conventions for activities that may have important environmental and social impacts if certain precautions are not taken, with some of the safeguards potentially conflicting or adding complexity rather than streamlining actions across the Conventions. This is the case, e.g., of the safeguards established under UNFCCC for REDD+ implementation activities, the safeguards established under CBD for effective planning and implementation of ecosystem-based adaptation to climate change and ecosystem-based disaster risk reduction, the CBD voluntary safeguards in biodiversity financial mechanisms, and the number of references made by UNCCD to environmental and social safeguards, particularly those contained in the [Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security](#). The GEF has also adopted [standards on environmental and social safeguards](#).

9.2 Concrete actions

INTERNATIONAL COALITIONS/PARTNERSHIPS AT HIGH POLITICAL LEVEL

9.A1 *Strengthen international coalitions and partnerships on Rio synergies at high political level*

Description: Important to lift the issue of Rio Convention synergies higher on the political agenda, especially by providing opportunities for Parties to engage in an integrated manner. Such dedicated opportunities are needed to galvanize political support and priority for effective, efficient implementation at the national level. Creating high-level political commitment would also sustain and mobilize momentum, and produce similar statements and support around initiatives on common topics (e.g., the UNFCCC COP Presidency Forest Road Map).

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions and COP Presidencies

Good-practice examples: 1) [COP 28 Joint Statement on Climate, Nature and People](#). 2) [Belém Joint Statement on the Rio Conventions](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE RIO CONVENTIONS

9.A2 *Subsidiary bodies of the Rio Conventions to collaborate and interact through relevant agenda items*

Description: Relevant agenda items under the subsidiary bodies of each of the Rio Conventions, such as their cooperation agenda items and the CBD SBSTTA's biodiversity and climate change agenda item, provide an opportunity for the subsidiary bodies to exchange and collaborate, mutually supporting each other's initiatives and invitations.

Time frame: Short, medium, long term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Subsidiary bodies of the Rio Conventions

Good-practice examples: 1) Collaboration and interaction between the CBD SBSTTA and the UNFCCC SBSTA, from 2001 to 2004, through their respective biodiversity and climate change and cooperation with relevant international organizations agenda items. E.g., UNFCCC [SBSTA14](#) supported the CBD SBSTTA request to the IPCC to develop a technical paper on the interlinkages between biodiversity and climate change and invited Parties to submit their views on the proposed technical paper and to forward their comments directly to the IPCC; UNFCCC [SBSTA15](#) welcomed information on a pilot assessment of the interlinkages between climate change and biodiversity that the CBD launched; UNFCCC [SBSTA16](#) welcomed the technical paper by the IPCC on the interlinkages between biodiversity and climate change; UNFCCC [SBSTA19](#) welcomed a CBD AHTEG report on the interlinkages between biological diversity and climate change and encouraged Parties to make use of it as a relevant source of useful information for their national purposes; [SBSTA20](#) decided to recommend a draft conclusion to the UNFCCC COP in response to a specific invitation from the CBD COP to the UNFCCC COP contained in decision VII/15. 2) UNFCCC COP [decision 13/COP.8](#), para. 2, requested the SBSTA to continue and enhance cooperation with the CBD SBSTTA and the UNCCD CST. 3) UNCCD COP [decision 7/COP.5](#), para. 5, requested the CST to enhance cooperation with the CBD SBSTTA and the UNFCCC SBSTA. 4) CBD COP [decision IX/27](#), para. 2, invited the subsidiary scientific and technical bodies of the three Rio Conventions to enhance mutual collaboration, in a manner consistent with their respective mandates, governance arrangements and agreed programs

Linkages to other building blocks: All

9.A3 *Convene regular joint meetings of the Chairs and/or the Bureaux of the Subsidiary Bodies of the Rio Conventions, particularly those on scientific and technical advice*

Description: Annual or biannual meetings of the Chairs and/or the Bureaux of the SBs of the Rio Conventions could be convened to coordinate and update themselves on relevant decisions from their respective COPs and relevant conclusions/recommendations from the SBs containing requests, invitations or follow-ups on processes for enhancing policy coherence, synergies and cooperation between the three Conventions and their implementation at the national level. The meetings could be held at any SB session.

Time frame: Short to long term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Chairs and Bureaux of the SBs of the Rio Conventions

Linkages to other building blocks: All

9.A4 *Strengthen and better resource the Rio Conventions JLG*

Description: The JLG between the secretariats of the Rio Conventions is the formal channel of cooperation between the three Conventions. As stated in its ToRs and Modus Operandi, the JLG has a broad mandate: 1) to enhance coordination between the three Rio Conventions, including the relevant exchange of information, and 2) to explore options for further cooperation between the three Conventions, including the possibility of a joint work plan. Its areas of activity include aspects such as developing technical papers to clarify and elaborate on specific policy and technical issues. However, until now, the JLG has focused on fulfilling the first part of its mandate, particularly on exchanging information. By strengthening and better resourcing it, the JLG could become a coordination body capable of developing and recommending guidance to support enhanced policy coherence across the three Conventions and delivering on the second part of its mandate.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions

Linkages to other building blocks: All

9.A5 *Establish a cross-Rio Convention communication mechanism for the secretariats of the three Conventions to share between them and communicate to the NFPs of their respective Conventions relevant notifications regarding current or upcoming invitations, activities or processes that relate to policy coherence, synergies and/or cooperation between the three Conventions*

Description: There is actually no established mechanism by which the secretariats of the three Rio Conventions can communicate to the Parties and observers of their Convention, through their respective focal points, information about activities related to policy coherence and synergies that have been agreed under one of the other Conventions and where participation from Parties and observers of the three Conventions would be desirable. An example is the technical information exchanges on synergies, policy coherence and cooperation between the Rio Conventions, agreed by CBD COP decision 16/22 and CBD SBSTTA recommendation 27/3.

Time frame: Short, medium and long term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Secretariats of the Rio Conventions, JLG, NFPs

Good-practice examples: Parties, observers and secretariats of the three Rio Conventions participated in the [Bern III Conference](#), convened under the CBD

Linkages to other building blocks: All

NATIONAL FOCAL POINTS

9.A6 *Request Parties to Identify a National “Rio Synergies” Focal Point*

Description: To request Parties to the Rio Conventions to identify a NFP responsible for being the liaison between the Party and the Rio Conventions on issues related to the synergistic implementation of the Conventions and overseeing national policies and processes relevant for addressing climate change, land degradation and biodiversity loss in an integrated manner. The NFP would coordinate with relevant stakeholders.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International, national

Who is responsible: Rio Conventions' COPs, Parties

Linkages to other building blocks: All

9.A7 *Create and update in real time a webpage where the National Focal Points of the three Rio Conventions are listed*

Description: This would provide useful information on how many NFPs are the same person or entity. It could be hosted on the JLG website.

Time frame: Short term

Scale: International

Who is responsible: Rio Convention secretariats, JLG

Linkages to other building blocks: All

HUMAN RIGHTS

9.A8 *Integrate human rights in national strategies as legally binding guardrails and a common denominator for the Rio Conventions*

Description: By incorporating human rights in biodiversity, climate and land-related planning, legally binding guardrails are provided for laws and policies that benefit both people and the planet. This includes procedural rights (participation, access to information and access to justice) as well as substantive rights such as the right to a healthy environment. It would contribute to realizing the rights of different groups and people, including women, persons with disabilities, Indigenous Peoples, and people of African descent, in the context of biodiversity, land and climate action.

Time frame: Short, medium, long term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments

Linkages to other building blocks: All

GENDER RESPONSIVENESS

9.A9 *Harmonize the gender action plans of CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC and integrate them coherently into implementation, monitoring, and reporting frameworks*

Description: Each Rio Convention has developed its own gender action plan with its own scope, indicators, timelines and accountability mechanisms. As each gender plan responds to specific needs of each of the Rio Conventions and full alignment may not be possible, it is rather important to identify opportunities for harmonizing them in a way that they can complement each other, reducing duplication, strengthening policy coherence, and ensuring that women and IPLCs are consistently visible across biodiversity, climate, and land degradation agendas. This harmonization also creates a direct bridge to the SDGs and the "Leave No One Behind" principle, ensuring that progress under the Rio Conventions contributes to and is measured against the broader commitment to inclusive, equitable sustainable development.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International, national

Who is responsible: Parties to the Rio Conventions, national governments, gender focal points, gender constituencies/caucuses, other observer women's rights organizations and human rights organizations

Linkages to other building blocks: All

TRADE-OFFS MANAGEMENT

9.A10 *Identify in advance actions for the implementation of one Convention that could produce negative impacts over the implementation of the other Conventions, and identify and assess those potential impacts on communities, biodiversity and land, as well as the steps and procedures to avoid, minimize and manage the potential resulting trade-offs*

Description: It is important not only to take advantage of opportunities for synergistic action that produces benefits for the implementation of the three Rio Conventions, but also to manage the trade-offs that some types of actions for the implementation of one of the Conventions could have over the implementation of the other Conventions. Trade-offs could be better avoided, minimized and managed if the potential negative impacts of specific actions are identified, assessed and understood in advance and if protocols and procedures for addressing those trade-offs are put in place.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments, including specific sectors

Good-practice examples: Australia's [Renewables Environmental Research Initiative](#) looks at the specific impacts that renewable energy has on biodiversity in order to inform guidance about how to avoid, reduce and offset those impacts in the best manner

Linkages to other building blocks: All

WATER AND WETLANDS AS CONNECTORS

9.A11 *Establish national wetland policies and strategies simultaneously contributing to CBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD and mainstream the importance of wetlands, their functions and contributions to people into national development plans, relevant sectoral plans and strategies, NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs and national LDN targets*

Description: Wetlands are one of the clearest areas of positive synergy among the Rio Conventions, contributing simultaneously to biodiversity conservation, climate mitigation and adaptation (particularly through peatlands, mangroves and other blue-carbon ecosystems), and land degradation neutrality. At its 15th meeting, the COP of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands adopted Resolution XV.4 on synergies with other multilateral environmental agreements and other international institutions, which explicitly recognizes that wetland conservation, restoration, sustainable management and wise use strengthens efforts to address biodiversity loss, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and other social, environmental and economic challenges, and invites Parties to mainstream wetlands in NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs and LDN targets.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: National

Who is responsible: National governments

Good-practice examples: Kenya's [National Mangrove Ecosystem Management Plan](#)

Linkages to other building blocks: All

9.A12 *Incorporate a water lens into finance and resource mobilization for the implementation of the Rio Conventions*

Description: Without a more explicit focus on water dependencies, resilience and water-related ecosystems in finance and resource mobilization for the implementation of the Rio Conventions, there is a risk of this being neglected and resulting in investments that undermine achievement of all three Rio Conventions and SDG6. Building on the finance elements of the UN Water Conference process, this can be integrated into finance work under the Rio Conventions. This would also advance a key message of the UN SDG6 synthesis report 2026: “protecting and restoring freshwater ecosystems need to be treated as core investments in resilience”.

Time frame: Short to medium term

Scale: National and international

Who is responsible: National governments, Rio Conventions and Ramsar NFPs, Parties to the Rio Conventions, funds and operating entities of the financial mechanisms of the Rio Conventions, UNCCD's GM

Linkages to other building blocks: All

CROSS-RIO GUIDANCE FOR RIO CONVENTIONS CONNECTORS

9.A13 *Explore and establish appropriate processes and modalities for developing cross-Rio guidance and other types of support for Parties to design and implement strategies, plans and actions on topics that cut across all three Rio Conventions, including ecosystem integrity, agriculture and food systems, health, soils, wetlands, forests and oceans (marine and coastal ecosystems)*

Description: This action is intended to address the coordination gap across the three Rio Conventions regarding the many practical and thematic connectors that exist among them and that are addressed through policies under each Convention (at the national or the international levels) that do not speak to each other. It could also address the coordination gap on cross-cutting topics not addressed in all three Conventions' regimes, such as pollution.

This action could lead to a broad variety of outcomes, e.g., the establishment of technical cross-convention workstreams on specific cross-cutting topics, at the national or the international levels, or the development of communities of practice that examine how food systems policies and investments affect biodiversity, land, climate, nutrition, water, and identify actions that reduce pressures across all three Rio Conventions objectives.

Time frame: Short, medium term

Scale: International, regional, national, subnational, local

Who is responsible: National governments, Parties to the Rio Conventions, subsidiary bodies, secretariats, JLG, other MEAs and UN initiatives, programs and organizations

Linkages to other building blocks: All

V. Resources

This section provides an indicative, non-exhaustive list of resources consulted during the preparation of the mapping study, especially those that compile actions, initiatives and good-practice examples related to enhancing cooperation, policy coherence and synergies across the Rio Conventions.

Primary resources consulted for the mapping study:

Resources containing actions, activities, options...

- ENACT Partnership, [ENACT 2024 Nature-based Solutions Discussion Paper: Strategic action across the Rio Conventions](#), 2024. It offers action-focused policy proposals to accelerate NbS within the Rio Conventions.
- Synergies Collaboration Platform, [Plan to Accelerate Solution \(PAS\): Synergistic implementation across the Rio Conventions](#), 2025. This PAS, hosted by the SCP, is one of the PAS launched under the UNFCCC COP30 Action Agenda to advance implementation towards the Paris Agreement's second GST in 2028. It contains several collaborative actions intended to overcome barriers and achieve impacts.
- United Nations Environment Programme, [Key Actions and Entry Points for National Coordination Across Biodiversity and Climate Change Clusters](#), 2025. It contains a series of actions identified by UNEP in the context of its technical assistance work.
- United Nations Environment Programme, [Report of the Bern III Conference on Cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions for the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework](#), 2024. The Bern III Conference was attended by representatives of Parties and secretariats from sixteen MEAs, including the three Rio Conventions. The report includes a list of actions consolidated by the co-chairs based on the conference discussions.

Resources compiling initiatives, programs and partnerships

- Synergies Collaboration Platform, [COP30 Summary Brief on initiatives and programmes supporting synergistic implementation of the Rio Conventions](#), 2025. It maps existing support within multilateral fora, presidency initiatives, international capacity-building and implementation initiatives and support, data tools, platforms and initiatives and sector-specific international cooperative initiatives.

Resources containing lessons learned, good practices and case studies

- Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH, Fakt Consult, International Institute for Sustainable Development, [Building Synergies between Biodiversity and Climate - Insights from countries on NBSAP and NDC planning and implementation](#), 2025. It synthesizes the findings from ten national studies, looking at approaches and opportunities to foster synergies through five entry points: 1) integrated planning and institutional coordination structures; 2) participatory processes within governance

systems; 3) sectoral implementation; 4) leveraging public and private finance; 5) building and using existing reporting mechanisms to foster synergies.

- Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH, International Institute for Sustainable Development & Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, [Synergies Between Biodiversity- and Climate-Relevant Policy Frameworks and Their Implementation: A series of thematic papers](#), 2024. The thematic papers on nature-based solutions (3), good governance (4), national to local implementation (5) and financing (6) provide relevant case studies.
- Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH, International Institute for Sustainable Development & World Wide Fund for Nature, [Effectively delivering on climate and nature: NDCs, NAPs and NBSAPs synergies. A checklist for National policymakers](#), 2024. It showcases “early movers” and “good practice examples” of four countries planning and implementing NDCs, NAPs and NBSAPs in the following areas: 1) high-level mandate; 2) assessment; 3) goal setting; 4) identification of strategies, policies, activities; 5) financing and implementation; 6) monitoring, reporting and stocktaking.
- Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (ed.), [Towards successful policy coherence for biodiversity and climate - learning from case studies](#), Discussion Paper, 2025. Contains case studies illustrating success factors and different actions, steps and approaches to advance policy coherence.
- Synergies Collaboration Platform, [COP30 Summary Brief on initiatives and programmes supporting synergistic implementation of the Rio Conventions](#), 2025. It contains case studies of domestic initiatives.
- United Nations Environment Programme, [Background document to support discussions on cooperation with multilateral environmental agreements \(UNEP/EA.7/INF/6\)](#), 2025. This background document for UNEA-7 was developed in response to two UNEA-6 resolutions: Resolution 6/4 (on Promoting synergies, cooperation and collaboration for national implementation of multilateral agreements and other relevant environmental instruments) requested UNEP to “collect and synthesize good practices, tools, success stories, and lessons learned and share them with Member States, relevant partners and stakeholders”. Resolution 6/6 mandated UNEP to analyze case studies, success stories, and lessons learned from national-level synergies in implementing the MEAs.
- United Nations Environment Programme & the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, [Methodology Handbook for SDG Indicator 17.14.1 on policy coherence for sustainable development](#), 2026.
- It is essentially a “good governance” checklist with indicators measuring whole-of-government coordination, whole-of-society engagement, financing, impact assessment, etc.
- United Nations Environment Programme, [From Silos to Synergies: Linking Planning, Finance, and Monitoring for Coherent Action on Climate, Biodiversity, and Land](#), White Paper, 2025.
- It synthesizes insights and lessons from emerging experiences in countries and showcases practical examples.

Other resources consulted

- Becerra B.T., [Mountain Ecosystems for a Resilient Future - Policy Pathways under the Conventions on Biological Diversity \(CBD\) and Climate Change \(UNFCCC\)](#), Adaptation at Altitude programme, 2025.
- Cavaneira P., [Options and elements for an accounting framework for the land sector in the Post-2020 Climate Regime](#), Terraprima Report to the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment, 2013.
- Convention on Biological Diversity Secretariat, [Findings from the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and their implications for the work undertaken under the Convention \(CBD/SBSTTA/25/9\)](#), 2023.
- Climate Policy Radar, [Rio Policy Radar](#) and [explanatory slides](#), n.d.
- Conference of the Parties of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, [Resolution XV.4 Enhancing the Convention's visibility and synergies with other multilateral environmental agreements and other international institutions](#), 2025.
- Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, [Report of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol on its first session, held at Montreal from 28 November to 10 December 2005. Part Two: Action taken by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol at its first session](#), 2006.
- Fernández Fernández E., Bénard-Tertrais X. & Sierra Suárez J.P., [Briefing on opportunities for climate-biodiversity synergies across international agendas](#), Transforma, 2024
- Fernández Fernández E., Sierra Suárez J.P. & Bénard-Tertrais X., [A contribution to enhancing policy coherence and synergies between the climate and biodiversity regimes](#), Transforma, 2025.
- Gutiérrez V., Palmegiani I., et al., [Advancing Landscape and Seascape Restoration: the case for Policy Coherence and Good Practice Sharing](#), a policy brief by Commonland and Climate Focus, 2025.
- Haines-Matos V., Kozban I., et al., [The Social Dimension of Nature-based Solutions - Guidance Report](#), Federal Agency for Nature Conservation, 2025.
- Hou-Jones X., Roe D. & Holland E., et.al., [Nature-based Solutions in Action: Lessons from the Frontline](#), 2021
- International Union for Conservation of Nature, IUCN's Indigenous Peoples Organisation Members & the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, [Podong Indigenous Peoples Initiative](#), n.d.
- International Union for Conservation of Nature, World Commission on Protected Areas & Climate Crisis Commission, [Increasing collaboration across the Rio Conventions to achieve synergistic climate and biodiversity outcomes at COP30](#), Technical Brief, 2025.
- IPBES, [Thematic Assessment Report on the Interlinkages among Biodiversity, Water, Food and Health of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services](#). Harrison P.A., McElwee P.D., & van Huysen T.L. (eds.), 2024.
- Iversen P., Lee D., & Rocha M., [Understanding land use in the UNFCCC: Summary for Policymakers](#), 2014.

- Lo V., Barragán G., et al., [Unlocking Land Tenure: Pathways for policy action after the triple COPs of 2024](#), Policy Brief, Land Governance Series, TMG Think Tank for Sustainability, 2025.
- McElwee P., [A tale of two panels: learning and coordinating across IPCC, IPBES, and other science-policy interfaces](#), *Climatic Change* 178, 2025.
- Mirzabaev A., Tello Leon C., et al., [Economics of Harmonizing Land Restoration Activities across the Rio Conventions in Rwanda and Implications for Food Security](#), A study for the Economics for Land Degradation Initiative, 2023.
- Naturescapes, [Thematic Reports for the GEF Sustainable Cities Program](#), n.d.
- Pettorelli N., Folkard-Tapp H., et al., [The risks of climate-nature silos - Why we need alignment and integration between environmental agendas](#), a report from the Zoological Society of London, 2026.
- Pettorelli N., Hails R.S., et al., [Aligning Environmental Agendas for Nature Recovery - Unlocking synergies through an ecosystem approach in the UK](#), a report from the British Ecological Society and the National Trust, 2025.
- Rogers B.M., Mackey B., et al., [Using ecosystem integrity to maximize climate mitigation and minimize risk in international forest policy](#), 2022.
- Roth G., [Restoring Indigenous health by connecting systems through the Indigenous determinants of health: local to global evidence](#), 2026.
- Synergies Collaboration Platform, [Resources for implementation](#), n.d.
- Synergies Collaboration Platform, [scene-setting presentation for the third CBD technical information exchange](#), 2026.
- United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification & World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies, [The Land Story. Country experiences with reporting on land degradation and drought](#), 2024.
- United Nations Environment Programme, [The Global Biodiversity Framework and the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals](#), n.d.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, [Global analytical study on the implementation of a human-rights based approach into the goals and targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework \(A/HRC/61/36\)](#), 2026.
- Valverde G., & Egbuwalo S., [Intergovernmental Consultations on Nature-based Solutions: Co-Chairs' Summary](#), 2023.
- Van Asselt H., & Rao T., [Maximizing Synergies to Address the Climate and Biodiversity Crises: Legal Foundations for Joint Work between the UNFCCC and CBD](#), Greenpeace Briefing Paper, 2025.
- Walz Y., Nick F., et al., [Coherence and Alignment among Sustainable Land Management, Ecosystem-based Adaptation, Ecosystem-based Disaster Risk Reduction, and Nature-based Solutions](#), Report 28, United Nations University Institute for Environment and Human Security & United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, 2021.
- Young V., Dooley K., et al., [Critical reforms for effective and timely action to prevent irreparable harm to Earth's climate and biodiversity: A call for a Joint CBD & UNFCCC SBSTA Work Plan on Climate and Biodiversity Action](#), Griffith Climate Action Beacon Policy Discussion Paper 3/23, 2023.

Submissions

- Submission of Birdlife International on behalf of several NGOs related to UNFCCC SBSTA62 agenda item 14: Cooperation with other international organizations. [UNFCCC Submission Portal](#)
 - Submission of [CBD Women's Caucus](#) on CBD notification 2025-005
 - Submission of Conservation International related to UNFCCC SBSTA62 agenda item 14: Cooperation with other international organizations. [UNFCCC Submission Portal](#)
 - Submission of [Global Youth Biodiversity Network](#) on CBD notification 2025-005
-