

Summary of the Sixth Meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity: 16–19 February 2026

Global biodiversity is vanishing at unprecedented rates, destroying ecosystems and threatening human survival. With the adoption of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) in 2022, the international community took a much-needed policy step towards putting nature on a path to recovery. It is its implementation, however, that will steer the necessary transformative change by addressing the causes of biodiversity loss, from land and sea use change to unsustainable consumption and inequality.

Delegates to the sixth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI 6) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) addressed a wide range of items related to implementation, from encouraging the required national actions to ensuring the necessary means to bridge data gaps and build capacities, such as scientific and technological collaboration and financial resources.

Participants reviewed the finalization and submission of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) and national targets towards GBF implementation, and noted the 28 February 2026 deadline for submission of Parties' seventh national reports. With only four national reports submitted by the time the meeting closed, by the EU, Lesotho, Uganda, and Switzerland, delegates underscored the urgency of reporting requirements while also highlighting the late disbursement of relevant funding and other constraints to timely submission.

Time limitations and opposing views resulted in the adoption of largely bracketed recommendations on many agenda items, including resource mobilization, the financial mechanism, scientific and technical cooperation, and cooperation with other conventions. Underscoring the need for compromise and solidarity to reach consensus, Parties hope to resolve their differences at the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 17), to be held in October 2026, in Yerevan, Armenia.

SBI 6 convened from 16–19 February 2026 at the headquarters of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO) in Rome, Italy. Approximately 600 delegates attended the session, representing governments, Indigenous Peoples and local communities (IPLCs), civil society, international organizations, women and youth, academia, and the private sector.

A Brief History of the Convention on Biological Diversity

The CBD was adopted on 22 May 1992 and opened for signature on 5 June 1992 at the UN Conference on Environment and Development (the Rio “Earth Summit”). The CBD entered into force on 29 December 1993. There are currently 196 Parties to the Convention, which aims to promote the conservation of biodiversity, the sustainable use of its components, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources.

The COP is the governing body of the Convention. Decision making is assisted by three subsidiary bodies: the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA); the SBI; and the Subsidiary Body on Article 8(j) and other provisions related to IPLCs (SB8j).

In this Issue

A Brief History of the Convention on Biological Diversity	1
SBI 6 Report	2
Resource Mobilization	3
Financial Mechanism	5
Planning, Monitoring, Reporting, and Review	6
Gender Plan of Action	7
Capacity-Building and Development, and Technical and Scientific Cooperation	9
Cooperation with Other Conventions and International Organizations	10
Specialized International ABS Instruments	11
Review of Effectiveness of Processes under the Convention and its Protocols	12
Functional Review of the Secretariat	13
Closing Plenary	14
A Brief Analysis of the Meeting	14
Upcoming Meetings	16
Glossary	16

The SBI was established in 2014 by [COP Decision XII/26](#) to replace the *Ad Hoc* Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention. Its core mandate includes: review of progress in implementation; strategic actions to enhance implementation; strengthening means of implementation; and operations of the Convention and the Protocols.

Key Turning Points

Three protocols have been adopted under the CBD. The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (January 2000, Montreal, Canada) addresses the safe transfer, handling, and use of living modified organisms (LMOs) that may have adverse effects on biodiversity, taking into account human health, with a specific focus on transboundary movements. It entered into force on 11 September 2003 and currently has 173 Parties.

The Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (October 2010, Nagoya, Japan) provides for international rules and procedures on liability and redress for damage to biodiversity resulting from LMOs. It entered into force on 5 March 2018 and currently has 55 Parties.

The Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits arising from their Utilization (ABS, October 2010, Nagoya, Japan) sets out an international framework for the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources, including by appropriate access to genetic resources and transfer of relevant technologies, taking into account all rights over those resources and technologies, and by appropriate funding, thereby contributing to the conservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of its components. It entered into force on 12 October 2014 and currently has 142 Parties.

Other major decisions include:

- the Jakarta Mandate on marine and coastal biodiversity (COP 2, November 1995, Jakarta, Indonesia);
- work programmes on agricultural and forest biodiversity (COP 3, November 1996, Buenos Aires, Argentina);
- the Global Taxonomy Initiative (COP 4, May 1998, Bratislava, Slovakia);
- work programmes on Article 8(j), dry and sub-humid lands, and incentive measures (COP 5, May 2000, Nairobi, Kenya);
- the Bonn Guidelines on ABS and the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (COP 6, April 2002, the Hague, the Netherlands);
- work programmes on mountain biodiversity, protected areas, and technology transfer, the Akwé: Kon Guidelines for cultural, environmental, and social impact assessments, and the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for sustainable use (COP 7, February 2004, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia);
- a work programme on island biodiversity (COP 8, March 2006, Curitiba, Brazil);
- a resource mobilization strategy, and scientific criteria and guidance for marine areas in need of protection (COP 9, May 2008, Bonn, Germany);
- the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including the Aichi Targets, and a decision on activities and indicators for the implementation of the resource mobilization strategy (COP 10, October 2010, Nagoya, Japan);
- agreement to use the terminology “Indigenous Peoples and local communities” (COP 12, October 2014, Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea); and

- adoption of the Rutzolijirisaxik voluntary guidelines for repatriation of traditional knowledge (COP 14, November 2018, Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt).

2022 UN Biodiversity Conference: Following a lengthy intersessional period due to the COVID-19 pandemic and related restrictions, the first part of COP 15 convened virtually from 11–15 October 2021, with a limited number of delegates physically present in Kunming, China. The second part of the meeting, the 2022 UN Biodiversity Conference, took place from 7–19 December 2022, in Montreal, Canada. The meeting adopted the GBF, which seeks to address biodiversity loss and guide global biodiversity policy through four overarching goals for 2050 and a set of 2030 targets. It is accompanied by decisions on: a multilateral mechanism on benefit-sharing from the use of digital sequence information (DSI) on genetic resources, including a global fund; resource mobilization; capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation; a monitoring framework; and mechanisms for planning, monitoring, reporting, and review (PMRR).

2024 UN Biodiversity Conference: Held from 21 October to 1 November 2024, in Cali, Colombia, COP 16 established the SB8j; adopted a decision on the operationalization of the multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism from DSI use, including establishment of the Cali Fund; adopted modalities for ecologically or biologically significant marine areas; and reviewed the development of national targets and the alignment of NBSAPs with the GBF. Following protracted negotiations on resource mobilization, however, the meeting was suspended due to loss of quorum, with a number of decisions left pending.

Resumed Sessions of COP 16: The integrated budget of the Convention and its Protocols was adopted by silence procedure from 3–6 December 2024, marking the first resumed session of COP 16. The second resumed session took place from 25–27 February 2025, at FAO headquarters in Rome. It adopted the remaining decisions on resource mobilization, the financial mechanism, the GBF monitoring framework, PMRR, and cooperation with other conventions.

SBSTTA 27 and SB8j 1: Held back-to-back from 20–24 and 27–30 October 2025, respectively, in Panama City, Panama, SBSTTA 27 and the first meeting of SB8j focused on GBF implementation and monitoring its progress. SBSTTA 27 approved the annotated outline of the global report on collective progress in GBF implementation and adopted a series of recommendations, many of which contain brackets reflecting lack of agreement on issues including biodiversity and climate change and risk assessment and management of LMOs. SB8j 1 also faced challenges and was unable to agree on the modalities for its *modus operandi*.

SBI 6 Report

On Monday, 16 February, SBI 6 Chair Clarissa Souza Della Nina (Brazil) opened the meeting, underscoring the SBI’s task to enable national action commensurate with the ambition of the GBF. Jaime Andrés Gnecco Daza, Minister Plenipotentiary, Colombia, on behalf of the COP 16 Presidency, stressed the need for reliable capacity-building mechanisms based on trust and mutual learning, and for enhancing synergies between the biodiversity and climate agendas. CBD Executive Secretary Astrid Schomaker encouraged potential donors to replenish the trust fund of the Convention, noting that it is a “marathon year” for the CBD. She also pointed

to gender responsiveness as an often-overlooked matter and called on delegates to promote more gender-responsive actions in their national targets.

Regional Statements: Burundi, for the AFRICAN GROUP, underlined the importance of resource mobilization and an effective financial mechanism, alongside strengthening the Secretariat to enable support for resource-constrained countries. The LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN GROUP drew attention to funding, resource, and capacity constraints that affect participation by developing countries, and stressed the need for a robust replenishment of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and other funds under the Convention. On Tuesday, Chair Souza Della Nina invited other regions to upload their statements.

Pilot Modalities: On Monday, the Secretariat highlighted the meeting's pilot modalities for early submission of statements, noting this is in support of [Decision 16/25](#), which aims to improve the effectiveness of processes under the Convention and its Protocols. CHINA noted that the pilot modalities should not affect Parties' ability to adjust their interventions during the meeting.

As a result of the pilot modalities, the first reading of each agenda item took place as follows: Chair Souza Della Nina drew attention to the [advance statement submissions](#) by Parties and observers, which are listed in document [CBD/SBI/6/INF/17](#). She then called for and received Party support for all statements submitted by observers, after confirming they were present at the meeting, and for statements submitted by non-Parties for agenda items under the Nagoya Protocol. Delegates entered their advance submissions formally on the record, noting that these would be taken into consideration for the preparation of conference room papers (CRPs).

Chair Souza Della Nina advised delegates who had submitted advance statements to refrain from making oral statements and advised others to submit their statement and highlight orally the key elements of their submission. Delegates also noted the possibility to submit revised statements as necessary.

Discussions on the pilot modalities took place under the agenda item on review of effectiveness of processes under the Convention and its Protocols.

Organizational Matters: On Monday, Bilal Qtishat (Jordan) was elected rapporteur and provided a welcoming statement on behalf of all participants. Delegates adopted the agenda ([CBD/SBI/6/1](#) and [Add.1](#)) and the organization of work contained in the scenario note ([CBD/SBI/6/1/Add.2/Rev.1](#)), without amendments.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION expressed concerns with difficulties in receiving visas that constrain certain Parties' and observers' participation in meetings. EGYPT emphasized that support for developing country Parties' participation has waned in recent years, which must be revitalized. Fiji, for the PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES (P-SIDS), underlined the structural disadvantages faced by small delegations in meetings featuring parallel sessions, and called for participation safeguards, including clear prioritization of contact groups.

Resource Mobilization

On Monday, the Secretariat introduced the document ([CBD/SBI/6/2](#)), including key findings of three studies on the relationship between debt sustainability and CBD implementation, implementation of the guidance on safeguards in biodiversity

finance mechanisms, and the relationship between biodiversity and climate finance, and a draft recommendation; and corresponding information documents ([CBD/SBI/6/INF/15](#), [INF/16](#), and [INF/18](#)).

Patrick Luna (Brazil) and Ines Verleye (Belgium) reported on a [workshop on resource mobilization](#), held from 10–13 February 2026 in Rome. They drew attention to two tracks of work: further developing the criteria for the institutional structure to operate the financial mechanism; and identifying impediments to global biodiversity financing and recommending elements for enhancement.

The SBI put the [advance statement submissions](#) formally on the record. Fiji, for P-SIDS, stressed that debt-related instruments and innovative finance are not substitutes for predictable public finance and fair burden-sharing. The Democratic Republic of the Congo, on behalf of the AFRICAN GROUP, underscored that innovative financial mechanisms can be useful provided they are voluntary, within national contexts, and do not introduce new conditionalities or excessive administrative burdens. Many stressed that financial resources must be adequate, transparent, predictable, timely, and flexible.

ARMENIA, NEW ZEALAND, and others welcomed the three studies. BRAZIL welcomed the recognition of the structural link between sovereign debt and the implementation of the Convention. MEXICO stressed that sovereign debt restricts developing countries' ability to adequately implement the Convention's objectives. ARGENTINA noted that any reference to biodiversity in relation to debt must be voluntary, at the request of countries, and in line with their economic and fiscal regulations. CAMEROON emphasized the importance of debt-for-nature swaps. CHINA cautioned against addressing biodiversity and sovereign debt together, noting this does not address the core challenges of mobilizing resources. INDONESIA supported incorporating biodiversity considerations in climate finance.

CHINA, MALAYSIA, ECUADOR, and others called for innovative financial instruments that are voluntary and respect countries' right to development, and urged donor countries to fulfil their commitments, particularly under GBF Target 19. KENYA stressed that increasing domestic financing cannot substitute for international funding requirements, and supported efforts redirecting financial flows from subsidies harmful to the environment. INDONESIA and SOUTH AFRICA underscored that closing the biodiversity finance gap cannot be achieved through innovative approaches alone, as it also requires fulfilment of financial obligations under the GBF.

Highlighting the asymmetry between climate finance and resources for biodiversity, BRAZIL, with others, stressed that biodiversity objectives should not be subordinate to climate priorities. COSTA RICA highlighted examples of initiatives integrating climate and biodiversity finance, including nature-based solutions for climate and marine payments for ecosystem services.

SAUDI ARABIA called for resource mobilization based on the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. NIGERIA noted that the Coalition for Finance Ministers is an appropriate platform for the envisioned international dialogue with ministers of environment and finance. SOUTH AFRICA stressed that such dialogues must still consider the differences in economic categorizations and classifications of participating countries. The

RUSSIAN FEDERATION noted the absence of the private and business sectors at SBI 6. CUBA and IRAN decried the impact of unilateral coercive measures, including on environmental initiatives.

COLOMBIA and GUATEMALA emphasized that the guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be backed by accountability, have transparent benefit-sharing mechanisms, and include traditional knowledge platforms based on Indigenous Peoples' free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC). NEW ZEALAND noted continued efforts to increase access to funding for IPLCs, least developed countries (LDCs), and SIDS.

CAMEROON highlighted that the possible criteria for the development of an instrument on biodiversity finance annexed to [Decision 16/34](#) were not negotiated, and recommended that these criteria be considered in intersessional work.

Third World Network, for the CBD ALLIANCE, noted that the three studies require further work, including the need to examine how sovereign debt conditions can lead to extractive activities harmful to biodiversity, and to broaden survey inputs for the safeguards study to include potentially affected IPLCs, among others.

On Wednesday, the Secretariat presented a CRP and highlighted the main amendments, including:

- extending the deadline for a peer review of the draft studies to 20 May 2026, aiming to allow for additional input by IPLCs on the study on safeguards;
- “acknowledging,” rather than “welcoming” the workshop;
- including a footnote to clarify that several paragraphs on the three studies are kept in abeyance pending the studies' finalization; and
- inserting agreed language from previous COP decisions on optimizing the synergies between biodiversity and climate finance.

CANADA, SWITZERLAND, NORWAY, and AUSTRALIA expressed support for the CRP but highlighted concerns with the imbalance of work on this item between SBI 6 and 7, particularly regarding lack of discussion on opportunities for broadening the contributor base. NIGERIA suggested requesting the Secretariat to report on progress in facilitating the international dialogue with ministers of environment and finance.

Zimbabwe, for the AFRICAN GROUP, proposed reiterating the urgency of mobilizing resources and recalling the intersessional process and roadmap of Decision 16/34. Chair Souza Della Nina stressed the focus of SBI 6 is on the three studies, with the Secretariat noting these items are included in the SBI 7 agenda. CHINA cautioned against expanding the focus beyond the three studies. The Secretariat confirmed that SBI 7 will feature discussions on broadening the contributor base and the two tracks of the roadmap on resource mobilization.

A lengthy discussion ensued, aiming to convey the urgency of progress on resource mobilization while respecting the division of work between SBI 6 and 7 and keeping the recommendation concise. Many expressed concern regarding the heavy workload for SBI 7 and many aspects of Decision 16/34 that have not yet been addressed. Some suggested including details of such elements in the draft recommendation, while the Secretariat noted that the elements are already included in the SBI 7 annotated agenda.

Extensive deliberations focused on whether to reference specific paragraphs of Decision 16/34 to provide direction to the SBI or to merely refer to the decision as a whole. Following informal consultations, JAMAICA shared that Parties agreed to refer to paragraphs 18, 22(a), 23(a), 24, 25, and 26.

ARGENTINA proposed additional paragraphs to be kept in abeyance pending the finalization of the three studies. Following several queries from Parties regarding the term “abeyance” used in lieu of bracketing provisions, the Secretariat clarified this term indicates that relevant paragraphs are parked pending the completion of the peer-review process for the three studies.

Parties debated at length whether the participation of IPLCs and relevant stakeholders in the assessment of debt-related instruments for biodiversity is appropriate. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION, JAMAICA, NIGERIA, and others proposed deleting reference to their participation, while BRAZIL, AUSTRALIA, and others preferred maintaining it. No agreement was reached, and a reference to considering, as appropriate, the full and effective participation of IPLCs and relevant stakeholders in the assessment of debt-related instruments was bracketed.

ZIMBABWE and COLOMBIA urged for safeguards to ensure debt management strategies do not result in harm to biodiversity. Delegates approved a paragraph, with minor amendments by GABON and ARGENTINA, seeking to enhance the integration of biodiversity considerations into national debt management strategies, removing reference to the improvement of enabling environments, and adding the exploration of “alternative debt management pathways that do not result in harmful flows of finance.”

Regarding a paragraph inviting the exploration of opportunities for applying debt-related finance instruments for biodiversity, Parties could not agree whether to take into account national contexts, and/or to do so in accordance with national circumstances. Clarifications indicated that contexts imply considering opportunities, whereas circumstances imply taking preventative measures.

CHINA proposed adding a paragraph noting that debt-related instruments should not be linked to conditionalities that infringe upon national sovereignty and economic policy autonomy. ZIMBABWE proposed language reiterating that debt-related instruments are not substitutes for the provision of financial resources to developing countries through grants and other flows of public finance. SWITZERLAND, the EU, CANADA, and NORWAY requested bracketing both proposals, with the EU noting that they were not directly related to the three studies.

On a paragraph encouraging relevant organizations to support debt-related initiatives, including by identifying good practices and by developing guidance, the EU, supported by CANADA and CÔTE D'IVOIRE, proposed referring to the Biodiversity Finance Initiative of the UN Development Programme (UNDP), as an example. ZIMBABWE noted that lessons learned from the studies should include how the conditions of sovereign debt shape harmful flows of finance. INDIA asked for the inclusion of a simplified access procedure and readiness support. SWITZERLAND and AUSTRALIA asked to bracket these proposals.

Chair Souza Della Nina invited delegates to engage in informal consultations on a provision inviting action from Parties and others on the voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms.

On Thursday, FIJI reported on the informal deliberations. ZIMBABWE called for their suggestion to reference the State of Finance for Nature 2026 report in the preamble to be recorded in the report of the meeting.

The Secretariat presented changes made to the draft COP decision in the CRP, including, among other amendments: either inviting or encouraging Parties and other governments to take the three studies into account in their resource mobilization work, pending peer-review, and to do so in accordance with Article 3 of the Convention; and naming the UNDP Biodiversity Finance Initiative as an encouragement to relevant organizations and initiatives to support activities related to exploring debt-related instruments.

The EU and FIJI proposed clarifications so that an invitation to continue optimizing the co-benefits and synergies of biodiversity and climate finance is first addressed to Parties and then also to other governments at all levels, relevant environmental agreements, stakeholders, and other partners. SAUDI ARABIA, supported by COLOMBIA, suggested specifying that this action be done “taking into account the need to avoid duplication among conventions, and to respect their various mandates,” which was bracketed.

Delegates approved the CRP as a whole, and then adopted the recommendation, with the remaining brackets.

Final Outcome: In the recommendation ([CBD/SBI/6/L.8](#)), the SBI requests the Secretariat to extend the deadline for a peer review of the draft studies to 20 May 2026, to finalize the studies for consideration by COP 17; and to include in its progress report any suggested amendments to the final version of the studies.

While whether to “invite” or “encourage” remains in brackets, SBI recommends that COP 17 invites or encourages Parties and other governments to consider the three studies in their work to mobilize financial resources from all sources, as appropriate and in line with national circumstances, priorities, and capabilities. SBI also recommends COP 17, among others, to invite:

- relevant international organizations and initiatives, regional development banks, other financial institutions, and stakeholder organizations to consider the three studies in their work on biodiversity finance;
- Parties and other governments to: assess implications of, and explore, further opportunities for applying debt-related instruments to the implementation of NBSAPs; enhance integration of biodiversity considerations into national debt management strategies and to explore alternative debt management pathways that do not result in harmful flows of finance; and explore other opportunities for applying debt-related finance instruments for biodiversity; and
- Parties, other government at all levels, relevant environmental agreements, business organizations, and other stakeholders to take the voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms into account and to continue to optimize the co-benefits and synergies of biodiversity and climate finance.

Financial Mechanism

On Monday, the Secretariat presented the document ([CBD/SBI/6/3/Rev.1](#)), which addresses the funding needs assessment for the ninth replenishment period of the GEF Trust Fund (GEF-9), draft elements for further guidance to the GEF, a draft recommendation, and annexes on terms of reference (ToR) for GEF-10, ToR for the seventh quadrennial review of the financial mechanism, and

additional guidance to the GEF; and the report on the assessment of the amount of funds needed for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols for GEF-9 ([CBD/SBI/6/INF/13](#)).

The SBI put the [advance statement submissions](#) formally on the record. Many reiterated that a reliable financial mechanism is key to the implementation of the Convention and its protocols. Fiji, for P-SIDS, stressed that more funding is necessary, but this is not enough; funding should also be adaptable and fit for purpose, recognizing diverse island contexts, and avoiding heavy administrative and disbursement processes. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION called for a permanent financial mechanism that meets the requirement of equitable access to resources for all Parties, on a non-discriminatory basis. JORDAN stressed the need for easy access and quick disbursement, and for enhancing synergies with other financial mechanisms.

CUBA called for a robust replenishment process for the GEF and a considerable increase in the GBF Fund. BRAZIL said that a reduced replenishment is incompatible with the ambition required for GBF implementation and stressed that biodiversity finance should flow to countries holding biodiversity.

COSTA RICA called for criteria to evaluate the performance of GEF implementing agencies. CHINA noted that the seventh quadrennial review should review the overall performance of the GEF and its implementing agencies, with particular attention to timeliness, adequacy, and predictability of funding, as well as the efficiency and effectiveness of fund utilization.

COLOMBIA stressed the need for direct access to funding by IPLCs. INDIA called for GEF support in a manner that respects and preserves IPLCs’ rights and knowledge, with their FPIC and full participation, in accordance with national legislation and applicable international instruments.

NEW ZEALAND encouraged the GEF to increase finance flows to LDCs and SIDS, including those in the Pacific region. JAMAICA called for: development of specific indicators to track how the GEF supports SIDS; a SIDS strategy to help in the implementation of the GBF; and accreditation of financial institutions that serve SIDS.

MEXICO underscored that reform of environmentally prejudicial subsidies is crucial to protect financial flows and bridge the identified gaps in funding. MALAYSIA acknowledged the important role of national focal points and underscored the need for establishing the recommended national platform for ongoing biodiversity project planning.

The INTERNATIONAL INDIGENOUS FORUM ON BIODIVERSITY (IIFB) stressed that the financial mechanism should enable the valuation of IPLCs’ immense contributions. Noting that IPLC funds manage resources with responsibility, transparency, and autonomy, they called for inclusion of IPLCs in decision-making.

On Thursday, plenary addressed a CRP. On the funding needs assessment, INDIA proposed adding the need to consider the exchange rate, inflation volatility, and the rising cost of conserving biodiversity in developing countries. CANADA opposed, and the proposal was bracketed. JAMAICA stressed including reference to the particular challenges that may be experienced by some Parties, particularly LDCs and SIDS, in mobilizing private capital.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION and FIJI stressed that establishing national platforms or using existing ones to receive information about funding needs should depend on the prerogative and capacity of Parties.

On the ToR for the seventh quadrennial review of the financial mechanism, the EU proposed deleting reference to “all” eligible Parties, which was opposed by the RUSSIAN FEDERATION. An informal group was convened on the issue, facilitated by Inka Gnittke (Germany).

In the evening, Gnittke reported to plenary that the group addressed the recommendations, identifying paragraphs of convergence and paragraphs requiring further discussions. The latter paragraphs were bracketed in their entirety. She noted that the group could not complete discussions on time, and that several paragraphs remain bracketed, as reflected in a revised CRP.

CANADA, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, CHINA, and COLOMBIA requested bracketing additional paragraphs, and the revised CRP was approved as amended. The SBI adopted the recommendation without discussion and with remaining brackets.

Final Outcome: The recommendation ([CBD/SBI/6/L.9](#)) remains largely in brackets. In agreed provisions, the SBI recommends that COP 17:

- notes the information on funding needs received from 45 eligible Parties and the compilation and analysis of that information transmitted by the Secretariat to the GEF, the report on the assessment of the amount of funds needed, and the limited number of submissions and information for GEF-9;
- recognizes the value of the GBF Fund in complementing the GEF;
- invites Parties and others to contribute to and participate in the seventh quadrennial review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism; and
- emphasizes the importance of integrating specific indicators for eligible countries, in particular the number of funded projects, disbursement times, and impact on local communities.

The recommended list of requests to the Secretariat remains fully bracketed, including to:

- commission and make available a report on the seventh quadrennial review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism in time for consideration by COP 18;
- further strengthen collaboration and engagement with financial institutions and stakeholders, especially those recognized by the GEF, the Green Climate Fund, and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; and
- facilitate the effective participation of IPLCs, women, and youth in the implementation of activities related to the financial mechanism.

Annex I on the ToR for a full assessment of the amount of funds needed for the implementation of the CBD and its Protocols for GEF-10 is largely agreed upon, while Sections C (Criteria) and D (Procedures or implementation) of Annex II on the ToR for the seventh quadrennial review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism remain fully bracketed.

Planning, Monitoring, Reporting, and Review

On Monday, the Secretariat introduced the document ([CBD/SBI/6/4](#)), noting that it outlines the status of submissions of NBSAPs, national targets, and national reports by Parties and provides an analysis of these, and drew attention to the deadline of 28 February 2026 for submission of the seventh national reports. They further noted that as of 16 February, 74 updated NBSAPs, 147 national targets, and one national report had been submitted by Parties, alongside 11 commitments made available online by

non-State actors. The Secretariat also drew attention to relevant information documents ([CBD/SBI/6/INF/5](#), [INF/6](#), and [INF/7](#)).

The SBI put the [advance statement submissions](#) formally on the record. South Africa, for the AFRICAN GROUP, and supported by many, welcomed the draft recommendations and underscored the need for strengthened means of implementation; predictable and adequate financial resources; and enhanced capacity-building and technology transfer to enable GBF implementation. They lamented delayed funds disbursement that impeded Parties’ preparation of updated NBSAPs and seventh national reports, also supported by the RUSSIAN FEDERATION and GUATEMALA. They further noted that reporting challenges include the lack of methodology, operational clarity, and reliable data for certain global headline indicators.

Fiji, for P-SIDS, stressed that a credible global review of collective progress in implementation requires credible national inputs, and cautioned against increasing administrative and reporting burdens on capacity-constrained countries. They proposed:

- scaled-up readiness support for Parties through cost-effective measures such as peer learning;
- the possibility to include optional contextual information in the online reporting tool (ORT);
- pragmatic approaches to monitoring that combine science with traditional knowledge; and
- recommending to COP 17 that reporting timelines and expectations are matched with financial and technical support.

Many noted updates in the preparation of their updated NBSAPs, national targets, and seventh national reports, with several highlighting consultative processes adhering to whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches, and others acknowledging support received. Many also noted the need for continued technical, financial, and capacity support, greater synergies, and simplified reporting requirements. IRAN noted that they had not received any GEF funding in recent years and called on the Secretariat to facilitate this process or provide another mode for disbursement of biodiversity-related financial support.

INDIA and KENYA welcomed the inclusion of commitments by non-state actors, which highlight progress at different levels of implementation. COLOMBIA called for greater data disaggregation in future analyses, alongside further examination of alignment between NBSAPs, national development strategies, and national-level Rio Convention implementation. The COOK ISLANDS called for flexibility in reporting to address on-the-ground realities and capacities of small countries, calling for support in developing simplified regional indicators for P-SIDS.

BRAZIL and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION stressed the recommendation should emphasize the need for operational capacity and support rather than solely focusing on reporting deadlines. MEXICO proposed a new recommendation to take note of the findings of the summary of national targets submitted. BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA suggested that the Secretariat compile detailed information on the date and availability of financial support provided to eligible countries, and present this to COP 17. NEW ZEALAND proposed encouraging Parties to submit their seventh national reports by or before the 28 February 2026 deadline. Delegates discussed the implications of the February deadline, noting that many Parties face difficulties in submitting on time. ARGENTINA and BURKINA FASO said that submissions received after the deadline should still be considered in the global report. The

Secretariat clarified that the deadline was established by [Decision 16/32](#) and cannot be altered. The Secretariat also informed Parties that: all national reports will be made publicly available regardless of submission time; and while national reports submitted late will not be included in the global report due to lack of time, they will still be considered as part of the global review.

On Tuesday, plenary addressed a CRP. On a paragraph noting with concern that some Parties may not be able to submit their updated or revised NBSAPs, national targets, or seventh national reports, the EU called for including reference to the agreed deadline. FIJI, with many, proposed referencing the technical and financial constraints faced by Parties not able to comply. Following a brief debate, delegates agreed to state that some Parties may not be in a position to submit by the agreed deadlines, particularly owing to technical or financial constraints, or both.

BRAZIL, with SOUTH AFRICA and COSTA RICA, suggested streamlining a provision urging Parties to finalize and submit revised or updated NBSAPs and national targets. FIJI, the UK, and ARGENTINA preferred retaining language clarifying how information received after the deadline would be used.

On a paragraph urging Parties to submit their seventh national reports, JAMAICA proposed to include the Secretariat's explanation on how information received after the deadline will be made available for the global review, which was agreed. SWITZERLAND and CANADA preferred deleting reference to national circumstances, which SAUDI ARABIA, KENYA, and INDIA opposed. Delegates eventually agreed to refer to technical and/or financial constraints. They also approved a paragraph encouraging the submission of additional details for optional fields in the national target template.

Following a query by COLOMBIA, the Secretariat clarified procedures regarding a provision inviting non-State actors to report commitments on the ORT. INDIA stressed avoiding duplication of data and JAMAICA underlined that the objective is to gather a collective and coordinated national-level response from governments and non-State actors.

On a provision inviting Parties and others to provide support, including capacity-building and technology transfer, for compiling and submitting information in national reports, AUSTRALIA urged noting this is "on voluntary and mutually agreed terms."

On language regarding GEF support, CANADA, supported by GUATEMALA, proposed to have two separate paragraphs to balance the efforts of the GEF while also recognizing the delays in disbursements. Following informal consultations, the Secretariat presented a proposal on Wednesday for alternative text that would:

- welcome efforts by the GEF and its implementing agencies to provide and disburse financial resources to support the development of updated or revised NBSAPs and national targets, and the preparation of the seventh national reports;
- note the delays experienced by some Parties in the disbursement of funds, which engendered delays in this work; and
- request the Secretariat, in collaboration with the GEF and its implementing agencies, to compile relevant information on the matter and make this available to SBI 7.

IRAN stressed including a further request for the Secretariat to facilitate GEF financial support for eligible Parties that have not received any financial support, or to determine another route in this regard. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION proposed this be a direct

invitation to the GEF. The UK opposed, underscoring that only the COP can make invitations or requests to the GEF. Chair Souza Della Nina noted she would engage in informal consultations with Iran to arrive at acceptable language.

COLOMBIA proposed new language urging Parties to guarantee the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders in the NBSAP and national report processes, in accordance with whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches. After drawn out discussions, delegates agreed to the Secretariat's proposal to recall the Guidance for revising or updating NBSAPs, as contained in Annex I of [Decision 15/6](#), and to include the exact wording therein.

On Thursday, Chair Souza Della Nina reported on the outcomes of informal consultations whereby the preambular text of the draft recommendation now referenced subparagraph 23(c) of [Decision 16/32](#) addressing the participation of relevant stakeholders. She noted that the proposal by Iran to invite the GEF to facilitate financial support for eligible Parties who had not yet received it was transferred to the draft recommendation on the financial mechanism. The SBI approved the CRP with these amendments.

In the evening, the SBI adopted the recommendation.

Final Outcome: In the recommendation ([CBD/SBI/6/L.3](#)), the SBI takes note of the summary of the global analysis of information in NBSAPs, including national targets, and notes the analysis will be revised on the basis of information submitted by 28 February 2026 and be available for use in the global report on collective progress in the implementation of the GBF to be considered by SBI 7.

SBI also, *inter alia*:

- urges Parties to submit their seventh national reports by 28 February 2026, taking into account the technical or financial constraints or both, and noting that information received after the deadline will still be available for the global review at COP 17;
- invites Parties, other governments, and multilateral and bilateral agencies to provide support, including capacity-building and development and technology transfer, on voluntary and mutually agreed terms;
- welcomes efforts of the GEF and its implementing agencies to provide and disburse financial resources to support the development of revised or updated NBSAPs and national targets and preparation of national reports;
- notes some Parties have experienced delays in disbursement or, in cases of direct implementation, expenditure of financial resources, resulting in delays in the development of revised or updated NBSAPs and national targets and preparation of national reports, and encourages implementing agencies to expedite disbursement and completion of necessary administrative arrangements; and
- requests the Secretariat to: compile detailed information of support provided by the GEF as part of GEF-7, the early action support, and under GEF-8, the enabling activities support for eligible countries, and to make this information available to SBI 7; continue supporting the operationalization of guidance related to NBSAPs, national targets, and national reports, and commitments from actors other than national governments; and continue support on the use of the ORT.

Gender Plan of Action

On Monday, the SBI put the [advance statement submissions](#) formally on the record. The Secretariat introduced the document on the midterm review of the implementation of the Gender

Plan of Action 2023-2030 ([CBD/SBI/6/5](#)), including a draft recommendation.

Fiji, on behalf of P-SIDS, urged: consistent integration of gender responsiveness; funding and financing; meaningful ways to measure progress; and greater coherence between gender responsiveness and other rights. Côte d'Ivoire, on behalf of the AFRICAN GROUP, laid down priorities for more gender-responsive legal frameworks: data, financing, capacity-building, and integration.

MEXICO underscored looking into the structural issues that have historically limited women's participation. PERU noted that the mobilization of financial resources should be operationalized with a focus on human rights and gender. BRAZIL stressed integrating the Gender Plan of Action into NBSAPs and national targets. INDIA called for strengthening coordination of gender and biodiversity national focal points on gender-related commitments. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION preferred using the term "gender-sensitive" instead of "gender-responsive."

The GLOBAL YOUTH BIODIVERSITY NETWORK (GYBN) urged more support for young women and girls in biodiversity decision-making. The CBD WOMEN'S CAUCUS highlighted the Gender Plan of Action is a critical operational tool that has already been agreed. IIFB underscored that IPLC women are protectors of ancestral and traditional knowledge for taking care of biodiversity. UN WOMEN noted the need to accelerate implementation of the Gender Plan of Action.

On Wednesday, plenary addressed a CRP. Delegates debated a paragraph encouraging Parties and others to continue and strengthen their efforts to implement the Gender Plan of Action, taking into account national circumstances, priorities, and capacities. Pointing to the language of [Decision 15/11](#), the EU, with NORWAY and AUSTRALIA, proposed to "urge" Parties and "invite" others, and to delete the reference to national circumstances, priorities, and capacities. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION and JORDAN preferred maintaining the language as included in the CRP. The matter was forwarded to informal consultations.

On a paragraph aiming to ensure the effective implementation of gender-responsive approaches across all biodiversity-related policies, strategies, plans, and actions, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION called for replacing "gender-responsive" with "gender-sensitive." CANADA and the UK opposed, noting the paragraph reflects language in the already-agreed Gender Plan of Action and the GBF.

Several Parties raised concerns with a translation issue whereby the French version referred to gender "sensitive" rather than "responsive" approaches, which Chair Souza Della Nina noted would be revised by the Secretariat.

CANADA, supported by AUSTRALIA and the AFRICAN GROUP, proposed including reference to girls in a provision regarding the participation of women. Palau, for P-SIDS, emphasized the importance of adequate resource allocation for meaningful participation.

Regarding the encouragement of generating, using, and reporting disaggregated data, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, with IRAN and SENEGAL, proposed deleting disaggregation by "sex" and "other demographic factors and gender indicators," and either retaining the qualifier "where possible" or adding the need to take into account national circumstances. GUATEMALA, the EU, the UK, and CANADA opposed, underlining this was agreed language and cautioning against rewriting commitments from the Gender

Plan of Action. The AFRICAN GROUP noted the importance of disaggregating by demographic factors, and supported this action being done "where possible."

Parties approved amendments proposed by NORWAY and the EU to the provision on promoting the allocation of adequate, predictable, accessible, and dedicated "human" and financial resources for "rights-based" gender-responsive implementation.

On a paragraph addressing the Gender Plan of Action's implementation, the EU, supported by AUSTRALIA and NORWAY, suggested reflecting agreed language to "urge" implementation, and "encourage" the use of the associated component indicator. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION and IRAN opposed, calling for consideration of national circumstances and priorities. Chair Souza Della Nina noted both expressions would be kept in brackets.

On support from relevant international financial institutions for gender-responsive biodiversity actions, SWITZERLAND proposed adding "in accordance with their respective mandates" and CANADA suggested including simplified access modalities. Parties agreed to these edits.

On the list of activities requested to the Secretariat regarding the implementation of the Gender Plan of Action, GUATEMALA and CUBA expressed concerns about the lack of available resources, with CUBA proposing a new sub-paragraph specific to developing countries depending on availability of resources. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION asked the Secretariat to compile a table reflecting all the additional requested resources.

MEXICO, supported by SWITZERLAND, proposed that capacity-building activities should take into account and engage with women's organization and networks.

Regarding the final review of the implementation of the Gender Plan of Action, TOGO stressed that progress should be identified in each of the objectives and indicators, not just the progress made towards them. Pending the outcome of informal consultations, the remaining CRP was approved as amended.

On Thursday, CÔTE D'IVOIRE reported on the outcome of informal consultations, sharing that, in encouraging further implementation of the Gender Plan of Action, Parties agreed to refer to paragraphs 2 and 4 of [Decision 15/11](#) and Section C of the [GBF](#).

In the evening, the SBI adopted the recommendation with minor amendments.

Final Outcome: In the recommendation ([CBD/SBI/6/L.2](#)), the SBI recommends that COP 17 take note of the findings of the midterm review, recognize the role of the Gender Plan of Action as the primary instrument to support the gender-responsive implementation of the GBF, and encourage further implementation, in particular by:

- ensuring the implementation of gender-responsive approaches across all biodiversity-related policies, strategies, plans, and actions at all levels and the full, equitable, meaningful, and informed participation of women and girls and the leadership of women;
- enhancing efforts to generate, use, and report data disaggregated by sex, age, and other demographic factors and gender indicators, where possible; and
- promoting the allocation of adequate, predictable, accessible, and dedicated human and financial resources and strengthening institutional capacity for a rights-based gender-responsive implementation.

SBI 6 also recommends that COP 17:

- encourage Parties to implement the Gender Plan of Action in all aspects and on all scales of planning, monitoring, reporting, and review related to the GBF;
- invite relevant international financial institutions, including the GEF, to support gender-responsive biodiversity actions and improve processes related to access to funding; and
- request the Secretariat, subject to availability of resources to: continue supporting Parties, in particular developing countries, including through technical guidance, capacity-building, and knowledge exchange; organize capacity-building activities, through engagement and collaboration with women's organizations and networks; and undertake a final review of the Gender Plan of Action for consideration by the SBI at a meeting before COP 19.

Capacity-Building and Development, and Technical and Scientific Cooperation

The SBI plenary addressed the item on Monday and Tuesday. On Monday, the SBI put the [advance statement submissions](#) on this item formally on the record. The Secretariat introduced the background document ([CBD/SBI/6/6](#)), noting it contains: views and recommendations of the Informal Advisory Group (IAG) on Technical and Scientific Cooperation (TSC) on options for addressing technical, technological, and institutional capability gaps identified by Parties; draft ToR for the independent evaluations of the relevance and effectiveness of the long-term strategic framework and the TSC mechanism; and elements of a draft recommendation. They also outlined associated information documents ([CBD/SBI/6/INF/2](#) and [INF/3](#)).

Fiji, for P-SIDS, stressed that cooperation must reduce the workload and improve effectiveness. They called for approaches that strengthen the regional and subregional TSC support centres, and prioritize practical, fit-for-purpose support. Malawi for the AFRICAN GROUP called for directing support to the TSC support centres to facilitate their timely operationalization.

MALAYSIA and MEXICO underlined the importance of continuously evaluating cooperation mechanisms to ensure effectiveness, and leveraging partnerships to support mutual learning. BRAZIL underscored the need for robust, Party-provided data for evaluations of capacity gaps, and called for focus on implementable actions and strengthened data collection and management capacities, among others.

MEXICO noted the global analysis of the capacity needs and gaps should consider the mandates of the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols and include the views of relevant stakeholder groups. The PHILIPPINES and LESOTHO noted it must be accompanied by the identification of corresponding means of implementation. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION urged prioritizing national data sources from each country, including from stakeholders. Calling for a human rights-based approach, IIFB noted the global analysis must include information directly submitted by IPLCs and relevant stakeholders.

Many welcomed the work of the IAG and supported the ToR for the independent evaluation. ARGENTINA suggested promoting projects tailored to the needs and conditions of Parties. CHINA proposed building capacities based on country needs and enhancing sectoral coordination, with no additional burden for developing countries. The COOK ISLANDS underscored long-term support and knowledge exchange processes, including spaces for integration of traditional and local knowledge with conventional science.

Delegates also highlighted the value of the support centres, noting their success depends on adequate and predictable funding. COLOMBIA and BOLIVIA said the centres should enable South-South and triangular cooperation, drawing attention to the needs identified by the Humboldt Biological Resources Research Institute, which is one of the support centres. SOUTH AFRICA drew attention to the comprehensive needs assessment concluded by the South African National Biodiversity Institute, highlighting the need for reliable financial flows. PERU called for facilitating the transfer of cutting-edge technologies. BOTSWANA prioritized strengthening data systems and harmonizing capacity assessments.

Delegates converged on calling for capacity-building that is targeted and responsive to national priorities. INDIA noted capacity-building must ensure the inclusive participation of IPLCs, women, and youth. NIGER stressed moving away from short-term projects towards systemic and sustainable capacity-building.

GYBN said youth organizations, together with Indigenous and women-led organizations, should be recognized as capacity providers. The ALLIANCE OF BIOVERSITY INTERNATIONAL and the INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR TROPICAL AGRICULTURE (CIAT) called for sustaining long-term and inclusive capacity-building through systemic investment, data governance frameworks, and regional collaborative mechanisms.

On Thursday, plenary addressed a CRP. On a request to the IAG to develop an assessment framework and methodology, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION requested to specify that the IAG develops this in collaboration with the global coordination entity, which is hosted by the Secretariat. INDIA proposed taking into account national circumstances, realities, and capabilities. CANADA noted that the framework and methodology will be used by the centres, which are regional and subregional in nature.

FIJI proposed requesting the Secretariat to assist the TSC support centres in identifying and assessing access to predictable financial resources. After informal consultations, delegates agreed to request the Secretariat, in collaboration with the global coordination entity in line with [Decision 16/3](#), to support the TSC support centres in identifying and facilitating their access to predictable funding sources, including through relevant partners.

On the methodology for the independent evaluations, the UK proposed that the chosen design and methods of analysis be detailed in the evaluation report. On sources of information, the EU and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION suggested that the global information gathered be analyzed and disaggregated by region and subregion.

In the evening, the SBI adopted the recommendation with minor corrections and remaining brackets.

Final Outcome: In the recommendation ([CBD/SBI/6/L.5](#)), the SBI recommends COP 17 to take note of the report of the IAG and reiterate its request to identify options to further address the technical, technological, and institutional capability gaps identified by Parties, for consideration by SBI 8 and COP 18.

SBI also recommends COP 17 to, among others:

- encourage Parties, subnational and local governments, IPLCs, women, youth organizations, and other relevant organizations to collaborate with the TSC support centres and partners in the assessment and analysis of capacity needs and gaps;
- request the IAG to develop an assessment framework and methodology to enable the TSC support centres to conduct future capacity needs assessment;

- adopt the ToR in Annex I for the independent evaluations of the relevance and effectiveness of the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development and the TSC mechanism; and
- request the Secretariat: to support the IAG in conducting an analysis of the capacity needs and gaps identified by Parties (for consideration by SBI 8 and COP 18), and in developing the assessment framework and methodology to commission independent evaluations (for consideration by the SBI before COP 19); and to further support, in collaboration with the global coordination entity, the TSC support centres in identifying and facilitating their access to predictable funding sources.

Cooperation with Other Conventions and International Organizations

On Tuesday, the Secretariat introduced a progress report on cooperation with other conventions and international organizations, including a draft recommendation ([CBD/SBI/6/7](#)), and relevant information documents ([CBD/SBI/6/INF/4](#) and [INF/8](#)).

The SBI put the [advance statement submissions](#) formally on the record. Fiji, for P-SIDS, underscored that synergies must reduce burdens and increase impacts. Emphasizing the ocean and coastal realities of the region, they encouraged stronger coordination among biodiversity-related conventions and relevant ocean governance processes. Zimbabwe, for the AFRICAN GROUP, expressed concern about the low response rate to the invitation to submit relevant information, and called for a discussion on how to best collect information from Parties. They called for improved cooperation and synergies with conventions on trade, health, and finance.

MALAYSIA underscored that any decision on cooperation should be facilitative, not prescriptive, highlighting that national mandate, capacity, and circumstances should be maintained. ARGENTINA and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION stressed that the specific mandate of each process should be respected. INDIA noted that synergies should balance biodiversity considerations with socio-economic development needs and enable measurable outcomes in biodiversity-climate linkages. EGYPT urged prioritizing the evaluation of cooperation activities to understand best practices.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA underscored that linkages with the chemicals and waste conventions are vital for SIDS. CHILE encouraged Parties to work closely with the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. MEXICO noted synergies among the Rio Conventions and other UN entities as a priority.

BURKINA FASO called for increased national-level synergies. MADAGASCAR stressed strengthened coordination among national focal points. BOTSWANA underlined the need to integrate obligations under biodiversity-related conventions into national planning frameworks, and highlighted the value of knowledge exchange, including through biodiversity-finance dialogues. BOLIVIA emphasized strengthened coordination mechanisms must be accompanied by technical and financial support.

The COOK ISLANDS welcomed continued efforts on cooperation that build on existing mechanisms. MEXICO supported the recommendation to the Joint Liaison Group to analyze overlaps in PMRR frameworks. COLOMBIA suggested the Joint Liaison Group develop a roadmap toward improved policy and programme coherence by COP 17, and supported further cooperation with UNESCO and the World Heritage Convention.

COSTA RICA proposed to include more explicit reference to Indigenous Peoples, including in monitoring mechanisms for ecosystem restoration and sustainable management. PANAMA urged for engagement with stakeholders at the frontlines of the triple planetary crisis, and for the development of useful and applicable best practices. KENYA called on the Secretariat and partners to develop practical guidance and tools to support Parties' coherent implementation of multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs).

CGIAR underscored that integrated landscape and food system approaches are a practical entry point for coordinated implementation across the Rio Conventions. UN WOMEN highlighted a publication on advancing gender-responsive synergies across the Rio Conventions, which calls for coordinated approaches across environmental and sustainable development agendas.

A contact group was established, co-chaired by Martha Mphatso Kalemba (Malawi) and Clarisse Kehler Siebert (Sweden), which met from Tuesday evening to Thursday.

On Thursday, BRAZIL, with CANADA and SWITZERLAND, noted that the contact group agreed to "further welcome" the establishment of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Panel on Chemicals, Waste and Pollution (ISP-CWP) and "invite collaboration" between this platform and the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and the Science-Policy Interface of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION opposed welcoming the establishment of the ISP-CWP and proposed to "note" it instead. Both operative verbs were kept in brackets, along with other subparagraphs that were not addressed by the contact group. The CRP was approved with remaining brackets.

In the evening, the SBI adopted the recommendation with minor corrections and remaining brackets.

Final Outcome: In the recommendation ([CBD/SBI/6/L.6](#)), the SBI recommends COP 17 to request the Secretariat to, *inter alia*:

- further engage in continued collaboration and cooperation with the secretariats of the other Rio Conventions, biodiversity-related conventions, and other relevant MEAs, UN entities, and other relevant organizations in supporting complementarity of efforts;
- seek views on how to more systematically assess and track good practices, the improvements, and results of cooperation between the CBD and other conventions and organizations; and
- to undertake, in collaboration with the other members of the Joint Liaison Group of the Rio Conventions, an analysis of overlaps in the frameworks on PMRR of the three conventions and provide options for their enhanced coordination and simplification, as appropriate and within their respective mandates.

Other requests to the Secretariat remain bracketed, in addition to other preambular paragraphs to either note or welcome, among others:

- the entry into force of the Agreement under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction;
- the collaborative efforts of the Joint Liaison Group of the Rio Conventions and the Liaison Group of biodiversity-related conventions; and
- the establishment of the ISP-CWP.

Other bracketed text includes:

- welcoming the global analytical study on the implementation of a human rights-based approach into the goals and targets of the GBF prepared by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights;
- inviting Parties to consider opportunities to promote and enhance synergies with multilateral agreements outside the environment sector; and
- inviting the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) to build on the Bern process and continue to strengthen cooperation among biodiversity-related conventions and other relevant MEAs.

Specialized International ABS Instruments

On Tuesday, the Secretariat introduced the background document ([CBD/SBI/6/8](#)), including an overview of submissions received and a draft recommendation, which puts forward three options for recognition of, or cooperation with, specialized international ABS instruments under [Article 4\(4\)](#) of the Nagoya Protocol, as well as a process for future work. The SBI put the [advance statement submissions](#) formally on the record.

Fiji, for P-SIDS, emphasized legal clarity, complementarity, and coherence with the objectives of the Nagoya Protocol, noting that specialized ABS agreements can help address sectoral realities but must not create loopholes, and called for safeguarding equity and traditional knowledge.

Many stressed the need to respect national sovereignty over genetic resources. Namibia, for the AFRICAN GROUP, proposed establishing an informal advisory group and, with SERBIA and PERU, supported a transparent Party-led mechanism for identifying specialized ABS instruments. PERU noted structured coordination and information exchange between ABS instruments should be seen as complementary to a formal process. BRAZIL and INDIA stressed that “specialization” under Article 4(4) is a legal term with concrete implications for national implementation, requiring due process, predictability, and safeguards.

JAPAN noted that ABS instruments under food security or pathogen management are outside the mandate of the Nagoya Protocol. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA cautioned against establishing hierarchies among international instruments and noted that nothing prevents Parties from developing other specialized international ABS agreements, provided they do not run counter to the objectives of the Nagoya Protocol.

PERU and GUATEMALA proposed additional criteria for specialized ABS instruments, including on traceability, IPLC participation, and DSI. MEXICO stressed that the possible inclusion of DSI in the absence of clear international rules may create confusion and interfere with the mandates of relevant bodies.

IIFB urged Parties to respect, protect, and uphold IPLCs’ rights to genetic resources and traditional knowledge. Third World Network, on behalf of the CBD ALLIANCE, shared development in other fora, such as the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) and the WHO Pandemic Agreement, showcasing that benefit-sharing remains a challenge.

A contact group was established, co-chaired by Mery Ciacci (EU) and Patience Gandiwa (Zimbabwe), which met from Tuesday evening to Thursday and also established an informal Friends of the Co-Chairs group.

On Wednesday, contact group Co-Chair Gandiwa reported to plenary noting divergence on: the proposed options; intersessional work through an informal advisory group; and whether to address DSI and Article 10 of the Nagoya Protocol.

On Thursday, contact group Co-Chair Ciacci reported on deliberations, noting convergence on a budget-neutral process in the form of an informal entity to advance work on the item and present its outcome at SBI 8, with a view to conclude at the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties (COP/MOP 7) to the Nagoya Protocol. The Secretariat said the contact group discussed:

- the preamble, with agreement to revert to the language of the background document;
- three operative paragraphs referring to submission of views, establishment of an informal entity, and requests to the Secretariat for intersessional work, respectively; and
- Annex II on the ToR of the entity.

Chair Souza Della Nina proposed plenary address the remaining operative paragraphs of the draft recommendation while bracketing the entire draft. SWITZERLAND, the UK, and JAPAN underscored the need to bracket the draft, noting the preamble was not discussed in the contact group. TOGO, MALAWI, and SENEGAL lamented the continuous postponement of the item, with MALAWI and NAMIBIA requesting clarification regarding a bracketed reference to Nagoya Protocol Article 4(4) in the context of the work of the informal entity. The EU noted the bracketed reference conveys their understanding that discussion should be based on Article 4 in its entirety. Chair Souza Della Nina requested the contact group Co-Chairs to continue informal consultations on the way forward.

In the evening, contact group Co-Chair Gandiwa reported on the outcome of informal consultations and the Secretariat introduced the agreed changes, including:

- maintaining the operative paragraph inviting the submission of views, as agreed in the contact group;
- maintaining the paragraphs on the modalities for advancing work and requesting the Secretariat to compile views, and support the organization and conduct of meetings for this work, and Annex II as agreed in the contact group, but: replacing the term “informal entity” with the term “informal group,” with an explanation, in a footnote, that the term “informal group” is a placeholder until Parties decide on the final name, with options proposed including reference to an open-ended informal advisory group or discussion forum; and bracketing references to an “online” process and meetings to advance work;
- reverting three paragraphs that took note of submissions and of proposed options for pathways for recognizing specialized ABS instruments, and recommended the inclusion of international cooperation as a standing item for future COP/MOPs, to the language of the draft recommendation in the background document, and bracketing them;
- deleting a paragraph inviting Parties to provide support, considering it was not in the background document; and
- reverting Annex I on options for determining the status of or recognizing specialized international ABS instruments to that contained in the background document.

The revised CRP was approved as presented. The SBI then adopted the recommendation ([CBD/SBI/6/L.7](#)) without amendments. TOGO put on record their regret about further postponing the item.

Final Outcome: The recommendation ([CBD/SBI/6/L.7](#)) remains largely bracketed. In agreed provisions, the SBI recommends:

- submission of views on the options and indicative criteria, including additional proposals;
- establishing an informal group to advance work, with its nature and meeting modalities remaining bracketed; and
- requesting the Secretariat to compile a synthesis of the views submitted and assist the Co-Chairs of the informal group.

The ToR of the informal group in Annex II are mostly agreed, with the exception of the group's nature and meeting modalities.

Bracketed text includes:

- the preamble;
- other operative provisions, including a timeline for completion of work and a recommendation to consider the issue as a standing agenda item under cooperation with other conventions; and
- Annex I on options for recognizing or determining the status of specialized international ABS instruments.

Review of Effectiveness of Processes under the Convention and its Protocols

On Tuesday, the Secretariat introduced the background document on options for further improving the effectiveness of meetings under the Convention and its Protocols ([CBD/SBI/6/9](#)), and related information documents containing: results from surveys on participation support mechanisms under other MEAs and the pilot modalities for the early submission of statements carried out at SBSTTA 27 ([CBD/SBI/6/INF.9](#) and [INF.10](#)); and an update on the further development of the decision-tracking tool ([CBD/SBI/6/INF.11](#)). The SBI put the [advance statement submissions](#) formally on the record.

Fiji, for P-SIDS, cautioned against efficiency for efficiency's sake, calling for processes that improve fairness and effectiveness. They supported the pilot modalities for early statement submissions where transparency is upheld, alongside reforms that reduce burdens on small delegations and increase stakeholder participation while avoiding tokenism.

Zimbabwe, for the AFRICAN GROUP, called for strengthened logistical and financial support to developing countries, LDCs, and IPLCs, including funding for more than one participant per delegation; and for building capacity to ensure equitable benefit-sharing from digital tools and innovation. They welcomed progress, including holding pre-session briefings and chair training. With many others, they highlighted the benefits of regional consultations and intra- and inter-regional coordination for improving preparedness, planning, and engagement. EGYPT proposed establishing a trust fund to support the attendance of two or more delegates per Party, as was done in the past.

JAMAICA stressed focusing on enhancing decision-making processes, and ensuring that contact groups are not held in parallel when there is not adequate capacity for delegations. COLOMBIA called for efficiency improvement that strengthens the Secretariat's institutional memory and avoids widening the digital divide. INDIA noted that clustering agenda items for efficiency should not dilute Protocol-specific mandates, and underlined the need for safeguards that uphold data security and equitable participation.

ARGENTINA and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION noted that the early submission of statements does not allow for translation into the six official UN languages, which limits participation. NEW ZEALAND welcomed the pilot modalities, noting that early submission allows Parties to focus on more critical issues.

IIFB encouraged Parties to facilitate IPLCs' participation. GYBN proposed exploring further ways to enhance the inclusiveness, accessibility, and transparency of processes, including through consultations with IPLCs, women, and youth. On concerns regarding the pilot modalities, the Secretariat noted a survey was circulated to delegates, inviting their feedback to improve the system for upcoming meetings.

Informal consultations on the item were facilitated by Gaute Hansen (Norway). On Thursday, plenary addressed a CRP, including: a draft SBI recommendation for the Secretariat; a recommended draft COP decision; a recommended draft decision for the COP/MOP of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety; and a recommended draft decision for the COP/MOP of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS.

On the SBI recommendation to the Secretariat, FIJI underscored the importance of undertaking consultations regarding "all possible" modalities for a Party-driven process to further improve the effectiveness of meetings. JAMAICA suggested specifying these modalities, noting these could be done by an *ad hoc* advisory body.

On the draft COP decision, ZIMBABWE noted the importance of retaining preambular language on securing funding for more than one delegate from developing countries. CHILE, supported by BRAZIL, suggested calling for funding for "at least two" delegates. CANADA, the EU, and SWITZERLAND called for time to consult, and the paragraph was bracketed.

Following a brief discussion, delegates approved noting "with appreciation" the pilot on early statement submissions alongside "identified challenges, benefits, and experiences."

Regarding a paragraph encouraging Parties and others to continue participating in the early submission process, delegates eventually kept in brackets a suggestion by MEXICO to "explore ways for online submissions to be translated into the six official languages of the UN," alongside the original text that called for their translation.

On pre-session documents, CANADA and MEXICO underscored that these should contain key elements, while SAUDI ARABIA emphasized the documents should be in all six official UN languages.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION, with BRAZIL and ARGENTINA, noted that it is not the Secretariat's prerogative to retire agenda items, while MEXICO underscored the value of the Secretariat suggesting such retirement to facilitate their consideration by Parties, citing time constraints.

On a list of requests to the Secretariat, subject to availability of resources and in consultation with the COP and SBSTTA Bureaux, TOGO, with the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, noted that some of them do not require consultation. The EU and NEW ZEALAND stressed some requests are core functions of the Secretariat, and therefore not dependent on additional resources. Chair Souza Della Nina asked Parties to send proposed amendments in writing to the Secretariat.

In the evening, plenary addressed a revised CRP. The Secretariat drew attention to a categorization of requests to the Secretariat into three paragraphs that include: requests subject to available resources, as appropriate, in consultation with the Bureau; requests in consultation with the Bureau, as appropriate; and requests to the Secretariat with no qualifications.

Drawing attention to remaining brackets throughout the document, Chair Souza Della Nina invited the SBI to address it as a whole. Delegates discussed briefly a bracketed paragraph on establishing a Party-driven process on effectiveness of processes

of the Convention and its Protocols, and approved the revised CRP as presented. The SBI then adopted the recommendation without discussion and with remaining brackets.

Final Outcome: The recommendation ([CBD/SBI/6/L.10](#)) is divided into four parts.

SBI requests the Secretariat to: consult Parties on the modalities for a possible Party-driven process to further improve the effectiveness of Convention processes and meetings; and provide draft guidelines for the operation of plenary sessions, contact groups and friends of the chair sessions to ensure consistency.

SBI recommends that COP 17, *inter alia*:

- notes with appreciation the pilot on the early submission of statements, and the application of the modalities for such submissions on a trial basis, as well as identified challenges, benefits, and experiences associated with the use of the pilot to improve the efficiency of meetings;
- encourages Parties to cooperate in streamlining meeting agendas and decisions; and
- requests the Secretariat, among others, to: hold, where possible, online briefing session for Parties, IPLCs, women, youth, and other stakeholders on agenda items ahead of intergovernmental meetings; invite submissions on options to further improve effectiveness, specifically with regard to engagement of observers, and to pilot these in the intersessional period up to COP 18; and limit the number and length of official documents while ensuring all required information is included and made available in six official languages.

Other paragraphs remain in brackets, including:

- encouraging the active participation of the early submission process and exploring ways for these submissions to be made available in all six official languages;
- requesting the COP and SBSTTA Bureaux to continue to improve the modalities for early submission of statements and to apply these on a voluntary basis on all agenda items; and
- requesting the Secretariat to develop briefing materials on applicable meeting procedures and an analysis on the possible use of technological tools for expediting decision-making processes.

SBI recommends that Cartagena Protocol COP/MOP 12 and Nagoya Protocol COP/MOP 6, among others, welcome progress made with the decision-tracking tool developed by the COP (as described in [CBD/SBI/6/INF/11](#)) and to include COP/MOP decisions, respectively, in this decision-tracking tool. The paragraphs calling upon Parties to increase contributions to the relevant voluntary trust fund to ensure the full and effective participation of representatives of developing countries remain in brackets.

Functional Review of the Secretariat

On Tuesday, the Secretariat introduced the relevant documents ([CBD/SBI/6/10](#) and [INF/12](#)). Executive Secretary Schomaker underscored that the review aimed to assess whether the Secretariat is appropriately structured and resourced to fulfil its functions in servicing meetings and implementing the Convention's objectives. Schomaker stressed the Secretariat's commitment to implement actions recommended by the review deemed to be priorities for the Secretariat's mandate, and highlighted that certain budget-neutral short- and medium-term actions had been initiated. UNEP provided additional context regarding administrative arrangements and noted the report confirms that the Secretariat had maintained a strong

record of delivery, despite operational and resource constraints. The Plenary put the [advance statement submissions](#) formally on the record.

Fiji, for P-SIDS, noted unbalanced focus on servicing meetings rather than on delivery on Convention objectives and provision of implementation support to Parties. They called for: accountability measures; resources that follow mandates, including budgetary planning that matches workload realities; and a digital transformation that enables and simplifies Parties' participation in implementing the Convention, not merely participating at meetings.

Eswatini, for the AFRICAN GROUP, underscored that an effective Secretariat is one that is responsive to the practical needs of Parties. They called for reorienting resources to balance administrative functions with substantive implementation support, alongside a transparent and inclusive follow-up process with clear performance indicators, benchmarks, and timelines. LESOTHO welcomed the recommendations for reinforced planning and budgeting systems, noting their importance for developing countries reliant on timely, predictable guidance and technical support.

JAMAICA underlined interlinkages between effectiveness of meetings, Secretariat restructuring, and Party participation in meetings and implementation. BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA stressed that the extended mandate and increased number of meetings must be accompanied by institutional efficiency and underscored the importance of building the relationship between the Secretariat and Parties.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION expressed concern with the review's excessive focus on the GBF, a temporary programme of the Convention. They noted that all actions, such as staffing, must align with the Secretariat's primary objective of providing assistance for implementation by Parties. ARGENTINA expressed concern on the lack of transparency in the budget, and CHILE on the expanding agenda and documentation. CHINA called for further clarifying the content, scope of implementation, and impacts of the proposed short- and medium-term actions. IIFB expressed concern on the proposal to place the People and Biodiversity Unit under the Strategic Partnerships, Financing and Economy division. Executive Secretary Schomaker addressed some concerns, including the Secretariat's duty to prioritize Parties' requests.

On Thursday, the SBI addressed a CRP including a draft SBI recommendation and a draft COP decision. CANADA, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, and CHINA suggested, and delegates agreed, to make clarifying amendments to a provision in the SBI recommendation noting with appreciation the follow-up actions "in progress" that align with the core functions and strategic priorities of the Secretariat, highlighting that these lie particularly in implementing the GBF and servicing CBD meetings. Delegates agreed to similarly amend a provision in the draft COP decision requesting the continued implementation of "ongoing" and remaining actions that "align with the core functions and strategic priorities of the Secretariat" and enhance the operational efficiency recommended in the functional review.

In the SBI recommendation, JAMAICA proposed, and delegates agreed, to amend a request for the Secretariat to prepare and submit to COP 17 a progress report on activities listed in the draft decision, and "any additional activities related to the functional review's implementation," together with proposals "and rationale" for adjustments in staffing required, "including additional posts."

Deliberations continued on how to consider actions already initiated in relation to the functional review, and those additional actions requested on the matter.

Delegates approved several elements of the draft COP decision, and agreed to an amendment proposed by the RUSSIAN FEDERATION and MEXICO to also take note of additional actions requested in the SBI recommendation. Delegates agreed to CHINA's proposal to amend draft decision text requesting the Secretariat to keep Parties informed through the COP Bureau, in a transparent manner, of progress in implementing the ongoing and remaining actions recommended in the functional review.

Following drawn-out deliberations on the procedure for the COP or the COP/MOP of the Protocols to take note of the draft decision, delegates agreed to recommend that the COP/MOP of both Protocols take note of the executive summary of the report of the functional review and related additional actions requested by SBI 6. The CRP was approved as amended. In the evening, the SBI adopted the recommendation with minor corrections.

Final Outcome: In the recommendation ([CBD/SBI/6/L.4](#)), the SBI takes note of the executive summary of the report on the external in-depth functional review of the Secretariat (as contained in Annex I of [CBD/SBI/6/10](#)), the ongoing consultations on the short-, medium- and long-term actions by the Secretariat with the Bureau and COP; and the ongoing follow-up actions of the Secretariat, a list of which remains bracketed.

SBI requests the Secretariat to: transmit the executive summary of the functional review and the progress report of the ongoing follow-up actions of the Secretariat, proposals and rationale for adjustments in post classification to COP 17; and to convene information sessions before SBI 7 and COP 17 with a view to briefing Parties on budgetary implications.

SBI also recommends COP 17 to:

- take note of the executive summary of the report, the outcome of the functional review which should lead to enhanced synergies and efficiencies within the Secretariat, and the follow-up actions taken by the Secretariat;
- request the Secretariat to continue implementing the ongoing and remaining actions that align with the core functions and strategic priorities of the Secretariat;
- ensure the implementation of recommendations of the functional review that are in line with the functions of the Secretariat, as established in Article 24 of the CBD, Article 31 of the Cartagena Protocol, and Article 28 of the Nagoya Protocol;
- keep Parties informed of the progress in implementing ongoing and remaining actions recommended in the functional review; and
- recommend that Cartagena Protocol COP/MOP 12 and Nagoya Protocol COP/MOP 6 also take note of the executive summary of the report and note the additional actions requested by SBI 6.

Closing Plenary

On Thursday evening, Rapporteur Bilal Qtishat (Jordan) introduced the meeting's report ([CBD/SBI/5/L.1](#)). ARGENTINA asked for their interpretation of gender according to the [Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court](#) to be included in the report. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION called for incorporating their request for a compilation of all requests made to the Secretariat that are subject to availability of additional financial resources. IRAN, supported by the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, put on record the

need to identify suitable financial mechanisms for countries that do not currently receive biodiversity financial support. Chair Souza Della Nina confirmed that the meeting report would reflect these statements, and the SBI adopted the report.

In her closing remarks, Executive Secretary Schomaker applauded delegates' collegial spirit that enabled SBI 6 to be a stepping stone toward COP 17 and welcomed their continued engagement with the pilot modalities for increasing efficiency in CBD processes. Chair Souza Della Nina thanked delegates for their commitment and flexibility shown across the meeting.

Pointing to participation challenges resulting from the pilot modalities, GYBN, IIFB and the CBD WOMEN'S CAUCUS stressed that full and inclusive participation cannot be sacrificed in the name of process efficiency.

A Brief Analysis of the Meeting

Along the path to a world living in harmony with nature lie stepping stones, paving the way and marking progress, providing opportunities for travelers to consolidate knowledge on the distance covered, and decide on the best route forward. One such stepping stone was the sixth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI 6) of the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD). The meeting allowed delegates time to check-in, just past the midpoint in their journey toward the 2030 targets set out in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF).

Exactly one year after the successful conclusion of the resumed 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 16) to the CBD, the SBI took stock of actions, both ongoing and anticipated, for operationalizing the decisions taken by the COP. These ranged from the ambitious, substantive goals of mobilizing resources to provide the means of implementation for the Convention's objectives, to the quieter but no less important work of supporting national reporting and increasing the effectiveness of Convention processes.

This brief analysis will assess the meeting's efforts in ensuring the well-functioning of the Convention: notably by testing novel approaches to improve effectiveness, and in paving the road for the implementation of global goals and targets towards the fast-approaching 2030 deadline.

Checking the Engine – On Effectiveness

The *leitmotiv* of the Convention is, ultimately, to deliver on the ambitions—and necessity—of valuing, conserving, restoring, and wisely using biodiversity. This starts by facilitating the convening of representatives of governments, rightsholders, and stakeholders who forge the path together towards these ambitions. Against the backdrop of limited fiscal space, alongside interlinked geopolitical and socio-environmental crises, ensuring the efficacy of these processes is critical.

In light of this, SBI 6 began a little differently than usual: opening interventions on each agenda item found their place not in plenary but on the CBD website, having been submitted prior to the meeting's start.

Delegates certainly voiced their problems with this pilot modality for early submission of statements. While it ultimately intends to allow for more negotiating time based on initial Party or regional group positions, many expressed concern that the statements were shared in the language they were originally submitted and were not translated into the six UN official languages. Some believed that

this did not contribute to inclusive deliberations. Others questioned whether the modality was effective in saving time, noting that, despite pleas to delegates who have provided advance statements to refrain from taking the floor, several Parties still delivered oral statements to highlight their views. Others pointed out that this resulted in unbalanced regional representation during plenary, with some groups opting to speak while others exercised restraint. Many, however, expressed appreciation for the host of approaches tested, including limiting the length of meeting documents, providing an outline of estimated extrabudgetary resource requirements for recommended activities, and organizing pre-session trainings and webinars. Parties recommended that such initiatives continue, citing their usefulness in exchanging information, increasing meeting preparedness for capacity-constrained Parties, and improving regional coordination.

An efficient Secretariat is also needed for effective policy-making. Following the adoption of the GBF in 2022 and considering the associated increase to the workload of the Convention, the COP mandated a functional review of the Secretariat. Among the easily welcomed findings is the Secretariat's strong record of delivering on obligations despite considerable operational and financial constraints. At the same time, the review provided an opportunity for many developing countries to ask for balance in the Secretariat's functions, between conference servicing and providing substantive implementation support, noting that success is measured in the work that is facilitated on the ground.

Inflating the Tires – On Implementation

For on-the-ground implementation to occur, access to knowledge, technical support, and funding is critical. SBI 6 operated under the shadow of the ever-present USD 700 trillion global biodiversity finance gap. Little acknowledgement was given to the now-passed deadline set out in Target 19 of the GBF—to increase total biodiversity-related international financial resources from developed to developing countries to at least USD 20 billion annually by 2025—although it is widely acknowledged that public funding alone cannot redress biodiversity finance flows.

The approaches to resource mobilization are multi-pronged. Developing countries stressed the need for developed countries to fulfil their financial commitments under the Convention. While dedicated funds, such as the GBF Fund, are used as tools to garner financial support and to broaden the contributor base, several Parties noted that establishing new funds does not correspond to increases in finance availability or disbursement.

Others repeatedly called for innovative approaches to close the financing gap, directing the SBI to support dialogues among ministers of environment and finance, and to explore instruments such as debt-for-nature swaps. SBI 6 was intended to take note of three commissioned studies exploring: the relationship between debt sustainability and the Convention's implementation; how the guidance on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms have been implemented; and the relationship between biodiversity and climate finance. Some participants expressed concerns about the usefulness or appropriateness of the CBD exploring questions related to debt, noting this is beyond its mandate and within the sovereign rights of States. Others highlighted the limitations of the study on safeguards, stressing the need for input by affected communities and Indigenous Peoples. Overall, delegates underscored the lack of time to adequately review these studies,

and the timeframe for peer review was extended until May 2026, to ensure a broad range of input so that the studies are presented to COP 17 in their most useful form. Historical challenges with resource mobilization and disbursement are ultimately forwarded to SBI 7. At its next meeting in August, the SBI will address fundamental issues, including impediments to the effectiveness of global biodiversity finance and opportunities for broadening the contributor base.

SBI 6 was unable to resolve questions related to the timely disbursement of funds for Global Environment Facility (GEF) eligible countries. One Party underscored the crux of the issue: pointing out their country had received GEF funding to prepare their seventh national report only in January 2026, but the report is due at the end of February 2026. Failure to submit by the deadline, they said, is thus rooted in lack of capacity and resources, rather than political will. These national reports are intended to feed into the global report and eventually the global review of collective progress on implementing the GBF, now beyond its halfway point. While the Secretariat noted that national reports submitted after the February deadline would still inform the global review, many stressed the potential lack and regional imbalance of national-level data to inform the global report, which the Secretariat will prepare before CBD COP 17.

Driving in Tandem – On Synergies

The question of how to operate effectively while acknowledging the overlapping and interlinked roles and activities of other conventions and international agreements and organizations was an undercurrent to several items on the SBI 6 agenda. In most cases, despite several hours of contact group deliberations and informal consultations, these issues remained unresolved, to be addressed by the COP in October.

On the standing item of cooperation with other conventions, divergence persisted on recommendations citing processes and organizations such as the Agreement on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction, human rights bodies, or the recently established Intergovernmental Science-Policy Panel on Chemicals, Waste and Pollution. Some prioritized the need for cooperation and synergies as a way to address the direct and indirect causes of biodiversity loss, while others highlighted institutional challenges. Repeated calls to respect differences in mandates of these conventions and bodies showcased some CBD Parties' discomfort with engaging in processes that they are not members of.

Similarly, deliberations on specialized international access and benefit-sharing (ABS) instruments did not reach a conclusive outcome. The inability of Nagoya Protocol Parties to agree on a roadmap for further work on this matter reflects their principled disagreement about the scope of the Protocol and its position vis-à-vis other ABS instruments. These include, for instance, the pathogen ABS system to be created under the Pandemics Agreement of the World Health Organization. Nonetheless, the SBI 6 recommendation to Nagoya Protocol COP/MOP 6, to be held concurrently with CBD COP 17, will serve as the pathway for continued deliberations on the matter.

Getting into Gear – On Next Steps

On long journeys, it is commonly understood that a group can only move as fast as its slowest member. At the beginning of the

meeting, CBD Executive Secretary Astrid Schomaker shared that the CBD is having its “marathon year.” Between the close of SBI 6 and the start of SBI 7 in August 2026, Parties have full agendas requiring both speed and endurance. First, their seventh national reports under the CBD, as well as their national reports under the Protocols, are due at the end of February 2026.

Second, many delegates noted concern with an overburdened SBI 7 agenda, which is set to continue the consideration of several SBI 6 items, including the financial mechanism and technical and scientific cooperation, alongside other issues such as subnational-level engagement for GBF implementation. Furthermore, extensive work on resource mobilization is expected to continue intersessionally and at SBI 7.

Between the long hours crafting agreement on maximizing the effectiveness of CBD processes and promoting implementation, negotiators and observers began turning their heads toward Yerevan, Armenia, where CBD COP 17 will be held in October 2026. The incoming COP 17 Presidency engaged actively throughout the week, with many highlighting the acceleration of efforts across the board to ensure preparedness for the last legs of the journey.

As noted by SBI 6 Chair Clarissa Souza Della Nina, the CBD’s implementation arm performed its functions with a collegial spirit and, with others, appreciated the endeavors to ease the substantive and procedural burden and ensure delegates “travel light” to Yerevan. As Parties dash towards the finish line, effective implementation is a necessary path towards a world living in harmony with nature.

Upcoming Meetings

CMS COP 15: The Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals will convene the 15th meeting of its Conference of the Parties with the theme “Connecting Nature to Sustain Life” to highlight the vital role of ecological connectivity in conserving ecosystems that support migratory species and human well-being. **dates:** 23–29 March 2026 **location:** Campo Grande, Brazil **www:** cms.int/cop15docs

Third Meeting of the BBNJ PrepCom: The third meeting of the Preparatory Commission for the Entry into Force of the Agreement under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction (BBNJ Agreement) will continue its work on the cluster of issues under discussion at PrepCom II, with a view to preparing recommendations for adoption at COP 1. **dates:** 23 March – 2 April 2026 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **www:** un.org/bbnjagreement

IPCC-64: During the 64th session of the IPCC, delegates will advance work related to the seventh assessment cycle. **dates:** 24–27 March 2026 **location:** Bangkok, Thailand **www:** ipcc.ch

UNFF 21: The 21st session of the UN Forum on Forests will focus on strengthening policy guidance and accelerating the implementation of agreed forest-related commitment, and address policy dialogue, development, and decision making. **dates:** 11–15 May 2026 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **www:** un.org/esa/forests

CBD SBSTTA 28: The 28th meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice of the CBD will discuss, among other things, the global review of progress in GBF implementation; synthetic biology; sustainable wildlife

management; and marine and coastal biodiversity. **dates:** 27 July – 1 August 2026 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **www:** cbd.int/meetings/SBSTTA-28

CBD SBI 7: The seventh meeting of the SBI will continue its work on reviewing implementation of the CBD and the GBF, ahead of COP 17. **dates:** 4–12 August 2026 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **www:** cbd.int/meetings/SBI-07

UN Biodiversity Conference (CBD COP 17): The 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity will review GBF implementation and address issues under the Convention, while the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on ABS will address issues under the Protocols. **dates:** 19–30 October 2026 **location:** Yerevan, Armenia **www:** cbd.int/meetings/COP-17

For additional upcoming events, see: sdg.iisd.org

Glossary

ABS	Access and benefit-sharing
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
COP	Conference of the Parties
COP/MOP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties
CRP	Conference room paper
DSI	Digital sequence information
FPIC	Free, prior and informed consent
GBF	Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GYBN	Global Youth Biodiversity Network
IAG	Informal Advisory Group
ISP-CWP	Intergovernmental Science-Policy Panel on Chemicals, Waste and Pollution
IIFB	International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity
IPLCs	Indigenous Peoples and local communities
LDCs	Least developed countries
MEAs	Multilateral environmental agreements
NBSAPs	National biodiversity strategies and action plans
ORT	Online reporting tool
PMRR	Planning, Monitoring, Reporting, and Review
P-SIDS	Pacific small island developing States
SBI	Subsidiary Body on Implementation
SBSTTA	Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice
SIDS	Small island developing states
ToR	Terms of reference
TSC	Technical and scientific cooperation
UNDP	UN Development Programme
UNEP	UN Environment Programme