

Summary of the 28th Meeting of the CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical, and Technological Advice and the 7th Meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation: 27 July - 12 August 2026

“The Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) shows the way forward. But we must pick up the pace—with ambition and accountability.” UN Secretary-General António Guterres delivered this statement during the 2026 International Day for Biological Diversity celebrations earlier this year.

Halfway to 2030, Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) took stock, reflected on progress, and determined the path forward in their implementation of the GBF. Delegates agreed that the seventeenth meeting of the CBD Conference of the Parties (CBD COP 17), which will convene in Yerevan, Armenia, in October 2026, is the right moment to carry out the first global stocktake, through a global review of collective progress in the implementation of the GBF (GRI). The Global Review Process was adopted at COP 15 alongside the ambitious landmark GBF, with its vision of a world living in harmony with nature by 2050.

The twenty-eighth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA 28) and the seventh meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI 7) convened at a critical juncture on the road to Yerevan, nearly nine months after SBSTTA 27 set in motion the first part of the GRI by approving its annotated outline and establishing the Ad Hoc Scientific and Technical Advisory Group to guide its preparation. During the intersessional period, Parties worked to build an evidence base for this first global stocktake. This includes reporting on national actions and progress through national reports, national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), and national targets, alongside the compilation and analysis of these inputs into the GRI.

This intensive work culminated in Nairobi, where Parties focused on the GRI in their nearly three weeks of deliberations. The meetings brought together the complementary mandates of the two subsidiary bodies: SBSTTA, providing the scientific, technical, and technological advice needed to understand progress and guide action, and SBI, addressing the implementation conditions required to translate ambition to deliver on the goals and targets of the GBF.

Delegates dissected the outcomes of the GRI, addressing its strengths and its shortcomings. Many noted that the GRI’s analysis presents a snapshot of GBF implementation. Delegates applauded the findings that the GBF has generated unprecedented global engagement, action, innovation, and learning across all 23 targets.

However, collective implementation is not accelerating quickly enough to put the 2030 targets within reach. The GRI highlighted uneven progress, particularly in means of implementation (MoI), capacity-building, access to knowledge, data and monitoring, and whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches, while stressing that availability and access to financial resources remain a major obstacle for developing countries.

Through long hours of negotiations, the subsidiary bodies worked to provide concrete recommendations for COP 17 with the primary aim of turning the GRI into a catalyst of accelerated action. SBSTTA 28 and SBI 7 recommendations formed two complementary strands: the global review and Yerevan pathway, and the strengthening of the planning, monitoring, reporting and review (PMRR). The Pathway focuses on five areas for accelerated action: completing NBSAPs and national targets; strengthening MoI, particularly finance, capacity-building, technology and technical cooperation; whole-of-government approaches; whole-of-society participation, including Indigenous Peoples and local communities, women and youth; and monitoring and knowledge.

In addition to the recommendations on the GRI, the meetings produced 15 recommendations, several of which remain heavily bracketed, with outstanding issues deferred to COP 17 for resolution.

SBSTTA 28 outcomes included recommendations on:

- Marine and coastal biodiversity, including ecologically or biologically significant marine areas;

In this Issue

A Brief History of the CBD Subsidiary Bodies	2
SBSTTA 28 Report	2
SBI 6 Report	14
A Brief Analysis of the Meetings	36
Upcoming Meetings	38
Glossary	38

- Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) assessments and biodiversity and business;
- Sustainable wildlife management;
- Programme of Work on Protected Areas and ecological connectivity; and
- Synthetic biology thematic action plan.

SBI 7 outcomes included recommendations on:

- Review of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;
- Synthetic biology;
- Communication, education and public awareness;
- Capacity-building and development, including the long-term strategic framework;
- Technical and scientific cooperation and technology transfer;
- Biodiversity mainstreaming;
- Resource mobilization;
- Financial mechanism;
- Subnational governments, cities, and local authorities;
- Multilateral Mechanism for benefit-sharing from the use of digital sequence information, including the Cali Fund; and
- Review of implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.

SBSTTA 28 and SBI 7 convened from 27 July – 1 August and 4–12 August 2026, respectively, at the UN Office in Nairobi, attracting more than 1,000 delegates and observers.

A Brief History of the CBD Subsidiary Bodies

The CBD was adopted on 22 May 1992 and entered into force on 29 December 1993. There are currently 196 Parties to the Convention. The CBD 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.

Subsidiary bodies include the SBSTTA; the SBI; and the Subsidiary Body on Article 8(j) and related provisions (SB8j). The COP is the Convention's governing body and meets every two years.

SBSTTA was established under CBD [Article 25](#) as an open-ended, intergovernmental, multidisciplinary, scientific advisory body to provide the COP and other subsidiary bodies with scientific and technical advice relating to the Convention's implementation. Article 25 further elaborates on SBSTTA's functions, including providing assessments of the status of biodiversity and the effects of types of measures taken in accordance with CBD provisions, and responding to questions that the COP may pose. SBSTTA further serves the Cartagena Protocol (CP) on biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol (NP) on access to genetic resources and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from their utilization, with [CP Article 30](#) and [NP Article 27](#) stipulating that any subsidiary body established by or under the Convention may also serve the protocols.

SBSTTA carries out its work according to its consolidated [modus operandi](#), set forth in Annex III of [Decision VIII/10](#) (operations of the Convention), which elaborates on SBSTTA's functions, operating principles, rules of procedure, and other modalities.

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 MoI; and operations of the Convention and the Protocols.

Recent Meetings

In December 2022 in Montreal, Canada, **COP 15** adopted the GBF, which will guide biodiversity policy in the years to come, through four overarching goals and 23 targets to be achieved by 2030.

COP 16, held from 16 October – 1 November 2024 in Cali, Colombia, focused on implementation, reviewing the development of national targets and the alignment of NBSAPs with the GBF. It further established the SB8(j), adopted modalities for ecologically or biologically significant marine areas, following eight years of negotiations, and adopted a decision on the operationalization of the multilateral mechanism for benefit-sharing from the use of digital sequence information (DSI) on genetic resources. The meeting was suspended without completing consideration of all agenda items, and a resumed session was held in Rome, Italy, from 25–27 February 2025, adopting outstanding decisions on resource mobilization; the financial mechanism; planning, monitoring, reporting, and review; and the budget.

In October 2025 in Panama City, Panama, delegates met for **SBSTTA 27 and SB8j 1**. Significantly, they approved the annotated outline of the global report on collective progress in GBF implementation, and requested the CBD Secretariat, under the guidance of the *Ad Hoc* Scientific and Technical Advisory Group, to prepare the report. SB8j provided advice on traditional knowledge, innovations, and practices from Indigenous Peoples and local communities (IPLCs) for the global report, requesting the Secretariat to utilize this advice when preparing the report.

In February 2026 in Rome, Italy, delegates convened for **SBI 6** and addressed a wide range of items related to implementation, from encouraging the required national actions to ensure the necessary means to bridge data gaps and build capacities, such as scientific and technological collaboration and financial resources. They adopted bracketed recommendations on many agenda items, including resource mobilization, the financial mechanism, scientific and technical cooperation, and cooperation with other conventions.

SBSTTA 28 Report

Opening the meeting on Monday, 27 July, SBSTTA 28 Chair Jean Bruno Mikissa (Gabon) underlined the role of SBSTTA 28 in supporting the GBF, noting the importance of sound scientific and technical recommendations on the review of collective progress in GBF implementation, and other agenda items including synthetic biology, sustainable wildlife management, protected areas, and marine and coastal biodiversity.

Susan Gardner, Director Ecosystems Division, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), underlined that biodiversity underpins sustainable development, and creates a better future for people. She lauded SBSTTA for bringing together a diverse variety of science and knowledge and underlined the need for accelerated implementation of the GBF.

CBD Executive Secretary Astrid Schomaker underlined the need to enhance implementation of the GBF, stressing that the global review is not just a process of ticking boxes but is a critical mechanism to reflect on progress. She pointed to work on the GBF monitoring framework, and highlighted links with relevant IPBES assessments, including the business and biodiversity assessment.

Adoption of the Agenda and Organization of Work: Delegates adopted the provisional agenda ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/1](#)), and organization of work according to the annotated provisional

agenda ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/1/Add.1](#)), and the scenario note ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/1/Add.2](#)).

Election of officers: On Monday, Niklaus Wagner (Switzerland) was elected as rapporteur. Uruguay, for the Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC), nominated Hesiquio Benítez Díaz (Mexico); Senegal, for Africa, nominated Joseph Sapunka Turay (Sierra Leone); and the Netherlands, for the Western European and Others Group (WEOG), nominated Julie Hammer-Monart (France). On Friday, Czechia, for Central and Eastern Europe nominated Snežana Prokić (Serbia); and Indonesia, for Asia-Pacific nominated Obaid Ali Al Shamsi (United Arab Emirates (UAE)). All candidates were elected by acclamation and began their term at the end of SBSTTA 28.

Process: Chair Mikissa reported that the procedure for early submission of statements would apply and highlighted that 175 written statements from Parties and 63 from observers have been submitted for SBSTTA 28 ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/INF/10](#)). As such, these statements were considered officially submitted under the relevant agenda items.

Planning, Monitoring, Reporting and Review: Global Review of Collective Progress in the Implementation of the GBF, and the GBF Monitoring Framework

This item was addressed in plenary on Monday, Friday and Saturday, and in a contact group co-chaired by Sanne Kruid (UK) and Paulina Stowhas Salinas (Chile), which met all week.

On Monday, Hesiquio Benítez Díaz (Mexico), Co-Chair of the *Ad Hoc* Scientific and Technical Advisory Group (AHSTAG) for the preparation of the draft global report on collective progress in the implementation of the GBF ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/2/Add.1/Rev.1](#)), highlighted the strong methodological basis of the report and reported extensive consultations, including 10 meetings of the Group. He thanked AHSTAG Co-Chair Emily Nicholson (Australia) and other members.

The Secretariat presented relevant documents including the Secretariat Note on the global review of collective progress in implementation of the GBF ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/2/Rev.1](#)); the draft global report on collective progress in the implementation of the GBF ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/2/Add.1/Rev.1](#)); monitoring framework for the GBF ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/2/Add.2](#)); and the summary, conclusions, and key messages of the global review of collective progress in the implementation of the GBF ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/2/Add.3](#)).

South Africa, for the AFRICAN GROUP with SAUDI ARABIA, ARGENTINA, EGYPT, GUATEMALA, and several others, prioritized matters relating to strengthening the MoI for the GBF.

Fiji, for the PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES (P-SIDS), lamented that the experiences from the region have not been fully represented. They called for, *inter alia*: gains in technology transfer and capacity-building to keep pace with implementation needs; and MoI to be treated as a binding constraint for small island developing states (SIDS), specifically in the review process.

Antigua and Barbuda, for the CARIBBEAN REGION, noted that the region has been “rendered invisible” in the report, lamenting that the framing does not capture the experience of countries in the Caribbean. They called for a regionally responsive approach to monitoring progress.

UGANDA said the draft recommendations are limited in addressing the identified barriers to implementation progress. EGYPT suggested future assessments should explicitly distinguish

between limited implementation, limited reporting, and limited data availability, and noted that analytical conclusions should be grounded in available knowledge. CHINA called for clarifying that data gaps are not implementation gaps and, with MALAWI, SOMALIA, NIGERIA, and CAMEROON, called for recognizing that MoI is not growing at the scale and speed required to support developing countries.

INDIA emphasized that the assessment of collective progress must not undermine the performance of individual countries, adding also the need to acknowledge differences in implementation capacities. BRAZIL said the review has demonstrated the need to distinguish between gaps in implementation and gaps in data, monitoring, and reporting. They cautioned against premature conclusions given the uneven capacities of Parties to collect, process, and report comprehensive data. INDONESIA noted that the report’s findings should be interpreted while accounting for national circumstances and capabilities.

SAUDI ARABIA also called for equity in the follow-up and monitoring of the implementation of all the goals and targets. ARGENTINA called for the review to take into account information from other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) to reduce the burden on states.

As incoming COP 17 Presidency, ARMENIA noted that the global report provides, for the first time, a picture of “where we all stand,” and stressed that it will help set a strong example for future review cycles. SERBIA shared that the country’s experience in aligning with the review process.

The DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO (DRC) underscored that the review process is essential for strengthening accountability, transparency, and learning in GBF implementation.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION noted that the methodology on the scale of ambition is not precise, calling for caution on how it is used to indicate implementation.

KENYA underlined the need for better interoperability between national biodiversity, development, and statistics systems; and recommended expanding the scope of the technical expert group to include expertise pertaining to new and emerging technologies, including artificial intelligence and geospatial technologies. COLOMBIA stressed that international support should be guided towards the needs of developing countries and underlined the need for incentives to drive implementation.

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA suggested that the section of the report on the support provided by Parties should take into account information from the document containing the status of resources approved by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for readiness and early action to implement the GBF and preparation of NBSAPs and national reports ([CBD/SBI/7/INF/17](#)). GUATEMALA highlighted the need to recognize the data-access challenges faced by developing countries.

NEPAL called for enhanced capacity development for countries with complex mountain systems, including through regional and transboundary cooperation among high altitude biodiversity countries. SYRIA highlighted war-related environmental challenges as faced by their country as a barrier to progress and urged cooperation among arid and semi-arid regions to overcome climate change related challenges. BURUNDI shared the country’s efforts to implement the GBF, including through developing national mechanisms to monitor this implementation.

The INTERNATIONAL INDIGENOUS FORUM ON BIODIVERSITY (IIFB) underlined the importance of ensuring that

all the processes related to the review include participation of civil society and grassroots organizations, calling for these contributions to be added to the current review. The CBD WOMEN'S CAUCUS stressed that achieving the 2030 mission of the GBF must be accompanied by increased MoI, and supported the inclusion of voices from IPLCs, women, and youth in this process.

GLOBAL YOUTH BIODIVERSITY NETWORK (GYBN) supported the draft report as a good basis for a global analysis for Parties self-reporting and underlined that the global review must be informed by the global collective.

P-SIDS called for, among others, the inclusion of gender as a headline indicator in the global review. EGYPT, TANZANIA, MALDIVES, COSTA RICA, and UAE supported maintaining the current set of indicators, stressing that changes at this stage would place additional reporting burdens on states. MALAYSIA noted the framework should be operationalized prior to the next review of collective progress. DRC stressed that existing key indicators sufficiently cover the GBF and cautioned against introducing new indicators before CBD COP 19, advocating instead for improved reporting and enhanced online reporting tools. COSTA RICA also argued against new indicators and suggested sharing lessons learned in the use of existing indicators.

A number of delegates supported establishing an ad hoc technical expert group on the further operationalization of the monitoring framework for the GBF. P-SIDS called for SIDS to be assured a seat in the expert group. NIGERIA said it should remain technically focused, time bound and inclusive, and the UAE said the mandate and duration of any expert group should be clearly defined. JORDAN said the expert group can support indicator use. TANZANIA called for adequate geographical representation.

During **contact group** discussions, one of the main points of divergence centered on whether the decision should reproduce the overarching and six key messages from the global report. Several participants argued that incorporating the messages verbatim would amount to endorsing or legitimizing their content. Some also favored retaining references to the key messages, emphasizing their value in communicating the report's conclusions and guiding implementation efforts.

In their discussions on key message 3 on MoI, delegates remained divided over the statement regarding gains in domestic and international public finance, with some referring to the statement as false, adding that the global report on implementation progress suggests the opposite.

Delegations suggested separating the financial aspects of MoI, from those pertaining to capacity-building, technology transfer, and technical and scientific cooperation. Others requested mention of the special circumstances of SIDS.

One delegation requested including text referring to, among other things, the unmet target in private financing for GBF implementation. In this vein, delegates considered broader language, noting that the availability and provisioning of MoI remains significantly below the scale, predictability, and timeliness and accessibility required for the full and effective implementation of the Framework.

Delegates also debated key message 4 on whole-of-government approaches, with some calling for stronger language relating to the limited progress of these approaches in achieving GBF Targets 1 (plan and manage all areas to reduce biodiversity loss) and 14

(integrating biodiversity in policies). Others suggested merging the whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches under one key message.

On whole-of-society approaches (key message 5), delegates pointed out additional challenges faced by non-state actors in supporting GBF implementation, including limited resources, technical capacities, access to information and knowledge, and effective participation and coordination mechanisms. Others called to define these non-state actors, and proposed to include persons with disabilities and business and industry to the list of non-state actors. Delegates considered inserting this list of non-state actors in a footnote.

The contact group also discussed several draft recommendations and considered, among others, a new text proposal detailing that methodological challenges related to headline, component, and complementary indicators have negatively affected reporting and monitoring. The proposal also outlines that challenges related to data availability and access, data fragmentation, technical and technological infrastructure, resource availability, and capacity have negatively affected reporting and monitoring efforts.

Reporting back during Friday's plenary, Co-Chair Kruid said that the group had made significant progress, and that two sets of recommendations would be forwarded to the COP when the group concluded its work.

On Saturday in plenary, Contact Group Co-Chair Kruid noted that the group had gone as far as they could at this meeting, and did not recommend reopening discussions. SBSTTA Chair Mikissa then introduced the two bracketed draft recommendations on the global review or progress of GBF implementation, and on the monitoring framework (CBD/SBSTTA/28/CRP.6/Rev.1), which delegates approved. In the evening, delegates adopted the final recommendations. The issue was also considered by SBI 7 under the corresponding agenda item (CBD/SBI/7/2/Rev.1).

Final Recommendation: In the final recommendation ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/L.7](#)) SBSTTA invites the SBI to agree to the inclusion of the following provisions on the scientific, technical, and technological aspects of the global report on collective progress in the implementation of the GBF in the draft decisions to be submitted for consideration by COP 17. The recommendations contained therein relate to the global review of collective progress in the implementation of the GBF at COP 17, and the GBF monitoring framework.

On the global review, the SBSTTA suggests that the COP, among other things:

- welcomes "with appreciation" the global report on collective progress in GBF implementation, and notes its overarching message and key messages;
- notes with deep concern that, unless collective implementation is rapidly accelerated, including through enhanced international cooperation, improved actions and efforts, and strengthened MoI, the 2030 targets and mission of the Framework will not be achieved, and stresses the imperative to address gaps, challenges, and barriers in implementation to achieve the 2030 targets and mission;
- "encourages Parties to ensure that the foundational data needed for implementing the monitoring framework, in particular national ecosystem maps, are in place to support the operationalization of the ecosystem-based headline indicators"; and

- “also encourages Parties, and “requests” or “invites” the GEF and invites other governments and other organizations, to provide support for addressing the technical and financial challenges faced by Parties, especially developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and SIDS, in improving their national monitoring and knowledge management systems “and foundational data needed for implementing and monitoring the Framework,” including by enhancing the provision of adequate, predictable, accessible and timely financial resources, technology transfer either “on favourable terms, including on concessional and preferential terms, as mutually agreed” or “on mutually agreed terms,” technical assistance and capacity-building and development to developing country Parties in order to enable the effective implementation of the monitoring framework and the GBF.

On the monitoring framework, the SBSTTA suggests that the COP, among other things:

- notes with concern that the methodological readiness of headline indicators listed in methodological statuses 1, 2 and 3 in document [CBD/SBSTTA/28/INF/4](#) remains low, which impedes national reporting;
- notes with appreciation the technical updates to the metadata for the headline indicators, as contained in CBD/SBSTTA/28/INF/4 and the support provided by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO) and its partners to the further development and operationalization of some headline indicators;
- requests SBSTTA to consider, before COP 18, scientific and technical inputs relevant to the second global review of collective progress in the implementation of the Framework, specifically taking into account the need to address methodological, scientific, technical, and data limitations in the first global review, including “further methodological development of headline indicators that remain at a low level of development and methodological readiness,” ways to reflect, among other inputs, the relevant IPBES deliverables, in particular its second global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services, while recognizing that the eighth national reports remain the primary source of information for the second global review, and respecting the respective mandates of the Convention and the Platform;
- decides to establish an ad hoc technical expert group, with a mandate until COP 18, to advise on the further operationalization of the monitoring framework, and in particular to support the eighth round of national reporting;
- requests SBSTTA to consider the outcomes of the work of the *Ad Hoc* Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on the Further Operationalization of the Monitoring Framework for GBF for subsequent consideration by COP 18;
- requests SB8j to provide advice on the integration of traditional knowledge, innovations, practices, and community-based monitoring into the monitoring framework, for consideration by SBSTTA before COP 18; and
- requests the Executive Secretary to, among others: collaborate with relevant partners to support the further operationalization of the monitoring framework, including by supporting technical and scientific cooperation and capacity-building and development related to the use of the monitoring framework and the development of national biodiversity monitoring systems; supporting the further development of the metadata for indicators under the guidance of the AHTEG; and keeping the

metadata for all headline and binary indicators under review to reflect methodological improvements, but without introducing substantive changes to methodology.

The recommendation has two annexes containing the optional component and complementary indicators to be added to the monitoring framework, and the terms of reference for the AHTEG.

Marine and Coastal Biodiversity

This item was addressed in plenary on Monday, Friday and Saturday, and in a contact group co-chaired by Patsy Nicole Contardo Urria (Chile) and Holly Kelley-Weil (UK) on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.

On Monday, the Secretariat introduced this item ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/7](#), [Add.1](#); and [CBD/SBSTTA/28/INF/2/Rev.1](#)), noting that the recommendation contains two parts, addressing both the description of ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs), and the conservation of marine and coastal biodiversity.

The AFRICAN GROUP commended the Secretariat and the Informal Advisory Group on EBSAs and looked forward to discussions on the modified EBSA descriptions. They supported the continued implementation of the EBSA process to inform area-based management processes and reaffirmed that the process is a technical exercise that does not prejudice the rights of states under international law. They lamented the persistent gaps in biodiversity data in marine and coastal systems and called for the development of scientific guidance to address this. The group welcomed 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) and called for respecting their respective mandates.

P-SIDS underlined that the Pacific is the planet’s blue lung and requested that: the new and modified EBSA description be advanced; the marine 30x30 target be measured more effectively; and island biodiversity be adequately represented as they harbor distinct ecosystems.

EGYPT acknowledged the new EBSA descriptions by the African Region and urged that the EBSA process remain science-based and participatory. With GHANA, they supported further recognition of national marine monitoring programmes as part of the EBSA process and further supported cooperation between the CBD Secretariat and the BBNJ Secretariat.

CHILE supported the call to ratify the BBNJ Agreement and reaffirmed their intention to host the BBNJ Agreement Secretariat.

INDONESIA supported the use of the Clearing-House Mechanism (CHM) on a voluntary basis for sharing information, implementation experiences, and improving data availability on EBSAs. SAUDI ARABIA, INDIA, BAHRAIN and others also welcomed the voluntary nature of the guidelines. SAUDI ARABIA also cautioned against excessive reporting burdens, calling for safeguards to protect nationally sensitive information. INDIA supported inclusion of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), and supported a balanced composition of the Informal Advisory Group on EBSAs.

SEYCHELLES also supported the extension of the mandate of the expert group and welcomed and supported the establishment the Advisory Group, emphasizing that it should be inclusive, particularly of SIDS.

ARGENTINA reiterated the importance of preserving states’ sovereignty in the EBSA process and called for greater clarity on the peer review process to strengthen trust. CHINA urged leveraging existing EBSA-related expert groups and producing thematic

reports to avoid duplication of efforts and to make efficient use of financial resources. GUATEMALA supported synergies with the BBNJ Agreement and other relevant instruments and called for strengthened capacity-building and knowledge-sharing.

SUDAN highlighted scientific cooperation and technology transfer as essential and called for strengthened national and local capacities to support the ecologically sound management of coastal and marine activities. MALAYSIA called for clarification on the extrabudgetary resource requirements for activities related to the conservation of marine and coastal biodiversity.

The contact group discussed a Co-Chairs' draft on marine and coastal areas. They focused discussions on the annex containing voluntary guidelines for peer-review processes related to the description of EBSAs. Many delegates objected to proposed change of the title "voluntary guidelines" to "voluntary reference elements for good practice." In their discussions of the purpose of the voluntary reference elements/guidelines, a few delegates considered that these should only relate to EBSAs and exclude other relevant compatible and complementary scientific criteria. They discussed the need to align the elements/guidelines with Section C of the GBF (considerations for GBF implementation), with some suggesting that the link is obvious, needing no elaboration, and others highlighting that describing this linkage would provide additional clarity to national experts.

The contact group agreed that the elements/guidelines would be based exclusively on expert peer reviews, which would in turn act as a scientific and technical quality assurance mechanism, and that the description of an area as meeting the EBSA criteria would not constitute the identification, designation or establishment of an EBSA or other area-based management tools.

Delegates addressed the element/guideline on having a clear justification of why the area meets the criteria, particularly acquiring applicable permissions for all information and knowledge used, including the best available science and traditional knowledge of IPLCs, respecting their FPIC, consistent with national legislation and circumstances.

The group agreed to refer to "experts" as opposed to "individuals with sufficient expertise" in the definition of those to be involved in the peer-review process towards describing and then designating EBSAs. Discussing specifics of the experts, some suggested experts from various sectors and user groups, "including artisanal and commercial fisheries and subsistence and customary users, including holders of customary marine tenure." Some delegations considered this definition as too specific, suggesting simplifying the guidelines, which, they recalled, will be voluntary.

The contact group also considered an annex containing the terms of reference (ToR) for an informal advisory group on work conducted under the Convention in relation to marine biodiversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ). Delegates debated the specificity of the ToR, with some preferring broader ToR, and others calling to fully define them. In this regard, they agreed that the informal advisory group would respect and take fully into account the mandates and work of other relevant competent intergovernmental organizations, as well as previous COP guidance regarding the role of the Convention with respect to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity of ABNJ and would conduct its work in a manner that promotes coherence and coordination.

To address an impasse over references to the BBNJ Agreement and its relationship with the CBD, the group agreed to insert

language that the proposed informal advisory group would provide advice on areas of potential cooperation, collaboration, or synergies, in line with the mandate and jurisdictional scope of the Convention, on relevant scientific and technical information to inform work under the BBNJ Agreement.

The contact group addressed the informal advisory group's duration, noting that experts would serve an initial two-year term, with the COP deciding on extending the group's mandate. Divergence emerged around whether to specify the qualities of the experts that could be invited to contribute to the group's discussions.

Providing a divergent view, some delegates argued that the establishment of the informal advisory group was not a direct COP request and suggested relying on existing instruments instead. One delegate proposed the establishment of a marine and coastal biodiversity advisory group, which would have a farther-reaching mandate.

On the draft recommendations, the group opened discussions with the EBSA section. They discussed the pros and cons of listing essential and particularly sensitive habitats of aquatic species in text encouraging Parties and inviting other governments and relevant organizations to support the identification and recognition of these areas. Some supported deleting the list, while others preferred retaining the list, which enumerated: Key Biodiversity Areas, Important Marine Mammal Areas, Important Shark and Ray Areas, and Important Marine Turtle Areas.

They also discussed a proposed recommendation, requesting the Secretariat to compile experiences in the use of the information contained in EBSA descriptions, including efforts to implement the GBF and the BBNJ Agreement and other relevant international agreements and frameworks. One delegation expressed reservations, noting that the "CBD is not a subsidiary body of the BBNJ Agreement." Others urged retaining the text, with the Secretariat explaining that this is related to the use of EBSA outcomes and would not affect the EBSA process.

During deliberations on draft recommendations on conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity, delegates, among other things, debated requests to the Secretariat to: commission a report containing scientific and technical information on marine biological and ecological connectivity; and develop scientific guidance on the application of emerging technologies to support marine biodiversity assessment and monitoring. Several called for precise requests to the Secretariat, while others preferred detailing the requests to promote clarity.

Delegates also discussed how to reflect the participation of stakeholders, including IPLCs, in activities to strengthen the coordination and cooperation on issues related to the marine biodiversity of ABNJ. Many called to specifically include IPLCs, with one delegation dissenting. They also considered how best to encourage cooperation on marine issues in ABNJ, with some suggesting referring to "other organizations" with competence in these areas, and others preferring to refer specifically to the UN Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, and/or the future Secretariat of the BBNJ Agreement.

Divergence further emerged on whether to request the Secretariat to update the documents on the: scientific guidance for selecting areas to establish a representative network of marine protected areas, including in open ocean waters and deep-sea habitats; voluntary specific workplan on biodiversity in cold-water areas within the jurisdictional scope of the Convention; and voluntary guidelines for the consideration of biodiversity in environmental impact

assessments in marine and coastal areas and the draft guidance on biodiversity-inclusive strategic environmental assessment in marine and coastal areas.

The group agreed to a request to the Secretariat to prepare an analysis of the status of the implementation on the programme of work on island biodiversity.

On Friday in plenary, Contact Group Co-Chair Kelley-Weil (UK) reported that the group has fulfilled its mandate and made significant progress, reaching consensus on most elements of the draft recommendations. She noted pending agreement on the annexes, expressing certainty that consensus on the outstanding issues can be reached at the COP 17.

SBSTTA Chair Mikissa lauded the group for presenting a balanced text and highlighted that this was “as far as it can take us at this meeting,” calling on delegates to approve the draft recommendation (CBD/SBSTTA/28/CRP.1) with the understanding that there will be a further opportunity for discussions at COP 17. He underlined that the outstanding issues “can only be agreed at COP.” Delegates approved the draft.

On Saturday in plenary, SBSTTA Chair Mikissa introduced the recommendation on marine and coastal biodiversity, calling on delegates not to reopen discussions or introduce new language at this stage. Delegates adopted the recommendation.

BELGIUM highlighted the importance of the BBNJ Agreement as a valuable instrument that will contribute to the achievement of the GBF, supporting strong BBNJ language in the COP decision, and reiterated their candidature to host the BBNJ Agreement Secretariat.

Final Recommendation: The final recommendation to the COP (CBD/SBSTTA/28/L.2) contains two parts: EBSAs; and on the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity.

On EBSAs, SBSTTA recommends that the COP, among other things:

- decides to extend the term of the EBSA Informal Advisory Group until COP 18;
- welcomes/takes note of the submissions related to the description of EBSAs and the modification of existing descriptions; and
- encourages Parties, and invites other governments and relevant organizations to make use of the best available scientific information and compatible tools, taking into consideration the identification and recognition of essential and particularly sensitive habitats of marine species, to support the description and identification of EBSAs and inform ecosystem-based approaches and area-based conservation measures, including the designation and management of marine and coastal protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, in support of GBF Target 3 (conserve 30% of land, waters, and seas (30x30)), while respecting the mandates of relevant international instruments and processes.

Unresolved text includes the adoption of the voluntary reference elements for good practice/guidelines on peer-review processes for the description of areas meeting the EBSA criteria and/or other relevant compatible and complementary scientific criteria.

On the section related to the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity, SBSTTA recommends that the COP, *inter alia*:

- encourage Parties, and invite other Governments and relevant entities, regional seas conventions and action plans and regional fishery bodies to strengthen coordination and cooperation at the global, regional and national levels on issues related to marine biodiversity of ABNJ, with the participation of stakeholders/

the full and effective participation of IPLCs, women, youth and other stakeholders;

- also encourages Parties, and invites other Governments and organizations with competence in ABNJ, to use the wide range of tools, guidance, and experiences developed under the Convention in their work to conserve and sustainably use marine biodiversity of ABNJ [such as in the implementation of the BBNJ Agreement] including in work to support capacity-building, scientific and technical cooperation and technology transfer, without prejudicing work carried out by those organizations and under relevant processes, while promoting synergies and avoiding the duplication of efforts.

Unresolved text includes a call to the COP to decide on establishing an informal advisory group on work conducted under the Convention in relation to marine biodiversity of ABNJ.

The annexes contain the voluntary reference elements for good practice/guidelines on peer-review processes for the description of areas meeting the EBSA criteria and/or other relevant compatible and complementary scientific criteria; as well as the bracketed ToR for an informal advisory group on work conducted under the Convention in relation to marine biodiversity of ABNJ.

Synthetic Biology

This item was addressed in plenary on Monday, Friday and Saturday and in contact group co-chaired by Valeria Giovannelli (Italy) and Martha Kandawa-Schulz (Namibia). The group met from Tuesday to Friday.

On Monday, the Secretariat introduced this item (CBD/SBSTTA/28/4, and Add.1), noting that the latter document contains the draft thematic Action Plan to Support Capacity-Building and Development, Access to and Transfer of Technology, and Knowledge-Sharing in the Context of Synthetic Biology for the implementation of the CBD and the GBF.

The AFRICAN GROUP commended the work of the AHTEG on Synthetic Biology during the intersessional period and noted that the draft thematic action plan is a good basis going forward. They noted the initial illustrative benefits and negative impacts of synthetic biology outlined by the group, called for adequate and predictable financial resources for the implementation of the action plan, and underlined the importance of regional support centers in implementing the plan.

P-SIDS supported the draft action plan but stressed the precautionary approach and FPIC for the protection of the environment. They underlined the need for the plan to be resourced through the GBF and delivered in part through funded mechanisms like the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). They called for the tools to govern this technology wisely.

Several delegations, including MALAWI, INDIA, and NAMIBIA, supported the implementation of the draft action plan. MALAWI expressed concern that information on synthetic biology in developing countries is limited, calling, with EGYPT, for capacity-building, knowledge exchange and adequate financial assistance in this regard. INDONESIA supported cooperation with the private sector, capacity-building, and technology transfer.

The UAE highlighted the action plan's voluntary nature. INDIA and GHANA emphasized that the use of the action plan be guided by a precautionary approach and support national biosafety and regulatory frameworks. CBD ALLIANCE also emphasized the importance of applying the precautionary principle and called for horizon scanning to help in identifying future positive and negative

impacts of synthetic biology. GYBN noted the absence of clear regulatory frameworks for recent technological developments in synthetic biology.

BELARUS said the plan should be implemented alongside the Cartagena Protocol and the Nagoya Protocol and be adequately resourced. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION and ARGENTINA noted that the plan should enshrine biosafety as a key principle based on GBF Target 17 (biosafety). SOUTH AFRICA noted that synthetic biology is an evolving area and called for flexibility in the action plan implementation.

Delegates, including TANZANIA, INDIA, UAE, GHANA, BAHRAIN, and GYBN, called for balanced geographical representation and inclusive participation in future expert groups.

ZIMBABWE said available resources should be directed to implementation of the action plan rather than a new AHTEG. PANAMA, supported by ARGENTINA, also rejected the idea of a new AHTEG, noting duplication with the Nagoya Protocol's mandates and ongoing work by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). BAHRAIN called for respect of religious and cultural systems of various societies with regard to synthetic biology.

IIFB underlined that species are sacred and help to connect humans to nature, underlining that synthetic biology applications will require FPIC and the application of the precautionary principle, to align with Article 8(j) and the Cartagena Protocol.

The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) reported that the 2025 IUCN World Conservation Congress adopted a policy on synthetic biology, noting that the process included close collaboration with the CBD, and welcomed the reference to the policy in the AHTEG report.

The **contact group** discussions used a Co-Chairs' non-paper, containing draft recommendations and an annex containing the draft thematic action plan.

Delegates discussed, among other things, the guiding principles related to the action plan, including that, while using this plan actors should consider the potential risks/impacts and "potential benefits" in relation to the intended use and the likely potential receiving environment, including unmanaged or wild settings, semi-managed, managed or urban settings, and contained settings.

They held diverging views on whether actors implementing the plan should also consider potential and current benefits of synthetic biology in relation to the intended use and the likely potential receiving environment, with some emphasizing that this is not a guiding principle.

Delegates also debated a potential guiding principle on the recognition of the diverse values of nature and its benefits, including biodiversity and ecosystem services, with some highlighting the importance of the overall benefits of nature outside of its uses in synthetic biology. On the MoI related to the action plan, they engaged in a familiar debate on the role of developed and developing countries in mobilizing adequate and predictable resources for the effective implementation of the CBD objectives in the context of synthetic biology. The group also considered an enclosure (a table) containing the outcome areas and indicative strategic actions to support capacity-building and development, access to and transfer of technology, and knowledge-sharing in the context of synthetic biology.

Discussions on the draft recommendations focused on streamlining the section related to synthesis and review of work relevant to synthetic biology conducted under the Convention and

its Protocols. They agreed to delete text requesting the Secretariat to collect and synthesize information relevant to the stocktake using existing mechanisms.

On the annexes, they held fraught discussions on whether an AHTEG should be established, and in that regard what its ToR should be. Some supported a discussion on the potential ToR whether or not the Group is eventually established, while others emphasized that any discussion on the ToR would be tantamount to acquiescing to the AHTEG's establishment. To address this, they included a bracketed proposal suggesting that no additional work on synthetic biology is required at this time.

On the membership of the potential AHTEG, some stressed the need for geographical and gender balance as well as the need for relevant expertise. Some supported three, and not four, experts per region, to keep the group manageable, while some called for the membership to be task-specific. One delegation underlined that the limited resources available for developing country participation could be used for core Convention activities, instead of new bodies.

Delegations also considered whether the AHTEG would assess the impacts of artificial intelligence (AI) and computational biology, the convergence of AI and synthetic biology, and/or applications for conservation use.

In plenary on Friday, Contact Group Co-Chair Kandawa-Schulz reported that the group had engaged in robust discussions and completed their consideration of the draft recommendation, including the draft thematic action plan. She reported that the draft recommendation would be forwarded to COP 17. Among other issues, she noted that views differed on the establishment of an AHTEG. On the thematic action plan, she reported that the last section had not been fully addressed. She said a conference room paper (CRP) would be prepared for further discussion at SBI 7.

On Saturday, SBSTTA Chair Mikissa introduced the draft recommendation on synthetic biology (CBD/SBSTTA/28/CRP.4), noting that while several issues remain unresolved, it reflects a delicate balance reached following many hours of negotiations. He urged delegates to consider and approve the CRP as a whole for further deliberations at COP 17. NEW ZEALAND requested clarification regarding the section on new technological developments with regards to synthetic biology, calling for brackets to be added to reflect the diverging views. Delegates then approved the CRP.

In the evening, delegates adopted the final recommendation on synthetic biology. NORWAY stated that the open-ended online forum on Synthetic Biology is independent from the AHTEG. AUSTRALIA drew attention to the fact that not all elements of the thematic plan, nor of the timing of the AHTEG report had been discussed in the contact group. FIJI called for clarity on whether there will be more time to negotiate the text at COP 17. The Secretariat noted that the text would be open for discussion at COP 17. Delegates then adopted the document.

Final Recommendation: In the final recommendation to the COP (CBD/SBSTTA/28/L.4), SBSTTA:

- "notes that there is a lack of clear mechanism or methodology for identifying the most recent technological developments and assessing their impacts on biodiversity"; and
- "decides to establish an AHTEG on synthetic biology, to further address the areas of "artificial intelligence and computational biology" "convergence of artificial intelligence and computational biology with synthetic biology" and "applications for conservation use" "development of methodologies to

assess the potential positive and negative impacts of synthetic biology applications” in the context of the Convention and the Framework” or “notes the outcomes of the work undertaken on synthetic biology and decides that at this time, the continuation of an AHTEG on synthetic biology is not necessary.”

Under the section on the synthesis and review of work relevant to synthetic biology conducted under the Convention and its Protocols, SBSTTA recommends that the COP, among other issues, requests the Secretariat to prepare a stocktake report containing a consolidation, synthesis, and review of the work and processes related to synthetic biology undertaken under the Convention and its Protocols since 2010 to identify gaps, overlaps, duplication and complementarities with existing processes under the Convention and its Protocols.

The recommendation contains two annexes: the thematic action plan, and the ToR for an AHTEG on synthetic biology, which remains in square brackets.

Sustainable Wildlife Management

This item was addressed in plenary on Tuesday and Friday and in a contact group co-chaired by Lactitia Tshitwamulomoni (South Africa) and Carolina Caceres (Canada) from Tuesday to Friday.

On Tuesday, the Secretariat introduced this item ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/5/Rev.1](#)), and the documents containing: the development of global guidance on the sustainable management of wildlife applicable to multiple species and multiple practices ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/INF/5](#)); and the compilation and synthesis of submissions of information on best practices for sustainable wildlife management ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/INF/6](#)).

Delegations largely supported the adoption of the draft global guidance. The AFRICAN GROUP noted that the draft guidance is strongly aligned with the GBF. They called for amendments including the addition of capacity-building to enhance sustainable agricultural practices that help reduce human-wildlife conflict, and the articulation of restoration and recovery initiatives as components of sustainable wildlife management. They called for a glossary of terms to enhance clarity and reduce ambiguity in the implementation of the guidance.

P-SIDS highlighted the region’s best practices, and called for: capacity and finance for SIDS to monitor harvest, trade, and benefits to enhance reporting; strengthening coherence with relevant bodies such as the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS); and center the rights and roles of Indigenous Peoples through FPIC and equitable benefit-sharing.

BRAZIL, for ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, THE BAHAMAS, CHILE, COLOMBIA, CUBA, MEXICO, PANAMA and URUGUAY, highlighted their proposal to initiate a process for the development of a programme of work on the sustainable use of biodiversity ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/INF/12](#)). They proposed a party-driven consultation process through a notification to Parties and stakeholders for options for a possible programme of work for the sustainable use of biodiversity, to be considered at CBD COP 18.

PANAMA noted that sustainable wildlife management as a key pillar of the Convention has received limited attention. IRELAND said that the proposal requires more time for deliberation and suggested its inclusion in the CBD COP 17 agenda as an area of potential further work.

Several delegations supported the voluntary nature of the guidelines including CHINA, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, PERU, BAHRAIN, INDIA, and INDONESIA. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION said this should be reflected in operative paragraphs, adding that the focus on IPLCs limits the sphere of application. CHINA also called for distinguishing legal and illegal wildlife use.

SOUTH AFRICA called to strengthen the guidance by including strategies for sustainable wildlife economies. INDONESIA said the global guidance should reflect climate resilience and integrated landscape and seascape ecologies.

GHANA underlined the importance of MoI and called for enabling conditions to support the implementation of the guidance.

SAUDI ARABIA reiterated that sustainable use is a key pillar of the CBD and called for the guidance to be applied, taking into account Indigenous and local knowledge in accordance with national legislation, and stressed that implementation should not lead to additional reporting obligations. They underlined that the implementation of the One Health Approach should go hand-in-hand with national capacities and available resources.

BURUNDI called for strengthening the One Health Approach due to increased zoonotic diseases. COSTA RICA welcomed the complementarity of the guidance as well as its integrated vision that includes good governance and respect for different knowledge systems. They called for clarity on the One Health Approach.

SYRIA reiterated the challenges due to climate change and conflicts, which undermine gains in wildlife conservation, noting the benefits of integrating the guidelines into national plans and agricultural policies. KENYA urged Parties to reintegrate sustainable wildlife management principles into NBSAPs, where relevant, and called for regional, sub-regional and global partnerships in this regard. EGYPT highlighted that effective wildlife management also addresses invasive alien species and climate change, among other threats, and encouraged the application of practical guidance aligning with the GBF.

BANGLADESH, with COSTA RICA, INDONESIA, TANZANIA, and GABON, called for stronger language to address the loss of life due to human-wildlife conflict, noting the importance of compensation mechanisms. TANZANIA also urged strengthening community-based wildlife conservation.

DRC shared the country’s policies on forestry, wildlife, scientific monitoring, and wildlife inventories; and stressed that the guidance should be based on an inclusive approach and avoid criminalizing livelihoods that depend on wildlife.

GUATEMALA emphasized the need to recognize cultural, spiritual, food, and economic links related to the use and sustainable management of wild species and called for strengthening participatory mechanisms for IPLCs. PERU said FPIC should be in line with the GBF.

BOTSWANA highlighted shifts in wildlife governance to community-led conservation for economic empowerment of local communities.

IIFB said a rights-based approach is essential for effective sustainable wildlife management.

GYBN urged reinforcing the meaningful participation and contribution of youth, in line with GBF Target 22 (participation, access to justice, and rights for IPLCs and other vulnerable groups), as well as the principle of intergenerational equity.

Contact group discussions focused on, among others, the draft voluntary global guidance and the draft recommendations to the COP.

Initial discussions on the draft voluntary global guidance focused on the principles and approaches, with delegates emphasizing that the wording would not need renegotiation so long as the proposed principles are drawn from existing internationally agreed texts. To address differing national positions, such as women's role, knowledge and, practices with respect to wildlife management, participants explored a footnote acknowledging that not all Parties have adopted national targets for GBF Target 23 on equitable participation of women.

The group then turned to safeguards intended to prevent or minimize adverse impacts of sustainable wildlife management interventions. They considered proposals to strengthen references to science-based management, and debated terminology related to customary tenure, access and subsistence practices, reflecting the diversity of legal and cultural contexts. They also accepted a proposal to clarify that the list of measures proposed is illustrative rather than exhaustive, allowing Parties to apply provisions in accordance with national circumstances and legal frameworks or adopt alternative measures as appropriate.

Delegates agreed to strengthen the preambular language by recognizing the critical role of IPLCs as key stewards of biodiversity and refined the language of other preambular paragraphs.

Divergent views emerged regarding adding sustainable biodiversity-based activities, products and services, as part of the consultations' possible programme of work on the sustainable use of biodiversity. Some opined that this does not fall within the mandate of the SBSTTA 28, while others argued that sustainable use of biodiversity is an integral component of sustainable wildlife management. The paragraph remained unresolved as delegates explored whether the issue could be accommodated under another agenda item.

The group also considered a proposal requesting an IPBES assessment on human-wildlife conflict, including species-specific mitigation measures and policy guidance. Several delegates noted that the proposal was more appropriately considered under agenda items related to IPBES and suggested that it be addressed at COP 17. Delegates agreed to explore avenues to raise this in the appropriate processes.

Delegates completed their review of the annex section on cross-cutting elements, including policy coherence and cross-sectoral integration; inclusive and participatory decision-making; inclusion of multiple systems of knowledge and recognition of rights; and equitable distribution of costs and benefits.

During Friday's plenary, Co-Chair Tshitwamulomoni reported that the contact group had completed its mandate on draft recommendations and global guidance on sustainable wildlife management, noting minor unresolved issues.

On Saturday in plenary, delegates approved the draft recommendation (CBD/SBSTTA/28/CRP.3) and adopted the final recommendation.

Final Recommendation: In the final recommendation ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/L.5](#)), SBSTTA, among other things:

- encourages Parties to integrate, with the full and effective participation of IPLCs, the voluntary global guidance, in NBSAPs, national development plans, wildlife policies, relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral plans, legal and institutional frameworks, programmes and other instruments as a contribution to the broader implementation of the sustainable use objective of the Convention;

- further encourages Parties, to engage the private sector and financial institutions in integrating the voluntary global guidance into their policies, strategies, plans, programmes, projects, and practices in line with GBF Target 15; and
- encourages Parties and invites IPLCs, women and youth, the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management, and relevant organizations and actors to: raise awareness of the voluntary global guidance; monitor "and evaluate" its use and effectiveness; and share information, best practices, and lessons learned relating to its implementation;

SBSTTA requests the Secretariat in collaboration with Parties, other governments, IPLCs, women, youth, and members of the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management and the Secretariats of other relevant multilateral environmental agreements to:

- promote awareness of, and facilitate the use of, the voluntary global guidance;
- support actions by Parties to address drivers of biodiversity loss and challenges to the sustainable management of wild species;
- compile the information, best practices and lessons learned, and make them available through the clearing-house mechanism and to the technical and scientific cooperation support centers;
- facilitate, in collaboration with the technical and scientific cooperation support centers and relevant organizations, capacity-building for Parties on sustainable wildlife management; and
- report on progress through an information document for COP 19.

In provisions containing bracketed text, SBSTTA recommends that COP 17:

- "adopts and welcomes with appreciation" the voluntary global guidance on the sustainable management of wildlife applicable to multiple species and multiple practices "with a focus on: (a) inclusive and participatory decision-making; (b) the inclusion of multiple systems of knowledge and the recognition of rights; and (c) the equitable distribution of costs and benefits";
- "also encourages" or "urges" Parties, and invites other governments, subnational, and local governments, and relevant organizations and actors, to strengthen local, regional, and transboundary cooperation on sustainable wildlife management for shared species and ecosystems, including on access to relevant technology, information and data;
- "encourages Parties to support the implementation of the voluntary global guidance, in particular in developing countries, especially least developed countries and SIDS, including through capacity-building and development, technical and scientific cooperation, technology transfer on voluntary and mutually agreed terms and the mobilization of adequate, predictable, accessible, and timely financial resources;
- also encourages Parties to ensure, when implementing the voluntary global guidance and "relevant One Health approaches" that responses to disease risks, in particular zoonotic risks, are informed by the best available scientific evidence and traditional knowledge; and
- "also requests the Secretariat to initiate a "an inclusive" consultation process on options for strengthening the implementation of sustainable use, including through a potential programme of work on the sustainable use of biodiversity."

The annex contains voluntary global guidance on the sustainable management of wildlife applicable to multiple species and multiple practices.

Scientific and Technical Needs to Support GBF Implementation: Strategic Review of and Update to the Programme of Work on Protected Areas

This item was addressed in Plenary on Tuesday, Friday, and Saturday and in a contact group co-chaired by Ruliyana Susanti (Indonesia) and Adèle Fardoux (France) from Wednesday to Saturday.

On Tuesday, the Secretariat presented the relevant document ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/6/Rev.1](#)) reminding delegations of [CBD Decision 16/12](#), calling for a strategic review and analysis of programmes of work to support the GBF implementation.

BRAZIL, for CHILE, COLOMBIA, CUBA, VENEZUELA, and MEXICO, supported the proposed establishment of a fifth programme element on ecological connectivity to provide a coherent structure for integrating ecological networks, corridors, stepping stones, and other connectivity measures into spatial planning, restoration, climate adaptation, and relevant sectoral planning.

The AFRICAN GROUP welcomed the review and analysis on the programme of work and the update of the relevant sections. They pointed to the Kigali Call for Action through which the continent is advancing Transfrontier Conservation Areas.

P-SIDS underscored the need for genuine marine representation in a programme of work that has been historically terrestrial and cautioned against reopening the agreed text on GBF Target 3 (conserve 30% of land, waters, and seas) but rather focus on achieving it.

HAITI called for ensuring sufficient, predictable, accessible financing and scientific and technical capacity development for SIDS to implement the programme of work. INDONESIA and TANZANIA also called for adequate MoI, including sustainable financing.

BAHRAIN noted the need for a clear definition of terms such as “Indigenous and traditional territories,” and suggested terminologies, such as FPIC, should be applied on a voluntary basis.

SAUDI ARABIA stressed that the programme of work should provide technical and financial support for protected areas and underscored the need to design protected areas in accordance with national priorities.

DRC underscored the need to expand protected areas through connectivity, pointing to the designation of the Kivu-Kinshasa Green Corridor as one of the largest protected areas. SOUTH AFRICA supported broadening the scope to include other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) and Indigenous and traditional territories, and the renaming the programme of work to the “programme of work on protected and conserved areas.”

INDIA expressed flexibility in the inclusion of OECMs and Indigenous and traditional territories and supported the use of new technology for effective implementation, among others. ARGENTINA cautioned against expanding the scope of the programme of work, preferring the original mandate. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION also expressed reservations on the rationale for broadening the scope to OECMs, and the consequent renaming of the programme of work.

NEPAL supported the adaptive and inclusive approach of protected area management and called for enhanced transboundary management including in mountain ecosystems, particularly the Himalayas.

BANGLADESH welcomed the proposed updates to the programme of work, calling for the recognition of riverine

ecologies, and supported greater financial resource allocation for managing coastal ecosystems in the Bay of Bengal.

KENYA recommended that Parties review their policies and strategies to take into account emerging issues and called for synergies across biomes including coastal zones and those beyond national jurisdiction.

CHINA supported a focus on quality scientific assessments and called for the update to be country-led. BOTSWANA noted that the country has already surpassed the GBF 30x30 Target and reported on national actions aligning with the programme of work.

IIFB supported: changing the title to “Programme of Work on Protected and Conserved Areas”; the implementation of the programme of work through a human rights-based approach that ensures IPLCs’ rights to give or withhold their FPIC; and direct funding for IPLCs as essential for the implementation of the updated Programme.

GYBN emphasized the importance of: applying a human rights-based approach, recognizing, among others, intergenerational equity in the context of protected and conserved areas; ensuring environmental and social safeguards in funding for protected and conserved areas; and participation, access to justice, access to information, and the full protection of environmental human rights defenders in all aspects of protected and conserved areas.

In the **contact group**, delegates considered three options tabled by the Co-Chairs on how ecological connectivity could be strengthened within the PoW on Protected Areas: establishing ecological connectivity as a fifth programme element; strengthening references to ecological connectivity in complementary activities that could support PoW implementation; or pursuing an alternative approach.

Discussions revealed broad recognition of the importance of ecological connectivity, although views differed on the most appropriate way to reflect it within the PoW.

The Co-Chairs observed emerging support for different options including combining elements of all options. Some emphasized that connectivity is intrinsically linked to protected areas and merits recognition as a standalone programme element. Others also recalled that the forthcoming IPBES fast-track Methodological Assessment on Integrated Biodiversity-Inclusive Spatial Planning and Ecological Connectivity could provide an important evidence base for any substantial revisions to the PoW, suggesting delaying finalization.

Delegates also briefly considered issues relating to scope and terminology, including the implications of changing the scope from protected and conserved areas to protected areas and OECMs. The Co-Chairs proposed convening a small informal group to develop proposals for draft recommendations prior to the next contact group meeting. Noting a lack of consensus on the scope, the group agreed to revisit the scope and the title of the programme of work at a later stage.

The group then turned to the draft recommendations, debating whether to expand the scope from protected areas and conserved areas to protected areas and OECMs. Some also suggested recognizing Indigenous and traditional territories within any future definition of conserved areas and requesting further technical work to develop a clear and robust understanding of the term.

The group also concluded its review of the annex updating the programme of work by mapping the targets of the GBF against complementary activities that support implementation. Delegates agreed that implementation of the updated programme of work

should be undertaken in line with Section C of the GBF and in accordance with national circumstances, legislation, and priorities.

In the Friday plenary, Co-Chair Fardoux reported significant progress achieved, including completion of work on the list of actions linked to the 23 GBF targets, while identifying several outstanding issues for further discussion. During a final meeting of the contact group, delegates agreed to strengthen language encouraging Parties to apply a human rights-based approach in implementing the updated programme of work, consistent with the GBF and the CBD's provisions relating to IPLCs.

The group also agreed to encourage Parties to consider relevant IPBES assessments when implementing the programme of work and to engage in preparations for the Platform's forthcoming methodological assessment on biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning and ecological connectivity.

The main outstanding issue remained the treatment of ecological connectivity. Delegates revisited competing proposals, including establishing ecological connectivity as a fifth programme element within the programme of work, postponing consideration of additional guidance until COP 18, or recognizing connectivity through strengthened cross-cutting complementary activities in the annex.

On Saturday in plenary, delegates approved the CRP (CBD/SBSTTA/28/CRP.5) and adopted it as the final recommendation.

Final Recommendation: In the final recommendation (CBD/SBSTTA/28/L.6), SBSTTA recommends that COP 17, among other things:

- revise the name of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas to better reflect its expanded scope, aligning it with GBF Target 3 (30x30) and include protected areas and OECMs, recognizing Indigenous and traditional territories where applicable;
- endorse complementary activities updating the Programme of Work to strengthen its alignment with the GBF, particularly Target 3, and encourage Parties to integrate the updated programme into national implementation efforts;
- invite relevant conventions, organizations, IPLCs, academia, women, youth, the private sector, and other stakeholders to support implementation through knowledge exchange, technical and scientific cooperation, capacity-building and coordinated action;
- encourage Parties to implement the updated programme in a manner consistent with the Convention's provisions relating to IPLCs, ensuring their full, equitable, inclusive and effective participation;
- invite Parties to consider relevant assessments of IPBES in implementing the updated programme and preparing the Platform's assessment on integrated biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning and ecological connectivity.

SBSTTA also requests the Secretariat to:

- continue supporting the Target 3 Community of Practice as a voluntary platform for coordination, knowledge exchange, and implementation support;
- collaborate with regional and subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centers and other partners to provide targeted scientific and technical support to Parties;
- prepare a synthesis report compiling experiences, lessons learned, scientific information and good practices supporting implementation of Target 3, including on governance, ecological connectivity, Indigenous and traditional territories, climate change, monitoring, finance, and human rights;

- report on progress in implementing the decision to SBSTTA before COP 18.

Several provisions remain bracketed for consideration by COP 17, including whether to:

- welcome or take note of the upcoming IUCN World Protected and Conserved Areas Congress;
- adopt a definition of conserved areas and revise the Programme of Work's title;
- mobilize new and additional financial resources for implementation, particularly for developing countries;
- establish a fifth programme element on ecological connectivity or instead address connectivity through cross-cutting complementary activities; and
- consider additional guidance on ecological connectivity at COP 18 based on the forthcoming IPBES assessment and implementation experience.

The annex updates the Programme of Work through a comprehensive set of complementary activities aligned with the GBF targets.

Matters Related to the Work Programme of IPBES

This agenda item was considered in plenary on Wednesday and Friday, and in a contact group co-chaired by Dickson Chitupa (Zimbabwe) and Jan Plesnik (Czechia) that met from Wednesday to Friday.

On Wednesday, the Secretariat introduced the Secretariat Note on the Item (CBD/SBSTTA/28/3), containing an overview of the recently adopted deliverables of the Platform; review of findings from the Business and Biodiversity Assessment, and its implications for the work undertaken under the Convention; a summary of collaboration between the Platform and the Secretariat of the Convention, and an updated schedule in the annex to the draft decision; and recommendations for consideration by SBSTTA 28.

Delegates lauded progress made by IPBES in advancing its programme of work, including the thematic assessments and summaries for policymakers (SPMs) of the [Nexus](#) and [Transformative Change](#) Assessments and the [Business and Biodiversity Assessment](#).

Chair Mikissa informed delegates that the draft recommendation from CBD [Decision 27/2](#) on IPBES would be merged with the recommendation emerging from SBSTTA 28.

GRULAC welcomed the Business and Biodiversity Assessment, highlighting its relevance to several targets of the GBF, particularly Targets 15 (responsibilities of businesses), 14 (integrating biodiversity in policies), 16 (sustainable consumption), 18 (reducing harmful incentives to biodiversity), and 19 (mobilize USD 200 billion per year for biodiversity from all sources). The group underscored the importance of strengthening science-policy support and helping countries translate scientific findings into national legislation and outcomes. GRULAC also welcomed progress the second global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services (Second Global Assessment), and the methodological assessment on monitoring biodiversity and nature's contributions to people, noting their contribution to monitoring GBF implementation, including protected areas.

The AFRICAN GROUP highlighted the importance of the Assessment in addressing the linkages of the Business and Biodiversity Assessment, and impacts, dependencies, and disclosure practices. The group noted that livelihoods across Africa are closely tied to socioeconomic sectors and businesses and expressed the region's commitment to promoting responsible and nature-positive

business practices. They observed, however, that examples in the assessment do not adequately reflect the scale and diversity of African enterprises, particularly small- and medium-sized enterprises.

P-SIDS emphasized that the ocean is both a livelihood and a lifeline for SIDS, welcoming the Nexus Assessment's recognition that biodiversity, climate, and other environmental crises are interconnected and cannot be addressed in isolation. They urged prioritization of work on biodiversity and climate linkages, reflecting on the urgency posed by climate impacts such as severe coral reef losses even under a 1.5°C warming scenario, with near-total losses projected at 2°C. They also welcomed the Second Global Assessment and urged that it adequately reflect the needs and perspectives of SIDS.

DRC, with GHANA, ZIMBABWE, INDIA, INDONESIA, SOUTH AFRICA, and KENYA, supported strengthened cooperation between CBD and IPBES, and welcomed the Business and Biodiversity Assessment.

GHANA called on IPBES to produce factsheets and an abridged version of SPMs. ZIMBABWE highlighted that further work is required on the draft recommendation. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION noted the links between the business and biodiversity assessment and GBF implementation, and preferred that the draft decision language should be "takes note" of the assessment and not "welcome" it.

INDIA stressed the need to strengthen the participation of developing country experts in IPBES assessments and reported on their promotion of mainstreaming biodiversity issues into the business sector.

SYRIA underlined that business is the keystone of the country's economy, and invited states to collaborate to create a fairer business environment.

IPBES thanked delegates for their participation in a pre-meeting workshop on the Business and Biodiversity Assessment, and highlighted actions in the assessment's findings linked to the implementation of the GBF, including the role of governments in supporting business action through coherent policy and regulation, financial systems, societal values, technology and data, and capacity and knowledge.

IIFB welcomed the business and biodiversity assessment, and supported the encouragement to Parties to use the findings to implement the GBF, underscoring that implementation should consider and uphold the rights and roles of IPLCs. GYBN outlined their priorities, underscoring the need to hold businesses accountable for biodiversity loss.

Contact group discussions focused on the draft recommendations on the Business and Biodiversity Assessment. Delegates exchanged views on the appropriate level of endorsement for the assessment report and its SPM. Several participants supported "taking note" of the assessment while "welcoming" the SPM, noting that the latter had undergone an intergovernmental approval process at IPBES 12, whereas the full assessment had not been negotiated and contained elements they considered of uneven relevance for some developing countries. Some of these concerns included gaps in the treatment of small and informal businesses, which some considered limited the report's applicability in certain contexts. Some favored "take note with appreciation," to recognize the extensive scientific work. Suggestions were also made to reorder the text to first welcome the SPM and then take note of the full assessment.

The group also discussed language inviting Parties to make use of the assessment findings in implementing the Convention and the GBF. Views diverged on whether Parties should be "invited" or "urged" to apply these findings. Some preferred adding the qualifier "as appropriate" to accommodate the varying relevance of findings.

Under provisions encouraging Parties to create or enhance enabling environments for sustainable business practices, delegates considered a proposal to establish, strengthen, and enforce policy, legal, and regulatory frameworks that incentivize or require businesses and financial institutions to contribute to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. Some objected, noting that adding more references from an already adopted SPM encumbers the decisions.

The group reached agreement on language encouraging Parties to support, rather than directly undertake, capacity-building and development activities aimed at measuring and managing business impacts and dependencies on biodiversity.

Delegates also focused on strengthening the text encouraging businesses and financial institutions to take action on the Business and Biodiversity Assessment. They considered whether these actors should be encouraged to "disclose" their impacts and dependencies on biodiversity, and then to "integrate" that information into decision making, investment decisions, and actions, agreeing to delete the language around integration. They debated new text calling to strengthen the work of the Global Partnership for Business and Biodiversity, with some noting that it was too late to consider new text, and that rules of procedure should apply across the board. The proposal remained in brackets.

In Friday's plenary, Contact Group Co-Chair Chitupa reported constructive discussions and progress, recommending that further discussion on the recommendations be addressed at CBD COP 17. SBSTTA Chair Jean Bruno Mikissa reminded Parties that the CRP would be merged with the recommendation from SBSTTA 27. Delegates approved CBD/SBSTTA/28/CRP.2, on Saturday in Plenary and adopted the final recommendation.

Final Recommendation: In the final recommendation ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/L.3](#)), SBSTTA recommends that the COP, *inter alia*:

- "welcomes" or "takes note with appreciation of" IPBES' business and biodiversity assessment, "welcomes" its summary for policymakers "and key messages, and notes its relevance to the work undertaken under the Convention and the GBF";
- encourages Parties and other governments, to create or enhance enabling environments for sustainable business "and consumption" practices, including by, among others, "setting up or strengthening and enforcing policy, legal, and regulatory frameworks that provide incentives or mandate actions by business and financial institutions to contribute to the conservation, restoration, and sustainable use of biodiversity;" and "promoting transparency and disclosure of business impacts, dependencies, risks, and opportunities related to biodiversity";
- strongly encourages business and financial institutions, financial actors and other relevant actors to consider the key messages of the summary for policymakers of the business and biodiversity assessment and to take action in line with the options outlined in the assessment, including to, among other things, identify and use appropriate existing methods to measure, "manage, and disclose" their impacts and dependencies on biodiversity and nature's contributions to people; and "where appropriate," to "share fairly and equitably the benefits" or "to ensure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits" arising from the utilization

of genetic resources, “and from digital sequence information on genetic resources,” as well as from traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources;

- invites IPBES, when developing future work, to consider: the needs, gaps and challenges expressed in the global report on collective progress in the implementation of the Framework; the outcomes of the global review of collective progress in GBF implementation; and the potential use of tailored knowledge products to enhance the accessibility and usability of its assessments for GBF implementation;
- requests the Executive Secretary to further strengthen the engagement and cooperation of the Secretariat of the Convention with IPBES in order to support the implementation of the recommendations from the midterm review of the Platform, “including, in particular, those on increasing the policy relevance and uptake of assessments and other deliverables”; and
- “further requests the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, to develop, in collaboration with relevant organizations, capacity-building activities and technical guidance to support Parties, in particular developing country Parties, in promoting the integration of biodiversity into business and the financial sector, in accordance with the goals and targets of the Framework.”

The annex contains the schedule of IPBES Assessments and of their consideration under the Convention (2026-2030).

Other Matters

COLOMBIA called on Parties to build on the progress achieved at CBD COP 16 by advancing work under Article 8(j), particularly the formal recognition of Afro-descendants alongside Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

Adoption of the Report and Closing of the Meeting

On Saturday evening in plenary, Rapporteur Niklaus Wagner (Switzerland) introduced the meeting report ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/L.1](#)), which was adopted.

As the incoming COP Presidency, ARMENIA congratulated delegates for the progress made in the negotiations during SBSTTA 28, pointing specifically to work under the global review, and welcomed delegates to Yerevan for COP 17.

CBD Executive Secretary Astrid Schomaker lauded delegates’ constructive spirit to advance negotiations. She noted that this meeting was a step forward towards a successful conclusion of talks in Armenia.

The AFRICAN GROUP highlighted that the global assessments of implementation progress has revealed that we are not on track to meet the 2030 targets, urging that this reality strengthen the collective determination to accelerate implementation. They underlined the importance of balanced, science-based decisions, stressed the need for adequate finances, access to technology and technical assistance for implementation of the GBF, and thanked all donor partners for providing participation support.

The EU underscored that SBSTTA 28 has made great progress that will underpin the outcomes of the first global review of progress of GBF implementation. They highlighted the need for synergies between the BBNJ Agreement and the CBD, and underlined the importance of close cooperation with IPBES, welcoming the Business and Biodiversity Assessment. They noted significant challenges to finalize decisions at COP 17, but remained confident that this is achievable.

GYBN called for a human-rights based approach, underlining that youth are rights and knowledge holders, and supported stronger frameworks to ensure that those most responsible for biodiversity loss are held accountable.

CBD WOMEN’S CAUCUS reflected on the concerning trend of IPLCs, women, and youth being relegated to a footnote, and underlined that the full effective participation of rights holders are enshrined in the GBF and are not optional but essential to delivering on its targets.

IIFB welcomed the recognition of IPLCs, women, and youth in the monitoring framework; called for upholding the precautionary principle in discussions on synthetic biology; and urged Parties to include Indigenous and traditional territories in the updated programme of work on protected areas.

The CBD ALLIANCE said the findings of the report of collective progress has shown that GBF implementation remains off track, pointing to inadequate financial support from developed to developing countries, among other barriers. They urged strengthening government regulation and public policy, and alignment of financial systems with biodiversity and human rights objectives.

In closing remarks, SBSTTA 28 Chair Mikissa thanked delegates for their dedication and hard work towards achieving the objective set at the beginning of the meeting: to collectively provide clear scientific and technical advice for GBF implementation and deliberate on the central issues underpinning implementation through the agenda items considered at SBSTTA 28. He gavelled the meeting to a close at 10:30 pm.

SBI 6 Report

On Tuesday, 4 August, SBI 7 Chair Clarissa Souza Della Nina (Brazil) opened the meeting, noting that SBI 7 provides the last opportunity before CBD COP 17 to address implementation of the GBF, and achieve impacts for people, planet, and prosperity. She highlighted that SBI decisions will affect the wellbeing of people and the ecological integrity of the planet, urging solution-oriented approaches in the 10 days allocated for the meeting.

Elizabeth Mrema, Deputy Executive Director, UNEP, speaking on behalf of Inger Andersen, UN Under-Secretary-General and UNEP Executive Director, reported that in the last three years, the GBF has elicited unprecedented global commitment, evidenced by the global report on the review of collective progress in GBF implementation. She expressed concern that fewer than half of CBD Parties are on track to achieve the GBF targets by 2030, lamenting that targets on marine, coastal, and inland waters are lagging behind those of terrestrial ecosystems.

CBD Executive Secretary Astrid Schomaker said SBI 7 carries a special significance due to its timing and agenda. On timing, she noted that the meeting will conclude eight weeks prior to COP 17, the halfway point of the GBF implementation. The SBI 7 agenda, she underscored, will provide the recommendations that will be key to the success of COP 17 and beyond. She noted that MoI is lagging behind even though investment in nature has grown due to misalignment in financing. For this, she cited the UNEP [State of Finance for Nature Report](#) findings, that for every USD invested in protecting nature, the world spends USD 30 destroying it.

Andres Duque Solis, on behalf of the Colombia COP 16 Presidency, said the COP in Cali demonstrated that ambition can be built where there is a common will for action. He urged ensuring tangible benefits from the Multilateral Mechanism and the Cali

Fund, legacies of the Cali COP, and key mechanisms for GBF implementation. He further highlighted the outcomes of the [First Conference on Transitioning Away from Fossil Fuels](#) held in April 2026 in Santa Marta, Colombia, as key in promoting sustainable energy and reducing pressure on ecosystems and promoting sustainable development models.

Regional Statements: On Tuesday, the Secretariat highlighted statements from Parties and observers received through the modalities for early submission of statements ([CBD/SBI/7/INF/21](#)) according to [Decision 16/25](#). SBI 7 Chair Souza Della Nina informed delegates that these statements would be formally entered into the record of the meeting. The statements can be found [here](#).

Organizational Matters: On Tuesday, Bilal Qtishat (Jordan) was elected rapporteur. Delegates adopted the agenda ([CBD/SBI/7/1](#) and [Add.1/Rev.1](#)) and the organization of work contained in the scenario note ([Add.2](#)), without amendments.

Fiji, for P-SIDS, underlined the disadvantages faced by small delegations in meetings featuring parallel sessions, and called for safeguards to ensure their equal participation.

PMRR: Global Review of Collective Progress in the GBF Implementation

This issue was addressed in plenary on Tuesday, 4 August, and in a contact group, co-chaired by Sanne Kruid (Netherlands) and Sivendra Michael (Fiji), which met for the duration of the meeting.

On Tuesday, 4 August, Hesiquio Benítez Díaz (Mexico), Co-Chair of the *Ad Hoc* Scientific and Technical Advisory Group (AHSTAG) for the preparation of the draft global report on the GRI ([CBD/SBI/7/2/Add.1](#)), highlighted the strong methodological basis of the review and reported extensive consultations with Parties and stakeholders, highlighting that it had benefited from peer review. He thanked AHSTAG Co-Chair Emily Nicholson (Australia) and other members, noting that the Group was available to respond to questions regarding the process and review.

The Secretariat then introduced the document ([CBD/SBSTTA/28/2/Rev.1](#) and [CBD/SBI/7/2/Rev.1](#)), noting that it included recommendations from both SBSTTA and SBI.

Several Parties noted the underlying message of the report: progress is inadequate to achieve the goals and targets of the GBF, with many calling to ensure timely, adequate, and predictable financial resources, technology transfer, as well as scientific and technical assistance to developing countries for its implementation.

The AFRICAN GROUP welcomed the work on whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches to achieve the GBF and supported the request to enhance the online reporting tool based on lessons learned from the seventh national reporting cycle. They looked forward to the adoption of a balanced and implementable decision to enhance implementation progress.

The European Union (EU) supported the establishment of a clear follow-up process to accelerate and continue implementation of the GBF to ensure continuity and coherence between the first and the second GRIs, and called to include the subtitles on the section on “Yerevan Pathways” to improve the readability of the report.

P-SIDS lamented that their experiences are not represented in the report as only a small number of SIDS managed to submit their reports on time, pointing to insufficient MoI. They urged the SBI to correct the report to reflect the experiences of SIDS, and “fix the method, not only the findings.”

CHINA appreciated the progress made by all Parties, called for SBI 7 to send a positive political signal to COP 17 to scale up

implementation, and to ensure that the outcomes of the GRI remain facilitative.

Delegates expressed diverse expectations for the GRI. CUBA said it should focus on increasing financial flows from existing mechanisms such as the GEF and the Cali Fund.

EGYPT highlighted that the purpose of the review should be assessing progress, noting that it is too early to draw conclusions. CHILE said the review is not an end point but opportunity for strengthened action to 2030. EGYPT, with INDIA and BRAZIL, highlighted limited implementation data should not be interpreted as limited implementation; and that developing countries should not be saddled with additional reporting burdens.

BRAZIL noted the need to take into account the short time available for meaningful progress since the adoption of the GBF three years ago, saying the review should not result in ranking and comparisons of progress.

On reporting and monitoring, UAE, PERU, SOUTH AFRICA, and BAHRAIN also cautioned against new obligations and increasing reporting burdens. BAHRAIN called for ensuring flexibility of the indicators on marine and coastal issues, noting that these should take into account national and regional capacities. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION called to update the national report formats and improve the online reporting tool and stressed that the global report should not substitute for the national reports. SOUTH AFRICA said key messages should be interpreted in line with national capacities.

On addressing implementation gaps and strengthening and accelerating implementation, several delegates, including CHILE, DRC, TANZANIA, and UGANDA, highlighted the need for GRI to focus on closing implementation gaps, emphasizing that the review is not an end point but an opportunity to strengthen action. NIGERIA called for clear signals for investment to achieve the GBF goals and targets. KENYA called for enhanced scientific and technical cooperation and highlighted the importance of biodiversity mainstreaming.

Several Parties, including ZIMBABWE, COLOMBIA, UGANDA, also called for focus on MoI, calling for timely and easily accessible financial flows. ARGENTINA pointed to the importance of GBF Target 19 (mobilize USD 200 billion per year for biodiversity from all sources) for strengthening MoI to meet the GBF goals, and called for strengthening institutional capacity. SAUDI ARABIA stressed the importance of the GRI in strengthening understanding for calculating the assistance needs of developing countries in implementing the GBF. URUGUAY said accelerating implementation goes hand-in-hand with MoI. CÔTE D’IVOIRE encouraged strengthening national biodiversity reporting systems and called on development partners to increase support to this end.

ZIMBABWE, KENYA, and COLOMBIA also underlined the need for the report to highlight rights holders, including Afro-descendants, IPLCs, women, and youth, in GBF implementation.

INDONESIA stressed that the findings of the report should take into account national circumstances and capacities, and supported the need for bringing together scientific and traditional knowledge for successful implementation.

Some delegations shared national challenges inhibiting progress: UAE and SOMALIA noted climate-related challenges of arid and semi-arid areas; CUBA noted the economic, commercial, and financial embargo by the US; and UKRAINE and RUSSIAN FEDERATION disclosed impacts from ongoing conflict. BOSNIA

AND HERZEGOVINA reported inability to participate in reporting progress due to financial constraints faced by countries with economies in transition and urged inclusivity in implementation support. ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA lamented that the Caribbean region is missing from the report, underscoring that this gap must be addressed. They noted that, due to their classification as a high-income country, they do not qualify for development assistance and called for the final decision recognize the circumstances of SIDS.

ARMENIA, as incoming COP 17 President, said the review presents a snapshot of where we stand collectively, and urged prioritization of actions where collective progress is required to accelerate on-the-ground implementation. COP 17, they underscored, would be critical to providing clear and meaningful pathways from aspiration to measurable results for biodiversity to returning nature in the path of sustainability.

GYBN said the justice gap is at the root of the current implementation gap. To bridge the justice gap, they urged considering direct drivers of biodiversity loss by addressing destructive sectors and actors, and by protecting environmental defenders who stand on the frontlines.

CBD WOMEN'S CAUCUS said the knowledge systems, leadership, and contributions of IPLCs, women, and youth are essential for strengthening the whole-of-society approach and ensuring equitable, inclusive, and effective biodiversity policies and actions.

IIFB said IPLCs are not merely "other actors," underlining that any efforts to omit explicit reference to them as rights-holders is a regression. They urged Parties to make use of traditional knowledge indicators, including the headline indicators: 22.1 on land use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of IPLCs, and 9.2 on the percentage of the population in traditional occupations, and to make use of optional disaggregation related to IPLCs.

CBD ALLIANCE emphasized the need to address the underlying roots of biodiversity loss, including corporate capture, debt burden and tax injustices. IUCN said the review is not just a stocktake but a guide for achieving the GBF and called for action-oriented recommendations, including inviting all non-state actors to support all key messages of the report.

UNESCO welcomed recognition of its Action Plan for Man and Biodiversity Programme and its heritage sites in enhancing protected areas including OECMs. They reiterated their commitment to translating ambition to action through science, education, culture and application of Indigenous knowledge.

CALIFORNIA BIODIVERSITY ALLIANCE noted that implementation at subnational and local government levels should be better acknowledged and their commitments better integrated in the global review process.

In plenary on Wednesday, 5 August, Co-Chair Michael reported on progress from the first contact group meeting where delegates considered questions to inform the preparation of the Co-Chairs' non-paper: whether to encourage new or increased commitments on MoI; and how to integrate lessons learned from the first GRI cycles to inform the second GRI. He reported that the contact group will continue to meet.

On Wednesday, 12 August, Co-Chair Kruid reported substantive progress made in a Friends of the Chair group that addressed the section on further enhancing PMRR mechanisms, including the monitoring framework for the GBF. She reported pending issues requiring adequate time to deliberate. Delegates approved CBD/SBI/7/CRP.11 as a whole, with the expectation they would complete

the outstanding work at COP 17. Delegates adopted the final decision, with brackets around the entire document for deliberation at COP 17.

Final Recommendation: The recommendation on the GRI ([CBD/SBI/7/L.10](#)) is structured around two sections: the global review and a "Yerevan Pathway" for accelerating implementation, and further strengthening the PMRR mechanism, including the monitoring framework.

Global review and Yerevan Pathway: The first global review provides a mixed picture on GBF implementation. While Parties have acted across all 23 targets, less than half of national targets associated with any global target are on track. The review highlights major gaps in the scope and coverage of national targets, whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches, and data and knowledge. The review further underscores that the main common barrier for developing countries to deliver on the GBF has been the lack of sufficient funding and other MoI. The proposed Yerevan Pathway is intended as a call to COP 17 to turn the review from a stocktaking exercise into an acceleration mechanism for implementation from 2026 to 2030, and to prioritize gaps identified while remaining party-driven.

The Pathway identifies five practical areas for acceleration: scope and coverage, including completion of NBSAPs and national targets; MoI, particularly finance, capacity-building, technology and technical cooperation; whole-of-government approaches; and whole-of-society approaches, including more effective participation of IPLCs, women, and youth; and monitoring and knowledge.

Strengthening PMMR: This section looks beyond the first review to improve the system that will underpin the second global review. It proposes mechanisms that will underpin the second review process through, among others: strengthening national reporting and monitoring, while reducing the reporting burden for the seventh and eighth national reports; improved indicators and methodologies; better use of the online reporting tools; and timely delivery of MoI, including GEF support. An ad hoc technical expert group is proposed to further operationalize the monitoring framework and a voluntary peer-review option for NBSAPs.

Digital Sequence Information on Genetic Resources

This item was addressed in plenary on Tuesday, 4 August, and then in a contact group, co-chaired by Nneka Nicholas (Antigua and Barbuda) and Ida Hellmark (Norway).

On Tuesday, Nneka Nicholas, Co-Chair of the Steering Committee of the Multilateral Mechanism for the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits from the Use of DSI on Genetic Resources, including the Cali Fund, presented the review methodology of effectiveness of the Multilateral Mechanism ([CBD/SBI/7/5/Add.2](#)).

The Secretariat introduced the documents ([CBD/SBI/7/5](#) and INFs [2](#), [14](#) and [15](#)), as well as the Executive Summary of the study commissioned on tools and models, such as databases, for making DSI on genetic resources publicly available and accessible in a transparent and accountable manner ([CBD/SBI/7/5/Add.1](#)).

The AFRICAN GROUP called to ensure the transparent implementation of the Mechanism and the Fund, underscoring that it is governed by the COP. They called for greater clarity on the governance of the Steering Committee of the Mechanism and underlined the need for the scientific and technical validation of the study. They also stressed that non-monetary benefits should include scientific and technical knowledge, among others.

P-SIDS called for a disaggregation of allocations and disbursements to SIDS and least developed countries (LDCs), and the addition of an indicator measured directly against the prioritization provision of decision 16/2. They also called for the COP to attach a compliance indicator to the commitment that at least half the Cali Fund supports IPLCs.

The EU welcomed the contributions already made to the Fund, while stressing that time is needed to test the Fund's modalities, assess them, and consider any challenges at COP 17. They recognized the calls for contributions into the Fund and called for a collective effort to capitalize it. They reiterated their commitment to support effective and transparent implementation of the Mechanism and its Fund.

South Africa, for the LIKE-MINDED MEGADIVERSE COUNTRIES (LMMCs), supported the COP's governance of the Fund, underlining that decisions should be made at the COP level. They emphasized that thresholds should not hollow out the Mechanism, and underlined that non-monetary benefits should include technology, know-how, and sharing of research results, among others.

TANZANIA supported an effective and transparent Mechanism, and the sustainable capitalization of the Fund to ensure developing countries can effectively participate in the use of DSI and share in the derived benefits.

COLOMBIA called for trust and collaboration between governments and the private sector, stressing the need for incentives to ensure this. They highlighted the importance of the work of non-state actors, as well as the Friends of the Cali Fund.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION and ZIMBABWE supported the call for DSI to be available in public databases, and the proposed global DSI data-sharing network. GUATEMALA also supported strengthening existing databases rather than creating a new global database.

INDONESIA called to ensure the transparency and effectiveness of the Mechanism, and, with the UAE and CÔTE D'IVOIRE, said it was premature to introduce additional modalities before more experience is gained.

PERU said the Multilateral Mechanism and Cali Fund are complementary, and that access and benefit-sharing (ABS) from DSI is a substantive obligation and pillar of the Convention and is not optional. UGANDA said the review of effectiveness should be party-driven, adding that DSI should promote equity. BURUNDI further urged transparency in ensuring access and benefit-sharing from DSI and compensation from countries of origin.

DRC and UGANDA said capacity-building, technology transfer, and scientific cooperation for developing countries are prerequisites for the success of the Mechanism and the Fund, and DRC supported ensuring the private sector contributes to the Fund.

BRAZIL supported the adoption of a complementary product and service-based modality noting it should also be available to entities operating in sectors not currently listed and should calculate contributions exclusively on the profits or revenues attributable to the relevant products and services, using the indicative rates of 1% of profits or 0.1% of revenues already agreed by the COP. GUATEMALA said discussions on modalities for products and services are premature, and emphasized that both monetary and non-monetary benefits should effectively reach Parties as well as IPLCs. BANGLADESH supported the proposed review methodology.

ZIMBABWE supported an assessment of the Mechanism at COP 18 and lamented the weak capitalization of the Fund so far.

INDIA and BAHRAIN said the Mechanism must preserve the sovereign rights of Parties and the integrity of national ABS frameworks. ARGENTINA and BANGLADESH said the Mechanism must avoid additional administrative burden to Parties.

MALAWI, supported by KENYA, said that the first review of effectiveness has shown the need to strengthen the contribution framework, which is at present insufficient to achieve meaningful capitalization and disbursements. They emphasized that businesses cannot expect to benefit from the Mechanism without contributing to it.

On Wednesday, 12 August, Chair Souza Della Nina introduced the document (CBD/SBI/7/CRP.10). Contact Group Co-Chair Nicholas reported on the work of the contact group. She noted that discussions on additional modalities for the Cali Fund had proved most divergent, and that Co-Chairs' options on this issue remain in brackets. On possible tools or models to increase transparency, she noted consensus on what to do but not on how to do it. On the review methodology, she informed delegates that a Friends of the Co-Chairs (FoC) group, facilitated by Australia and Malawi, had completed work on the table of elements of the review methodology, but ran out of time to address the conceptual framework, approach, and governance of the methodology. The FoC then requested the Secretariat to convene an informal session between SBI 7 and COP 17 to discuss the remainder of the methodology. She noted that the session would not yield any product.

Co-Chair Nicholas also noted unforeseen additional discussions in the contact group, including on the operational documents of the Cali Fund, in particular the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Secretariat and the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office of the UN (MPTFO) on the Fund. She noted that the group had agreed to request the Secretariat to facilitate a webinar, to be held between SBI 7 and the COP, bringing together the Cali Fund, UN Partners and the MPTFO who could answer procedural questions. She noted that the contact group had created a closed small group to facilitate textual changes for the SBI recommendation, chaired by Patrick Luna (Brazil). Luna reported that the small group (Armenia, Brazil, Egypt, the EU, India, Japan, Jordan, Namibia, the Russian Federation, South Africa, Switzerland, and the UK) drafted two preambular and three operative paragraphs, all in brackets. He noted that these paragraphs had not been incorporated into the CRP. He then orally presented the draft paragraphs. Chair Souza Della Nina noted that there are areas of convergence but many areas of divergence. She highlighted that the review methodology of effectiveness of the Multilateral Mechanism was included in an annex.

AUSTRALIA underlined that the text proposed is for the SBI recommendation and should have been included for discussion in the CRP, and said that it is not normal procedure to discuss substantive new text at the point of reviewing the L-doc.

EGYPT noted that while in the FoC, they were presented with a modified version of text than the one that is included in the CRP.

The Secretariat said that in the FoC, the group had only considered part of the text, and recalled that the Co-Chairs asked the Secretariat to convene an additional online session before COP 17 to discuss the rest of the text. She noted that there was text that had not been discussed that is not in the CRP. She highlighted that those who will participate in the informal online discussion would receive the text to be discussed.

EGYPT noted that some discussions held on some of the issues discussed had been omitted from the CRP altogether.

Chair Souza Della Nina proposed that, since there were more problems with the CRP, it would be revised, including the text from the FoC, and recirculated for plenary to consider.

Later in the day, delegates considered a revised draft recommendation (CBD/SBI/7/CRP.10/Rev.1). Chair Souza Della Nina noted she had been advised that there was still disagreement, with informal negotiations on the margins of the meeting. As convener of the informal talks, BRAZIL noted that the small group text earlier presented had not achieved consensus, and reported on lunchtime talks to bridge the gaps on option 2. They provided the textual amendments, supported by PERU, including: a note that the MoU had been “concluded and signed on 25 February 2025, prior to the deliberations of COP 17”; and a recommendation that COP 17 consider an “appropriate course of action regarding the alignment of the MoU and its annexes,” as well as all related governance, administrative and operational documents and arrangements, including those developed or agreed upon by the Steering Committee, “including its report, with the distinctive characteristics of the Cali Fund as a benefit-sharing fund, and with the governance arrangements included in decision 16/2, while ensuring transparency to the Parties.”

Namibia, for the AFRICAN GROUP, accepted the text as amended by Brazil, and called on delegates to adopt the final recommendation without reopening it. She stressed the Cali Fund’s integrity needs to be defended and underlined that its rules must be written by Parties. This was supported by EGYPT, MALAWI, ZIMBABWE, SOUTH AFRICA, and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION. JORDAN noted that this is new text and called for it to be bracketed.

Egypt, for the AFRICAN GROUP, highlighted that the MoU was signed before consultations with the COP, underlining that the MoU is core to the functioning of the Fund and signing it before a COP considers it affects the transparency of its governance. They stressed that Parties should have confidence in the Fund, which, he stressed should not be a donor-driven fund. They called for the MoU and all relevant documents adopted by the Steering Committee to be submitted to the COP to ensure transparency and accountability. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION underlined that the amended text recalls the facts and proposes a way forward to remedy damage done.

AUSTRALIA expressed concern over the message that the SBI is sending to businesses wishing to contribute to the Fund in this new text, called to remove the proposed text, preferring a focus on finalizing the modalities to operationalize the Fund.

The EU observed that some Parties had raised serious issues, but called for more time to discuss and understand these issues and consider how to address them. They proposed edits to Brazil’s text, including deleting the references to the fact that the MoU was concluded “prior to deliberations at COP 17,” and “the distinctive characteristics of the Cali Fund.” This was supported by SWITZERLAND, NORWAY, and JAPAN. The UK noted that these amendments could be a good basis for discussions.

JAPAN took note of the concerns raised by the African Group on the MoU but questioned whether highlighting these concerns in a CRP could create a perception that there are fundamental governance problems within the Fund. They noted that this could divert attention from the operationalization of the Cali Fund.

Chair Souza Della Nina proposed that a small group continue to discuss this text and come to a compromise, and “reconstruct our trust in the process.” After consultations, BRAZIL presented the

amended text, which delegates accepted. Chair Souza Della Nina proposed, and delegates agreed, that the CRP be submitted and adopted as an L-doc.

Final Recommendation: In the final recommendation (CBD/SBI/7/CRP.10/Rev.1), the SBI, recalling the sovereign rights of states over their natural resources, *inter alia*:

- notes that the “Standard MoU for the Cali Fund for the Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits arising from the Use of DSI on Genetic Resources using Pass-through Fund Management” among participating UN entities (UN Development Programme, UNEP and the CBD Secretariat) and the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office of the UN regarding the operational aspects of the Cali Fund, together with its annexes, was concluded and signed on 25 February 2025, prior to the COP; and
- recommends COP 17 consider a possible appropriate course of action regarding the MoU and its annexes as well as all related governance, administrative and operational documents and arrangements, including those developed or agreed upon by the Steering Committee, including its report, in relation to and in line with the distinctive characteristics of the Cali Fund as a benefit-sharing fund, and with the governance arrangements in accordance with decision 16/2, while ensuring transparency to the Parties;

The SBI recommends the COP, *inter alia*:

- “urges” or “calls upon” Parties, and invites other governments, relevant organizations and stakeholders, including the private sector, to organize participatory activities and partnerships, as appropriate, to encourage private sector engagement and contributions to the Cali Fund and non-monetary benefit-sharing “consistent with decision 16/2 and without prejudice to applicable national ABS measures;
- “requests” or “strongly encourages” Parties, and invites other governments and relevant organizations, to support the work of the Steering Committee of the Multilateral Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, and the Secretariat of the Convention acting as the interim Secretariat of the Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, through financial support and “formal and” informal activities, “including capacity-building, technical assistance, awareness-raising and information-sharing,” such as workshops on the operationalization of the Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, and related items “and to support the effective participation in the work of the Committee of members from developing country Parties, in particular LDCs and SIDS”;
- “reaffirms that the governance, institutional arrangements and operational modalities of the Multilateral Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, remain under the authority of the COP, and requests the SBI to review their consistency with decision 16/2 and other relevant COP decisions periodically, and to make recommendations, as appropriate, to the COP”;
- “requests the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, to ensure that the findings and recommendations arising from the study on tools and models, such as databases, for making DSI publicly available and accessible in a transparent and accountable manner are subject to peer review, allowing Parties, IPLCs, database operators, and relevant experts to provide comments, and to submit the finalized study and recommendation for review by the SBI at a meeting held before COP 18 and consideration by the COP 18, “before informing future policy development”; and

- requests that the Executive Secretary, in consultation with the Steering Committee, and in line with the review methodology and subject to the availability of resources, to, among others, commission a review report containing: an analysis of data and information that is in line with the pillars and governance assessment of the Multilateral Mechanism, including the Cali Fund, information from the global report on collective progress in the implementation of the GBF and other readily available sources, as relevant; and recommendations for improving the effectiveness of the Multilateral Mechanism, including the Cali Fund.

The annex, which is in square brackets, contains the review methodology of effectiveness of the Multilateral Mechanism, and the Cali Fund.

Resource Mobilization and Financial Mechanism

This issue was addressed in plenary on Tuesday, 4 August, and in two contact groups: Financial Mechanism, co-chaired by Ye Wang (China) and Inka Gnittke (Germany); and Resource Mobilization, co-chaired by Lucretia Landmann (Switzerland) and Francis Ogwal (Uganda).

On Tuesday, the Secretariat presented its note on resource mobilization ([CBD/SBI/7/3](#)), which contains a progress report on the Secretariat delivery on requested analysis on resource mobilization; a detailed overview of the SBI 7 tasks and synthesis of the documentation; and elements of a SBI 7 draft recommendation. He further highlighted addendums ([CBD/SBI/7/3/Add.1](#), [Add.2](#), [Add.3](#), [Add.4](#)), and information documents ([CBD/SBI/7/INF/18](#), [INF/19](#), and [INF/20](#)).

Brazil, for GRULAC, emphasized the importance of resource mobilization for implementation of the Convention and the GBF, underscoring that the financing gap should be taken seriously. They underlined that, while stewards of a significant portion of global biodiversity, many countries in the region are no longer eligible for official development assistance (ODA). They reiterated the obligations of developed countries in providing financial resources and urged differentiating co-financing from direct funding. They highlighted that many Parties in the region have yet to receive funds from the Global Biodiversity Framework Fund (GBFF).

Zimbabwe, for the AFRICAN GROUP, raised concern on the global shrinking fiscal space. They highlighted the call of the African Union Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan for 2023–2030, to mobilize and increase financial resources for Africa's biodiversity from all sources, in accordance with CBD Article 20 (financial resources), and ensure equity and accountability with regard to access to these resources. They further raised concern that GEF-9 has led to reduction of close to 27% funding compared with GEF-8 at a time when parties are expected to implement and accelerate the GBF, and highlighted that debt burdens crippling developing countries should be addressed so that these do not incentivize harmful activities.

The EU urged addressing impediments to biodiversity finance effectiveness supporting the proposed elements for enhancing effectiveness, emphasizing their voluntary nature. Concerning the further development of criteria for the structure to operate the financial mechanism, they underlined that paragraph 21 of [Decision 16/34](#) (Resource Mobilization) already sets out four criteria for the modalities of the global financial mechanism for biodiversity. On the broadening of the contributor base, the EU noted that it is important and timely to amend the list of developed country Parties

and countries that voluntarily assume the obligations of developed country Parties, because this amendment has the potential to mobilize new and additional international biodiversity finance.

Fiji, for P-SIDS, lamented the replacement of the explicit reference to developing country Parties, in particular LDCs and SIDS, with the generic phrase “all eligible Parties.” They noted that the elimination of the reference to SIDS will undermine allocation and differentiated access. They stressed that gross national income per capita conceals the structural vulnerability of SIDS and urged the development of capacity and vulnerability criteria over income per head.

South Africa, for LMMCs, said four years following GBF adoption, MoI remains wanting. They highlighted fiscal and capacity deficits noting that developing countries cannot meet their implementation obligations without capacity transfer. LMMCs also lamented the shortfall of funding to implement GBF Target 19a, which calls for increasing total biodiversity-related international financial resources from developed to developing countries to at least USD 20 billion per year by 2025, and at least USD 30 billion per year by 2030. The international biodiversity finance architecture, they noted, should provide predictable, adequate, and accessible MoI.

DRC reiterated that the GBF will not succeed without concrete international finance justice, underlining that biodiversity financing is a legally-binding requirement. SAUDI ARABIA and KENYA called for resource mobilization to be governed by the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR). COLOMBIA called to strengthen the global financial architecture for biodiversity, and stressed that resource mobilization from all sources should be complementary to the financing obligations of developed country Parties. EGYPT emphasized the importance of resource mobilization, and highlighted the need for country-driven biodiversity financing. GHANA called for aligning financing with biodiversity conservation objectives.

INDIA reiterated that the global financial mechanism for biodiversity should be governed by and fully accountable to the COP, and called for a phased approach to any reforms including those related to expanding the contributor base. INDONESIA underlined that voluntary contributions from developing country Parties should not undermine CBDR but rather complement overall resource mobilization efforts. CHINA urged focus on effectiveness, noted that the design of the system should be fair to recipient countries, and stressed that any revision of the contributor base should be approved by COP and should not affect developing-country access to financing. BAHRAIN said that in assessing efforts to bridge financing gaps, delegations should remember that developing states' contributions are optional and non-binding.

BOTSWANA expressed concern that financial flows for biodiversity for developing countries lags behind and supported efforts towards expanding the contributor base. BANGLADESH supported resource mobilization from all sources and broadening the resource base without compromising the capacities of developing countries. GABON called on developed countries to fulfil their obligations to provide new, additional and predictable financial resources to developing countries.

CANADA, speaking also for AUSTRALIA, JAPAN, NEW ZEALAND, NORWAY, SWITZERLAND, and the UK, reaffirmed their commitment to meeting their obligations as developed country Parties and continuing to provide international biodiversity finance. However, they stressed that achieving global biodiversity financing

needs will require a broader and more sustainable contributor base. The group argued that expectations for financial contributions should evolve in line with Parties' changing economic circumstances and capabilities, noting that the current list of developed country Parties has not been updated since 2006 and no longer reflects present-day economic realities. They highlighted that many countries previously considered developing have experienced significant economic growth, while the relative share of global income held by traditional donor countries has declined. They proposed using the World Bank income classification as an objective proxy to review and update the list of developed country Parties, suggesting that all high-income countries, excluding SIDS should be expected to contribute to international biodiversity finance.

TANZANIA underlined that public finance is the cornerstone of biodiversity financing. CHILE recalled that biodiversity financing and climate financing are separate and underlined the need to avoid double counting. GUATEMALA pointed to the role of the GBFF, lamenting that many mega-diverse countries have not received support from the Fund, and stressed the need for effective and easy access to the Fund. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION noted that any actions to be taken on resource mobilization before COP 18 should be funded by the core budget.

ARMENIA stressed that decision 16/34 (resource mobilization strategy) should serve as the baseline for resolving outstanding differences, and expressed full support for advancing implementation of the decision.

ARGENTINA called for greater consideration of debt burden borne by developing countries and emphasized that public financing and contributions from other sources should complement, rather than replace, developed countries' obligations to provide new and additional financial resources. The DOMINICAN REPUBLIC called for a COP 17 decision for financial resources to developing countries for biodiversity projects and initiatives within national development programmes.

KENYA noted that resource mobilization targets are off track, and called for addressing barriers to access.

YEMEN urged that vulnerable countries affected by crises and conflicts be prioritized in biodiversity financing, and called for stronger links between financing and NBSAPs. PANAMA argued eligibility criteria for accessing finance should reflect countries' biodiversity value and vulnerability, and underlined that IPLCs should have direct access to financial resources.

NAMIBIA highlighted that the 2025 deadline for GBF Target 18, to identify and reform harmful incentives, has passed, and requested that COP 17 explicitly address harmful incentives alongside broader resource mobilization efforts.

IIFB highlighted that only a small share of international biodiversity finance reaches IPLCs directly and called for direct, accessible financing also for women and youth. They requested retention of language guaranteeing the full and effective participation of IPLCs rather than weaker references to inclusivity, and called for stronger safeguards, monitoring, and equitable access to biodiversity finance.

GYBN urged greater support for youth-led biodiversity initiatives through long-term and flexible funding. They warned against broadening the contributor base in ways that dilute developed countries' obligations. They questioned the emphasis on blended finance and private finance, citing evidence of their limited effectiveness and equity.

CBD ALLIANCE reaffirmed that developed countries bear responsibility for an ecological debt and called for the institutional structure of the financial mechanism to be firmly grounded in equity. They urged linkages between biodiversity finance, debt relief, tax justice, and measures to address illicit financial flows.

On Tuesday, 11 August, Chair Souza Della Nina introduced the draft recommendation (CBD/SBI/7/CRP.9). Resource Mobilization Contact Group Co-Chair Landmann reported on the progress made by the contact group, highlighting the efforts of a Friends of the Chair group on addressing the broadening of the contributor base. She noted that some progress was achieved, and stressed her belief that the CRP provides a good basis for negotiations at COP 17.

Chair Souza Della Nina requested approving the CRP as a whole, noting that more discussions will be required at the COP. This was supported by CHINA, CAMEROON, NORWAY, CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC, MALDIVES, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, BRAZIL, and the EU.

SAUDI ARABIA and QATAR called for a paragraph-by-paragraph reading of the CRP. FIJI noted some omissions in the CRP, highlighting a missing footnote on the criteria. CHINA noted that the report should reflect the lack of time to fully consider the CRP in plenary, and the divergence of opinions in the CRP. MALDIVES lamented that their proposal had been omitted from the annex.

QATAR noted that more than 80 states had called to delete Option B (related to, *inter alia*, a request to the Secretariat to review and amend the list of developed country Parties and other Parties that voluntarily assume the obligations of developed country Parties using the country income groups of the World Bank as a proxy, to include high-income country Parties), but noted that this option remains in the CRP. They called to bracket the entire document, with SAUDI ARABIA proposing to also bracket each paragraph separately. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION requested Saudi Arabia to reconsider this approach, to ensure the collective progress that led to agreement on some paragraphs is not lost when discussions resume in Yerevan. This was supported by the EU and PERU.

QATAR, supported by SAUDI ARABIA, called for the meeting report to reflect that 80 delegations had supported the deletion of Option B.

Chair Souza Della Nina asked countries to be flexible as there was no time to address the CRP paragraph-by-paragraph, noting that all concerns would be brought to the COP. She underlined that the entire document is open for negotiation at COP 17. She called on delegates to entrust her and the Secretariat to amend the document with the omissions highlighted by FIJI and MALDIVES. Delegates then approved the CRP.

On Wednesday, 12 August, delegates considered the final recommendation (CBD/SBI/7/L.9). Chair Souza Della Nina recalled some amendments had been included to address Tuesday's discussions. The Secretariat noted that they had reinserted the footnote from Fiji, and had inserted the specific language covering concerns raised by Maldives. He also noted that the entire recommendation to the COP is in brackets. Chair Souza Della Nina called to adopt the document as a whole, which was supported by the RUSSIAN FEDERATION and FIJI.

QATAR and SAUDI ARABIA also called to bracket the text referring to a request to the Secretariat from the SBI for a non-exhaustive list of areas of convergence and divergence identified by the Friends of the Co-Chairs of the contact group on resource mobilization, opining that this discussion was still in contention.

This was opposed by the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, CHINA, the EU, CÔTE D'IVOIRE, and COSTA RICA. JAPAN, BRAZIL, and ZIMBABWE urged retaining this as clean text, noting that this was a request for a non-exhaustive list to be considered at COP 17. COSTA RICA underlined the importance of the text for further discussions in Yerevan.

Chair Souza Della Nina explained that the brackets would begin in the text relating to the COP decision, and not affect the SBI part. She proposed that a small group convene to find a way forward. FIJI proposed, and delegates agreed, to a short suspension of plenary to resolve this issue.

After a brief huddle, FIJI reported that all Parties agreed to lift the brackets in the first four paragraphs of the final recommendation, and that they had agreed to note that due to limited time available, there was no time to reach consensus. Delegates then adopted the final recommendation.

Final Recommendation: In the final recommendation ([CBD/SBI/7/L.9](#)), the SBI takes note of the report on progress in implementing decision 16/34 of 27 February 2025, requests the Secretariat to provide an updated progress report on the requests contained in that decision, and also requests the Secretariat to make available to COP 17, the non-exhaustive list of areas of convergence and divergence, identified by the FoC to the contact group on resource mobilization at SBI 7, noting that due to the limited time available, there was no time to reach consensus on the list. The SBI also recommends COP 17 adopt a resolution on resource mobilization. The draft then details elements of the COP resolution, which is contained in square brackets. The SBI recommends the COP, *inter alia*:

- notes that, despite reported increases in biodiversity-related financial flows, international public finance remains insufficient, unpredictable, and unevenly accessible and that further efforts are required to achieve Target 19 of the Framework;
- “adopts” or “notes” the criteria for the institutional structure to operate the financial mechanism envisaged under Article 21 of the Convention;
- invites the GEF and other relevant existing financial entities, including international financial institutions and multilateral development banks, to take the criteria into account, as appropriate, in their ongoing efforts to reform or improve their operation; and
- requests the SBI, before COP 17, to, among others develop measures that could be taken to enhance global biodiversity finance in order to mobilize new and additional resources from all sources.

The recommendation then outlines four detailed bracketed options on broadening the donor base.

The annex contains the criteria for the institutional structure operating the financial mechanism envisaged under Article 21 of the Convention, which is also heavily bracketed.

Financial Mechanism: On Wednesday, 5 August, the Secretariat introduced the document on the financial mechanism ([CBD/SBI/7/4](#) and [INF/17](#)), and the GEF Secretariat introduced the preliminary report of the GEF Council ([CBD/SBI/7/4/Add.1](#)).

The GEF Secretariat noted that it had approved USD 4.2 billion for biodiversity-related projects in the reporting period. They said that the report provides country-by-country biodiversity financing, as well as providing information on the GBFF disbursements, including financing IPLCs for relevant activities. They noted that 70% of GEF-9 will be dedicated to biodiversity-related projects and

shared some of the gains from GEF-8 for biodiversity conservation. They reiterated their commitment to assist countries in the final sprint to 2030.

The Bahamas, for GRULAC, highlighted, with INDONESIA, INDIA, and others, that the financial mechanism must be financed by developed countries to enable developing countries to meet their obligations in the implementation of the GBF. With the AFRICAN GROUP, they called for concessional financing, recognized the role of the GEF as the financial mechanism, but lamented that there has been a decrease, in absolute terms, in GEF financing.

The AFRICAN GROUP, with INDONESIA, noted their commitment to innovative finance mechanisms but stressed that these should only complement and not replace the obligations under the Convention. They underlined that the resourcing of the GBFF is insufficient and requires further capitalization.

P-SIDS noted that SIDS and LDCs need to be able to access financing, lamented that SIDS are not reflected in the GEF report and called, with MALDIVES, for information on SIDS-specific figures. On allocation flows, they lamented that there has been a reduction in real terms over the last four years.

EGYPT and ARGENTINA stressed that the financial mechanism must remain responsive to COP guidance on its operationalization and supported the stocktake on the GBFF as well as a country-driven review of the institutional structure on operating the mechanism. SAUDI ARABIA underscored the importance of the Mechanism in meeting country needs and noted that future considerations must respect national circumstances and capacities. ARGENTINA, CHINA, and QATAR called for adherence to [CBD Article 21](#) (financial mechanism). ARGENTINA also emphasized that mobilization of co-funding should be considered complementary rather than a condition for receiving funding. BAHRAIN, with QATAR, objected to automatic reclassification of developing countries based on economic indicators.

CAMEROON pointed to the annex related to resource mobilization, reiterating the SBI 7 negotiations should lead to agreement on the criteria for the institutional structure to operate the financial mechanism.

BURUNDI underlined that the financial mechanism should be clear and effective for Parties to implement biodiversity-related priorities.

NAMIBIA said direct access to funding should be through national entities and called for the stocktake of the GBFF to outline the details of African countries that have received funds. DRC and KENYA noted that GEF-9 financing had decreased and, with MOROCCO, UGANDA, GABON, INDIA, CHINA, PANAMA, and SAUDI ARABIA, underlined the need to ensure funding by simplifying the bureaucracy around access, decision-making, and disbursement. MOROCCO underscored the need for developed country Parties to bolster their commitments to GEF-9 and reiterated their calls for a financial mechanism better tailored to the needs of developing countries. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION demanded that the GEF fulfil the agreements to all Parties and stakeholders, calling for timely provision of resources to states as they prepare their eighth national reports.

IIFB expressed concern that pledges for GEF-9 have reduced from USD 5.2 billion provided in GEF-8 to USD 3.9 billion. They, however, welcomed the aim that at least 20% of all resources for the GEF 9 is committed to IPLCs, noting the need for clear guidance. They further welcomed the allocation of USD 100 million for Indigenous conservation initiatives, urging the GEF to incorporate

lessons learned from the GEF-7 Inclusive Conservation Initiative and the GEF-8 Heart of Conservation Initiatives.

CBD WOMEN'S CAUCUS urged that GEF-9 and GBFF operationalize the technical lessons from the evaluation of the CBD's Gender Plan of Action and the GEF Policy on Gender Equality. They called for the financial mechanism to institutionalize mandatory gender-responsive budgeting across all project lines by creating dedicated, ring-fenced funding windows, ensuring that gender equality is not just a secondary co-benefit but a primary, funded objective.

GYBN said the GEF has not been designed to provide direct, flexible, and predictable finance for locally-led biodiversity action, and this gap should be explicitly recognized in the current decision. They urged governance reform of the GEF to move beyond engagement and ensure the meaningful participation of IPLCs, women, and youth. On the mobilization strategy for the Global Biodiversity Framework 2026–2030, they urged establishing dedicated funding for these groups.

On Wednesday, 12 August, Co-Chairs Wang and Gnittke reported that the contact group has made substantial progress on this technically and politically complex agenda. They noted outstanding issues requiring further discussion at COP 17. Delegates approved CBD/SBI/7/CRP.12 as a whole with the expectation of completing the outstanding work at COP 17. They adopted the final decision, CBD/SBI/7/L.11, in which much of the text remains bracketed.

Final Recommendation: In the final recommendation (CBD/SBI/7/L.11), SBI recommends that that COP 17 *inter alia*:

- “welcomes” or “acknowledges” pledges of approximately USD 3.9 billion to GEF-9, while “noting that contributions come from only half of developed country Parties” and “expressing concern that the overall level of resources remains insufficient for GBF implementation, particularly Target 19”;
- “urges” developed country Parties, and “invites” others to contribute voluntarily, to support GEF-9 in accordance with Article 20 of the Convention;
- “welcomes” the allocation of 35% of GEF-9 resources to biodiversity, the aim for at least 70% of funding to support biodiversity, and the inclusion of aspirational targets for IPLCs, LDCs and SIDS, and private capital;
- “requests” the GEF to strengthen its effectiveness through improved integration and policy coherence, greater private-sector financing, whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches, more transparent and equitable resource allocation, simplified and more predictable access, and stronger support for IPLCs, LDCs, and SIDS;
- “calls for” enhanced direct and accessible funding for IPLCs, including consideration of the 20% portfolio-wide target, while “dedicated funding windows and direct access modalities” remain bracketed;
- “emphasizes” country ownership and alignment of GEF support with NBSAPs and GBF targets, including support for national biodiversity finance plans and stronger national institutional and technical capacity;
- “calls for” greater transparency and granularity in reporting on biodiversity finance, including programming, approvals, disbursements, and sources of finance;
- “expresses appreciation for” the operationalization of the GBFF, while “expressing deep concern over its limited capitalization,” and “noting that many eligible Parties have

not yet received support,” and reiterates the call for new and additional contributions from all sources; and

- “requests” the GBFF and its Implementing Agencies to broaden the contributor base, improve co-financing arrangements without making co-financing a condition for access, simplify and expedite approval and disbursement procedures, reduce processing times, and enhance equitable access, particularly for LDCs, SIDS, and eligible countries that have not yet received support.

Fifth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Protocol

On Wednesday, 5 August, the Secretariat presented its note containing a summary of the process followed for the fifth assessment and review and the midterm evaluation, as well as addendum containing a draft recommendation from inputs provided by the Liaison Group and the Compliance Committee (CBD/SBI/7/6 and CBD/SBI/7/6/Add.1).

Several delegations thanked the Compliance Committee and the Liaison Group for their work on the analysis, and their role in the analysis of the assessment and review of CP effectiveness. Many Parties called for adequate and timely financial resources and adequate capacity-building to improve the implementation of the CP.

Malawi, for the AFRICAN GROUP, lamented that several parties have not taken measures, or have only draft or temporary measures, for implementation and that the development of biosafety legislation remains a challenge for several Parties in some regions. They called for focused capacity development and political will to finalize and operationalize legal, administrative, and institutional measures. They noted that risk assessment, risk management, detection and identification require continuous updating due to growing technological development. With LESOTHO, INDONESIA, MAURITANIA, MOROCCO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, and KENYA, they urged regional cooperation through the Networks of Laboratories for the Detection and Identification of Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) and called for enhancement or focused capacity-building and development and access to dedicated and predictable financial resources for CP implementation.

Vanuatu, for P-SIDS, noted that almost three-quarters of CP Parties have insufficient or no national resources for biosafety, urging that Article 28 of CP and CBD Article 20 on financial resources be aligned with requests to support CP implementation budgets. They requested that island and archipelagic border biosecurity, accredited laboratory access, and certified reference materials be expressly added to the priority capacity areas, and be reflected in the next iteration of the Capacity-building Action Plan adopted in [decision CP-10/4](#). They also requested that the methodology for the sixth assessment and review provide disaggregated data on SIDS and LDCs. On the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol, to which not a single Pacific country is yet a Party, they noted that they requested a resourced accession-support programme, and for a substantive review at the sixth assessment rather than a further deferral.

VIET NAM said capacity development should remain responsive to nationally identified priorities, and EGYPT called for strengthening national capacities in the use of the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH), and in risk assessment and

risk management, and detection and identification. TANZANIA supported South-South cooperation for knowledge sharing.

PERU observed that 80% of CP Parties still lack capacities in identification of materials and organisms and, with NAMIBIA, INDIA, YEMEN and others, urged prioritization of capacity-building.

MOROCCO underlined the need to invest in human resource training, and stated that biosafety must be fully mainstreamed into national policies on biodiversity, agriculture, and health.

SOUTH AFRICA called for Parties to share experiences in the compilation of the fifth national reports to distill key lessons for future evaluations and assessments.

ZIMBABWE underscored the importance of strengthened biosafety measures to keep pace with rapid developments in biotechnology, underscoring the role of regional technical and scientific support centers in this regard. UGANDA urged resource mobilization to strengthen national and subnational institutional capacities. GHANA stressed the need to build technical and technological capacities, and recommended that the GEF allocate adequate resources. DOMINICAN REPUBLIC called to strengthen financing to address the gaps identified, underlining that capacity-building is key to ensure the effective implementation of biosafety measures.

SAUDI ARABIA said biosafety is not a luxury and but a necessity to protect people's health and protect agroecosystems, and with BAHRAIN called for sustainable financing for laboratories and human capacities. PANAMA called for integration of Indigenous and local knowledge (ILK) and safeguarding traditional food systems. They objected to the provision of funds for a new AHTEG on Synthetic Biology, noting duplication with the CP. VENEZUELA emphasized the importance of the precautionary approach and FPIC in commercialization of LMOs.

TUNISIA urged synergies between the CP and GBF Target 17 (biosafety) implementation. DRC noted that elaboration of legislation to prevent biosafety risk remains a challenge in several regions and stressed the need for raising public awareness and strengthening public and private implementation.

URUGUAY supported the centers for knowledge exchange, technology transfer and capacity-building adding that adequate financial resources should be accessible and predictable.

IIFB said the full and effective participation of IPLCs is essential for CP implementation to ensure that decisions on LMOs incorporate not only scientific and technical criteria, but also ILK, socioeconomic, cultural, and territorial considerations.

SBI 7 Chair Souza Della Nina noted common understanding on the draft recommendations, saying a CRP will be prepared.

On Sunday, 9 August, delegates addressed the CRP containing the draft recommendations.

On advancing the implementation of the goals and targets of the Framework that are relevant to biosafety, the EU proposed qualifying the reference to integration of biosafety into NBSAPs with "where relevant," noting that not all Parties have completed their NBSAPs.

The EU explained that national reports contain free-text fields with additional information that was not reflected in the assessment and review of the CP urging the Liaison Group to develop ways to capture and analyze such qualitative information. BRAZIL and FIJI sought clarification and following informal consultations, delegates approved the EU's recommendation.

On strengthening scientific and technical capacities in response to rapid developments in modern biotechnology, EGYPT proposed adding forward-looking and precautionary approaches, including horizon scanning and technology monitoring, to strengthen national preparedness and decision-making. BRAZIL noted that related SBSTTA language on horizon scanning remained bracketed and could therefore also be bracketed for further discussion at COP.

NORWAY and the EU called for further discussion on recommendations for GEF-9 and GBFF support for capacity-building and development on biosafety, specifically on language on establishing direct, adequate, predictable, and dedicated funding channels. JAPAN supported bracketing the reference to direct funding. MALAWI stressed that the provision was critical for the financial support required to implement the Protocol. FIJI, supported by NIGERIA and CÔTE D'IVOIRE, argued that the main outstanding issue concerned "direct" funding, while Zimbabwe raised concerns over the reference to country-driven projects. The EU requested that the entire paragraph remain bracketed.

On Monday, 10 August, delegates approved the final recommendation.

Final Recommendation: In [CBD/SBI/7/L.2](#), SBI 7 recommends that that the twelfth Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol (CP-MOP 12), *inter alia*:

- notes with concern that important gaps persist in areas critical for implementation, and that biosafety capacity-building and development remain a priority, in particular in risk assessment, risk management, and the detection, and identification of living modified organisms;
- recognizes that capacity-building and development and dedicated and predictable resources remain priorities for effective implementation, particularly for developing country Parties, including LDCs and SIDS and countries with economies in transition;
- urges Parties to advance implementation of relevant GBF goals and targets, including through the integration of biosafety into NBSAPs;
- requests the Compliance Committee and Liaison Group to provide input to the sixth assessment and review and final evaluation; and
- requests the Liaison Group to consider ways to collect and analyze qualitative data in addition to primarily quantitative information.

On the goal for Parties to have in place functional national biosafety frameworks, SBI recommends that CP-MOP 12, among others:

- welcomes progress, including increased publication of mandatory information and use of the BCH and requests continued capacity-building, training, and development of user-friendly digital tools; and
- recommends financial support for preparation of national reports and measures to minimize administrative, procedural and operational delays.

On the goal for Parties to have improved the availability and exchange of relevant information through the BCH, SBI 7 recommends that CP-MOP 12, among others:

- welcomes progress in compliance, including submission of national reports and publishing information through the BCH and recommends funding to implement compliance action plans;

- recognizes continuing challenges, including those arising from rapid developments in modern biotechnology, synthetic biology, and other new genetic modification techniques;
- invites support to address limited laboratory detection capacities, insufficient equipment and infrastructure, trained personnel, porous borders, and institutional and regulatory gaps;
- calls for enhanced technology transfer and technical cooperation and support for accredited laboratories, reference materials, validated methods, equipment, financial resources, and trained personnel; and
- encourages Parties to accede, ratify, accept or approve the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol.

On the goal for full information on CP implementation made available by Parties in a timely manner, SBI 7 recommends that CP-MOP 12, *inter alia*:

- recommends that the GEF provide eligible Parties, sufficiently in advance of the reporting deadline, financial support for the preparation of national reports; and
- recommends that implementing agencies take steps to minimize administrative, procedural, and operational delays and facilitate the expeditious disbursement of funding.

On the goal that Parties are in compliance with the CP requirements, SBI 7 recommends that COP 17, in adopting its guidance to the GEF with respect to CP implementation support, request the GEF to make specific, adequate, and timely funding available to eligible Parties to implement compliance action plans developed at the request of the Compliance Committee.

On the goal that Parties carry out scientifically sound risk assessments of LMOs and manage and control identified risks to prevent adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health, SBI 7, recommends that CP-MOP 12:

- recognizes that conducting risk assessment and risk management continues to pose challenges for some Parties and that those challenges are made more difficult by the rapidity of developments in modern biotechnology, including the application of synthetic biology and other new genetic modification techniques for LMO development;
- also recognizes that rapid developments in modern biotechnology require the continuous updating of relevant scientific, technical, and institutional capacities, “including, as appropriate, through forward-looking and precautionary approaches, horizon scanning and technology monitoring to support national preparedness and informed decision-making”; and
- encourages Parties and other stakeholders to continue to address human resources, financing, and infrastructure needs concerning the key areas for capacity-building related to risk assessment and risk management, and to establish regional networks of risk assessment and risk management experts to facilitate peer review, technical support and knowledge exchange among Parties, including with the support of the regional and subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centers.

For the goal that Parties prevent and address illegal and unintentional transboundary movements of LMOs, SBI 7, recommends that CP-MOP 12: reminds Parties to report cases of illegal and unintentional transboundary through the BCH; and invites Parties, other governments and relevant organizations to provide support for capacity-building and development on preventing and addressing illegal and unintentional transboundary

movements of LMOs, with a particular focus on addressing challenges related to limited laboratory detection capacities, insufficient laboratory equipment and infrastructure, trained personnel, porous borders, and institutional and regulatory gaps.

On the goal that Parties have measures in place to fulfil the handling, transport, packaging and identification requirements of LMOs under CP Article 18, SBI 7, recommends that CP-MOP 12 encourages Parties to facilitate cross-sectoral cooperation and coordination among competent national biosafety authorities, customs authorities, and other relevant government bodies to strengthen capacity for the handling, transport, packaging and identification of LMOs; and invites Parties, other governments, and relevant organizations to provide support for capacity-building and development.

On the goal that Parties are able to detect and identify LMOs, SBI 7, recommends that CP-MOP 12 invites Parties, other governments and relevant organizations to provide support for capacity-building and development in the areas of detection and identification of LMOs, with a particular focus on addressing challenges related to limited access to accredited laboratories, certified reference materials, especially for newly commercialized LMOs, validated detection methods, adequate equipment, sustainable financial resources and sufficient trained personnel; and calls for enhanced technology transfer and technical cooperation to strengthen national and regional capacities for the detection, identification, and monitoring of LMOs.

SBI 7 recommends that, in the goal for Parties to take into account socioeconomic considerations when making decisions on the import of LMOs and cooperate on research and information exchange, that CP-MOP 12, *inter alia*, encourage Parties to cooperate on research and information exchange on any socioeconomic impacts of LMOs, especially on IPLCs, their livelihoods, food systems, traditional agricultural practices and biocultural richness.

On the goal for Parties to mobilize adequate resources from all sources to support the implementation of the CP, SBI 7 recommends that CP-MOP 12:

- urge Parties to allocate adequate resources to biosafety in their national budgets, in accordance with their national circumstances, priorities and capabilities; and
- call upon developed country Parties, and invite other governments, international organizations, bilateral and multilateral funding agencies, regional development banks and other programmes and initiatives, to provide adequate, predictable and accessible financial resources and in-kind contributions, as appropriate, to support the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol.

Second Assessment and Review of the Effectiveness of the Nagoya Protocol

On Wednesday, 5 August, the Secretariat presented its note on the Second Assessment and Review of the Effectiveness of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization, which contains the conclusions of the Informal Advisory Committee and the Compliance Committee on scoping study on the possible reasons and underlying root causes for the challenges to effective implementation and compliance, and on possible ways to enhance implementation ([CBD/SBI/7/7](#)). The Secretariat also drew attention to addendums on the topic ([CBD/SBI/7/7/Add.1](#) and [CBD/SBI/7/7/Add.2](#)).

The AFRICAN GROUP noted that the assessment had identified challenges such as inadequate MoI. They supported a facilitative and non-confrontational compliance procedure, and underlined that the ABS Clearing-House should enhance transparency.

P-SIDS, with PERU, UGANDA, and SOUTH AFRICA, urged Parties to establish and fully operationalize their checkpoints and, with BRAZIL, underlined that a review of the compliance mechanism and its procedures is premature.

PERU drew attention to slow disbursement of resources for, among other issues, the convening of workshops.

MOROCCO, with THIRD WORLD NETWORK, said DSI and ABS are not mere obligations but key levers of Parties' economies and called for strengthening the complementarities between the GEF and the Cali Fund.

SOUTH AFRICA underscored that the Protocol should be treated as a rights-based instrument so it can deliver results. SAUDI ARABIA and COSTA RICA said information exchange should be implemented within national conditions and specificities to ensure data protection and confidentiality. INDONESIA stressed that any standardized checklists should remain voluntary, and, with INDIA and KENYA, reaffirmed that the implementation of the NP should respect the sovereign rights of states.

GHANA, BURUNDI, MADAGASCAR, TANZANIA, and MOROCCO called for support to assist developing countries to implement ABS legislation. ZIMBABWE underscored that legislation alone does not translate into fair and equitable benefit-sharing, saying the success of the NP should be judged on the impacts on benefits and enhancing livelihoods.

INDIA shared the country's experience in implementing benefit-sharing measures, noting this could be included as a good practice.

KENYA called for enhanced support for capacity-building, strengthening IPLC governance of genetic resources, and sharing of lessons learned and good practices. DRC urged strengthening legal and regulatory frameworks, institutional capacities, monitoring, and reporting.

ARGENTINA highlighted the need to address consistency in national reporting. UGANDA urged inclusion of subnational level actors in capacity-building initiatives.

MALAWI welcomed Parties' work to implement the Protocol but noted that methodological challenges persist, calling for the next review to assess whether the systems established promote implementation.

ZAMBIA highlighted that the first national report had shown implementation gaps, underscored the need to enhance submissions to the ABS Clearing-House to improve transparency, and also recognized the need for improved stakeholder engagement. BURUNDI lamented the persistent gaps in implementation, including, with BAHRAIN, low human and financial resources to implement all the elements of the Protocol, and called for the development of partnerships with research centers.

NAMIBIA highlighted the importance of incorporating the World Health Organization Pandemic Agreement, the BBNJ Agreement and others in the shaping of NP implementation. URUGUAY urged for consistencies between the NP and other processes to avoid duplication and observing the nature and scope of ABS.

YEMEN, a non-party, noted that they will soon join the NP, expressing concern over Parties' compliance and the monitoring process.

IIFB expressed concern over the moderate progress on the implementation of the Protocols on matters related to traditional

knowledge associated with genetic resources and IPLCs and called on Parties to make efforts to advance in the implementation of these provisions.

INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, supported by the UK and JAPAN, noted that ABS policies and measures have a significant impact on business and industry and called for legal clarity of complex national regulations and ABS legislation, seeking also access to information in the ABS Clearing-House.

SBI 7 Chair Souza Della Nina noted common understanding regarding the draft recommendations, saying a CRP will be prepared.

On Sunday, 9 August, delegates considered the draft recommendations (CBD/SBI/7/CRP.2), organized in three parts, assessment and review of effectiveness; enhancing implementation; and financial mechanism and resources.

On assessment and review of effectiveness, KENYA proposed broadening the provision on the ABS procedures beyond access measures to also address user measures, and for relevant guidance developed to be published through the ABS Clearing-House. The EU and UK questioned distinction between access and user measures given existing provisions on user compliance. REPUBLIC OF KOREA proposed strengthening the paragraph by calling for clear information on the scope of application, relevant exceptions, responsible authorities, required documentation and procedural steps, as well as comprehensive guidelines for potential users through the ABS Clearing-House. ARGENTINA, supported by INDIA and BAHRAIN, proposed making implementation subject to the availability of MoI.

On checkpoints, BRAZIL, supported by INDIA, proposed replacing the call to "fully operationalize" checkpoints with language referring to their "progressive operationalization" and national capacities. INDIA, supported by the EU, also proposed adding a reference to taking action in accordance with Article 15 (compliance with domestic ABS legislation) of the Protocol. On Monday, 10 August, the UK reported agreement achieved during informal consultations, and Parties approved the amendments.

Delegates considered whether IPLC agreement should be explicitly referenced before community protocols and procedures are made available through the ABS Clearing-House. ARGENTINA questioned the need for such additional caveats, noting that the preceding paragraph already provides for the full participation of IPLCs. BRAZIL explained that the provision concerns disclosure and making information, including ILK, available through the Clearing House, and supported retaining a safeguard. Delegates agreed that the issue would be taken up informally by interested Parties.

The EU proposed a new paragraph urging Parties to use existing tools developed under Articles 19 and 20 and made available through the ABS Clearing-House. NAMIBIA suggested including IPLCs in this invitation.

On the compliance procedures and mechanism, SOUTH AFRICA supported by NAMIBIA proposed noting that the limited number of cases brought before the Compliance Committee does not, in itself, demonstrate compliance with the Protocol. They also proposed requesting the Secretariat to develop indicators of sufficient practical experience that could trigger a future reconsideration of the procedures and mechanisms. MALAWI suggested an assessment on why the compliance procedures and mechanisms had not been triggered, including whether Parties were sufficiently aware of, and

able to access and use, them. UK asked for time to consider these elements.

Deliberating on the third assessment and review, SOUTH AFRICA and NAMIBIA with BRAZIL and MALAWI proposed review of progress towards the operationalization of Article 10 (global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism), including the Cali Fund. The EU, JAPAN, and UK argued that this will preempt the COP 17 deliberations on the Cali Fund.

NAMIBIA noted limitations in addressing transboundary genetic resources and a request for compilation of information on provisions for which limited or no implementation experience has been reported for consideration by the COP-MOP.

On enhancing NP implementation, NAMIBIA and SOUTH AFRICA proposed including campaigns targeting diverse ABS actors to strengthen capacity-building, communication, and regional cooperation.

FIJI stressed that Pacific countries face challenges in establishing and operating checkpoints and argued that regional and subregional support centers could provide an important delivery mechanism for addressing these gaps.

Under the provision encouraging the integration of ABS into regional and subregional capacity-building and development initiatives, KENYA proposed adding a reference to promoting ABS under the BBNJ Agreement. JAPAN objected, noting that the benefit-sharing mechanism under the BBNJ Agreement remains under negotiation. The issue remained unresolved.

On the section addressing the financial mechanism and resources, the EU, UK, and NORWAY opined that text on the provision of MoI by developed country Parties and other Parties that voluntarily assume the obligations of developed country Parties was repetitive. MALAWI, BAHRAIN, and ZIMBABWE supported retaining the text. After discussions, delegates agreed to merge language relating to the provision of MoI, including from “developed country Parties and other Parties that voluntarily assume the obligations of developed country Parties” and from international organizations, regional development banks, other programmes and initiatives, and the private sector.

MALAWI reiterated their proposal to request the GEF to establish a dedicated funding window, within the Biodiversity Focal Area, for ABS including for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, with adequate and predictable resources. NORWAY called to put this in brackets. The UK called for clarity from the GEF on existing funding in this regard. The GEF SECRETARIAT noted that 15 countries had so far accessed ABS funding and drew attention to the fact that there is a small amount of “set-aside funding” for global and regional projects related to both the Nagoya and Cartagena Protocols. They noted that this does reduce funding for other biodiversity related funding. MALAWI requested additional time to reflect on the GEF response. This new language remained in brackets.

NAMIBIA proposed new text calling on the COP to ensure that the core functions of the Secretariat in servicing the NP, including the ABS Clearing-House and the compliance mechanism, are provided for from the core budget, underlining, with MALAWI and SOUTH AFRICA, that this is a governance issue under the COP and a core function of the Convention that should not be subject to the availability of resources. JAPAN noted that this was a decision for the Budget Committee and called for the text to be deleted. The EU proposed, with the UK, that this could be addressed through a

budget decision at COP 17. Delegates agreed to bracket the text until a compromise solution could be reached.

Delegates approved the CRP, noting ongoing discussions on outstanding issues. On Tuesday, 11 August, parties adopted the recommendation with remaining brackets.

Final Recommendation: The recommendation ([CBD/SBI/7/L.4](#)) is divided into three parts:

Assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Nagoya Protocol: SBI-7 recommends that NP-MOP 6:

- welcome inputs from the Compliance Committee and Informal Advisory Committee on Capacity-building, as well as the scoping study on challenges and root causes affecting implementation and compliance;
- take note of updated indicator data and the outcomes of the second assessment and review, recognizing progress while underscoring the need for further work to strengthen implementation and effectiveness;
- invite Parties and others to take the findings and indicative actions into account in implementing the NP;
- encourage Parties to develop clear and streamlined ABS procedures, facilitate research contributing to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, operationalize checkpoints, and publish relevant information through the ABS-CH;
- invite Parties to ensure the full and effective participation of IPLCs, including women and youth, in ABS processes, including through community protocols and procedures;
- encourage engagement with IPLCs, user organizations, and other stakeholders, as well as regional approaches to ABS and transboundary cooperation;
- “develop user measures, including guidelines, as appropriate and in accordance with national measures, and to publish them through the ABS Clearing-House”;
- invite Parties to ensure the full and effective participation of IPLCs, including women and youth among them, in ABS processes, including by facilitating the development by IPLCs of community protocols and procedures for ABS, and make such protocols and procedures available through the ABS Clearing-House as part of national records, “if the IPLCs concerned so agree and” without prejudice to the protection of confidential information;
- urge “Parties to use existing tools developed in accordance with Articles 19 and 20 of the NP and made available through the ABS Clearing-House”;
- request “the Secretariat to propose indicators of sufficient practical experience that would trigger reconsideration of the compliance procedures and mechanisms at a future meeting of the NP COP-MOP”;
- request “the Secretariat to assess, in coordination with the Compliance Committee, the reasons for which the compliance procedures and mechanisms under the NP have not been triggered through submissions, including whether Parties and relevant stakeholders are sufficiently aware of and are able to access and use the procedures, and to identify any procedural, institutional or practical barriers and options to address them”;
- decide “to establish a Party-driven intersessional process to advance the development of the modalities of the global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism under Article 10 of the Nagoya Protocol, building on the work already undertaken and taking into account the relevant findings of the second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol”; and

- request the Secretariat, subject to the availability of resources, to convene an open-ended intersessional meeting of Parties with the participation of IPLCs and relevant stakeholders, to develop specific elements of the modalities of the global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism under NP Article 10, building on the work undertaken for consideration by the NP-MOP 7.

SBI-7 recommends that NP-MOP 6 also requests the Secretariat to propose a methodology, in consultation with Parties, for conducting the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the NP, taking into account:

- the outcomes and lessons learned from the second assessment and review;
- the need to collect and analyze information to enable an assessment of the level of operationalization of ABS systems and their effectiveness in achieving the objective of the NP, while avoiding additional reporting burdens;
- input from the Compliance Committee and the Informal Advisory Committee on Capacity-building for the Implementation of the NP;
- the need to assess progress towards operationalization of Article 10 of the Nagoya Protocol and the “experience of the Multilateral Mechanism;”
- “the need to review and, as appropriate, revise the framework of indicators with a view to incorporating indicators for use in measuring the operationalization of ABS systems and the outcomes achieved in terms of benefits shared, in addition to the existence of legislative, administrative and policy measures”;
- SBI to consider the proposed methodology before NP-MOP 7 and to make recommendations for consideration at NP-MOP 7; and
- “the Secretariat to compile, on the basis of the second assessment and review and information available through the ABS Clearing-House, information on provisions of the NP for which limited or no implementation experience has been reported, including with respect to genetic resources occurring in transboundary situations, and to make that information available for the consideration of the COP/MOP 6.”

Enhancing the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol: On capacity-building and development and awareness-raising, SBI-7 recommends that NP-MOP 6:

- encourage Parties, other governments and relevant stakeholders to enhance long-term capacity for implementing the NP, taking into account the outcomes of the second assessment and review and areas where further support is required;
- strengthen national authorities’ capacities to implement the NP and domestic ABS measures;
- promote the exchange of experiences, best practices, success stories and lessons learned among actors involved in ABS processes, including through regional and global initiatives and with IPLCs;
- establish or strengthen mechanisms to facilitate partnerships between users and providers of genetic resources and holders of associated traditional knowledge;
- document and share lessons learned, best practices, and capacity-building resources through the ABS Clearing-House;
- support information systems that facilitate ABS and compliance and, as appropriate, their interoperability with the ABS Clearing-House;
- support IPLCs in publishing and using information through the ABS Clearing-House;

- strengthen communication efforts, including targeted campaigns for different ABS actors, promoting ABS as a strategy for valuing biodiversity, supporting conservation and sustainable use, and creating opportunities for sustainable development;
- continue implementing the awareness-raising strategy for the NP and use existing tools, including the communication, education and public awareness (CEPA) toolkit, with considerations for ABS;
- request the Secretariat to produce targeted communication materials highlighting success stories and best practices, facilitate exchanges through regional workshops, and promote the integration of ABS into regional and subregional capacity-building initiatives and cooperation frameworks;
- “promote cooperation, collaboration and synergy among the secretariats of relevant MEAs addressing ABS, such as the BBNJ Agreement”;

On the ABS Clearing-House and information-sharing, SBI-7 recommends NP-MOP 6:

- emphasize the key role of the ABS Clearing-House in supporting effective implementation of the NP;
- underscore the importance of Parties publishing all available mandatory information through the ABS Clearing-House and keeping it up to date;
- request Parties to provide up-to-date, accurate and practical information on ABS procedures and national model contractual clauses through the ABS Clearing-House;
- urge Parties that have not yet published all mandatory information to do so as soon as possible and keep it up to date;
- encourage Parties to use the interoperability of the ABS Clearing-House with relevant national information systems to facilitate publication of information on internationally recognized certificates of compliance and checkpoint communiqués;
- request the Secretariat to further develop the ABS Clearing-House, taking into account feedback from Parties and the Informal Advisory Committee and relevant information from the second assessment and review; and
- request the Secretariat to convene a meeting of the Informal Advisory Committee to the ABS Clearing-House before NP-MOP 7 and report on its outcomes.

With regard to the GBF, SBI-7 recommends that NP-MOP 6:

- encourage Parties to provide, in their second national reports, complete and disaggregated information on benefits received, including monetary and non-monetary benefits, recipients including IPLCs, and the proportion of benefits directed towards biodiversity conservation and sustainable use;
- invites Parties, international organizations, regional development banks, programmes, initiatives, and the private sector to provide additional financial resources for NP implementation, taking into account the findings and indicative actions of the second assessment and review;
- requests the GEF to continue supporting developing country Parties, particularly LDCs, SIDS, and countries with economies in transition, including in establishing and operationalizing checkpoints and publishing checkpoint information through the ABS Clearing-House;
- requests the GEF to make funding available in a timely manner for the preparation and submission of second national reports, without creating additional reporting requirements; and

- requests the Secretariat to disseminate information on existing funding opportunities to Parties and IPLCs, women, and youth.

Synthetic Biology

On Wednesday, 5 August, the Secretariat presented its note containing the draft thematic action plan to support capacity-building and development, access to and transfer of technology, and knowledge-sharing. He noted that the scientific and technical elements have already been reviewed by SBSTTA 28 ([CBD/SBI/7/8](#)); and additional information on the topic ([CBD/SBI/7/8/Add.1](#)).

Tonga, for P-SIDS, supported the thematic action plan, lamenting its weakening by the lack of attention to actors, timelines, baseline, and target date. They noted that Parties to the CP in Decision CP-11/7 welcomed additional voluntary guidance materials to support the case-by-case risk assessment of LMOs containing engineered gene drives, saying the request to COP 17 should be for risk assessment guidance for emerging technologies that are close enough to deployment. With EGYPT, they called for retaining the precautionary approach in the guiding principles, and the recognition of the diverse values of nature, including its intrinsic value.

On Thursday, 6 August, Chair Souza Della Nina reiterated that since SBSTTA 28 had addressed the draft thematic action plan, SBI 7 should only consider the draft recommendation to the COP.

The AFRICAN GROUP welcomed the inputs of the AHTEG on synthetic biology on the draft thematic action plan, stressing that the plan was a good basis for moving forward. They highlighted that the implementation of the plan is a priority for the region and recognized the role of the regional support centers in the implementation of this plan.

Several delegations said implementation of the action plan is dependent on MoI, including technology transfer and scientific and technological cooperation. The AFRICAN GROUP, with PERU, URUGUAY, MALAWI, ZIMBABWE, INDONESIA, EGYPT, SOUTH AFRICA, QATAR and others called for dedicated, adequate, predictable and timely financial resources. EGYPT stressed its implementation should be demand-driven.

PERU called for the inclusion of reference indicators to promote self-assessment and, with INDIA, stressed the special needs of megadiverse countries.

URUGUAY underlined that draft plan needs to be tailored to the needs of parties and, with INDIA and EGYPT, called for adequate complementarity with existing plans under the Convention.

NAMIBIA called for practical implementation arrangements, which include risk assessment and governance tools, underlining that the action plan needs to address the links between capacity-building and benefit sharing, including for DSI of genetic resources.

UAE, with INDIA, ARGENTINA, and SAUDI ARABIA, stressed that the action plan should be voluntary and should not create new burdens for Parties; and underlined that any technology transfer should be done on mutually agreed terms.

MALAWI emphasized that the plan should enhance reporting through the CHM and called for technical workshops and training on risk assessments.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION recalled SBSTTA 28 discussions had identified that the products of synthetic biology are LMOs and stressed that this matter should be considered under the CP.

INDONESIA called to respect national level frameworks and, with PANAMA, called for complementarity with the CP. INDONESIA, TANZANIA, BOTSWANA, and CHILE urged

ensuring safeguards and the precautionary principle. PANAMA and BOTSWANA also called for meaningful engagement of actors including IPLCs, women, and youth.

ARGENTINA noted the lack of an agreed definition of synthetic biology, calling for stronger links with GBF Target 17.

IIFB supported the AHTEG outcomes and the draft thematic plan, calling for the plan to take into account the needs of IPLCs with regard to synthetic biology.

Chair Souza Della Nina noted convergence in Parties' interventions, noting a CRP would be prepared.

On Sunday, 9 August, delegates addressed the CRP related to the synthetic biology thematic action plan to support capacity-building and development, access to and transfer of technology and knowledge sharing (CBD/SBI/7/CRP.3). She informed delegates that this recommendation would be merged with the one from SBSTTA 28.

The EU called to include a reference to the "precautionary approach for the environmental release of the applications of synthetic biology" in text inviting Parties and all stakeholders to make use of the thematic action plan on a voluntary basis. This was opposed by AUSTRALIA, who noted that this text concerns capacity-building and not synthetic biology uses. Delegates agreed to encourage Parties, other governments and relevant organizations "to facilitate" the full and effective participation of IPLCs, women, and youth, with their FPIC in the implementation of the thematic action plan, "in accordance with domestic legislation."

The EU, GUATEMALA, COSTA RICA, and SWITZERLAND preferred inviting the regional and subregional support centers of the technical and scientific cooperation mechanism to "facilitate" the implementation, as opposed to these centers encouraged to "develop their own capacities" for facilitating the implementation of the thematic action plan.

On MoI, the EU called to delete "developed country" parties as the primary donors towards the implementation of the plan, highlighting the need to broaden the donor base. This was originally opposed by Fiji, for P-SIDS, and BRAZIL, who supported the original text, which encouraged "developed country Parties" to provide MoI. The EU suggested encouraging "developed country Parties and Parties which voluntarily assume the obligations of developed country Parties" to provide MoI. Chair Souza Della Nina called on interested Parties to work on the language.

On a request/invitation to the GEF to make resources available, the EU, SWITZERLAND, and NORWAY called to bracket references to "sustainable" financial resources. This was opposed by P-SIDS and CÔTE D'IVOIRE, who further called to include the qualifiers "additional" and "easily accessible" financial resources. URUGUAY highlighted that at COP 10 delegates had adopted language referencing adequate, predictable, and timely financial resources. AUSTRALIA, with BRAZIL, proposed bracketing the entire paragraph.

The EU, supported by ARGENTINA, GUATEMALA, and others, called on the Executive Secretary to "facilitate" capacity-building and development and knowledge-sharing activities, in particular for developing countries, IPLCs, women, and youth to facilitate implementation of the action plan. ZIMBABWE preferred that the Executive Secretary "support" these activities.

Delegates addressed a request to the Executive Secretary to develop a voluntary monitoring mechanism to track the implementation of the plan, with the EU preferring that the mechanism "voluntarily monitor" the plan's implementation.

Opposed by SWITZERLAND and AUSTRALIA, EGYPT suggested that mechanism also consider “biosafety, biosecurity, environmental risk assessments, and regulatory risk assessments.” The paragraph remained in brackets.

On Monday, 10 August, BRAZIL reported agreement with the EU, FIJI, and SWITZERLAND on acceptable language related to MoI. Delegates agreed that the COP “encourages developed countries Parties and invites Parties in a position to do so,” other governments and relevant organizations to make financial, technical and in-kind resources available to support the implementation of the thematic action plan, especially for developing country Parties, in particular LDCs, SIDS, and countries with economies in transition. Delegates then approved the CRP, as amended.

On Tuesday, 11 August, the SBI adopted the final draft ([CBD/SBI/7/L.3](#)).

Final Recommendation: In the final recommendation, the SBI recommends that COP 17, among others:

- invites Parties, other governments, IPLCs, women and youth organizations and other relevant stakeholders to make use of the thematic action plan for the implementation of the three objectives of the Convention and the GBF, “on a voluntary basis,” in accordance with national priorities and circumstances, “and in line with the precautionary approach for the environmental release of the applications of synthetic biology”;
- invites Parties to consider, as appropriate, the actions contained in the thematic action plan in the development, updating and implementation of NBSAPs, as well as in relevant sectoral policies, strategies and plans, in accordance with national priorities and circumstances;
- encourages developed country Parties, and invites Parties in a position to do so, other governments and relevant organizations, to make financial, technical and in-kind resources available to support the implementation of the thematic action plan, especially for developing country Parties, in particular LDCs and SIDS, and Parties with economies in transition;
- “invites” or “requests” the GEF, and invites other donors, to make available new, additional, “adequate,” predictable, easily accessible and “sustainable,” timely financial resources to Parties, especially developing country Parties, to support the implementation of the thematic action plan, in accordance with national needs and priorities, including for strengthening national capacities for “horizon scanning, monitoring and assessment, environmental risk assessment, risk management and regulatory oversight”;
- invites Parties, other governments and relevant organizations to submit to the Executive Secretary information on national and regional experiences, best practices and lessons learned with regard to capacity-building and development, access to and transfer of technology and knowledge-sharing in the context of synthetic biology; and
- requests the Secretariat to, among others: create a compilation of the national and regional experiences, best practices and lessons learned as a resource to support the implementation of the thematic action plan; and develop a “voluntary monitoring mechanism for tracking” or a “mechanism to monitor, on a voluntary basis,” the implementation of the thematic action plan, “including, where appropriate, by considering biosafety, biosecurity, environmental risk assessment, regulatory considerations and broader environmental and socioeconomic implications.”

Engagement with Subnational Governments, Cities and Other Local Authorities to Enhance GBF Implementation

This issue was addressed in plenary on Thursday, 6 August, and on Tuesday, 11 August. The Secretariat presented the review of the role of subnational and local governments in the implementation of the GBF ([CBD/SBI/7/9](#)), and the information emerging from seventh national reports relevant to the role of subnational governments, cities and other local authorities in GBF implementation ([CBD/SBI/7/INF/11](#)).

Tuvalu, for P-SIDS, noted that the term “other local authorities” remains undefined, underlining that the most effective local authority for biodiversity is the community; called for the review to recognize customary, traditional, and community governance institutions as local authorities and as legitimate implementers under the Plan of Action; and requested the Executive Secretary to report on whether biodiversity finance is actually reaching the local and community levels.

The AFRICAN GROUP underlined that subnational-level actors operate where biodiversity matters are most prevalent; and welcomed the report’s recognition of the importance of multilevel governance for the implementation of the GBF and the clear alignment with the roadmap from Montreal and Cali to Yerevan identified in the report. PANAMA welcomed the recognition that subnational governments are responsible for action on the ground.

TANZANIA noted the impacts of biodiversity loss on urban areas, suggesting that the recommendation prioritize work in urban green spaces including forests and botanical gardens, among others.

SOUTH AFRICA reported on their International Day for Biodiversity celebration by hosting in collaboration with the CBD Secretariat, the Global Flagship Event themed, “Acting locally for global impact.” They noted that the event was preceded by their NBSAP validation workshop.

CHAD and TANZANIA called for strengthening the effective participation of IPLCs, women, and youth. MADAGASCAR called for increased coordination of local and subnational governments with national strategies.

INDIA called to ensure that any future work does not create additional burdens on developing countries.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION reiterated the need to address this issue under the agenda item on biodiversity mainstreaming, in order to provide clear guidance to the COP on whole-of-society approaches.

IIFB, supported by PANAMA, underlined that GBF implementation requires profound action at the local level and cooperation between local authorities and IPLCs’ organizations for the effective spatial planning, ecosystem restoration and monitoring; and called for the draft recommendation to encourage Parties to promote IPLCs’ recognition as local authorities to promote GBF implementation.

GYBN underlined the need to ensure the effective engagement of youth and intergenerational equity in discussions on this issue.

Chair Souza Della Nina proposed that she would prepare a CRP on this item, and that the Bureau would further discuss whether this issue could be merged with the item on biodiversity mainstreaming, suggested by the Russian Federation.

On Tuesday, August 11, delegates considered the draft recommendation on this issue (CBD/SBI/7/CRP.6). They discussed the importance of strengthening the capacities of subnational governments, cities, other local authorities, and customary, traditional, and community institutions to enhance

native biodiversity in urban and densely populated and rural areas, including through biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning, urban biodiversity management, restoration of ecosystems and ecological connectivity, and environmental monitoring and reporting.

Delegates also welcomed references to the conservation and sustainable use of urban biodiversity. Views diverged on a paragraph encouraging Parties to recognize IPLCs as local authorities in support of the implementation of the Framework.

They also discussed a request to the Secretariat to compile information on the extent to which biodiversity finance reaches subnational governments, cities, and other local authorities, with SOUTH AFRICA, supported by the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, calling for this compilation to contain information on barriers to access to funding and opportunities to strengthen direct and equitable financing mechanisms for local implementation.

CANADA and SWITZERLAND noted that the additional request was too specific, preferring to delete it. CANADA also proposed requesting the Secretariat to undertake a review of the role of subnational governments, cities, and local authorities including a specific analysis of and case studies on the contributions of actors other than national governments/IPLCs, women, and youth. This text remained in brackets. Delegates then approved the draft recommendation.

On Wednesday, 12 August, delegates adopted the final recommendation.

Final Recommendation: In the final recommendation ([CBD/SBI/7/L.12](#)), the SBI recommends that COP 17, among other things:

- notes the contributions of Parties, and others, and encourages them to continue to strengthen coordination mechanisms, dialogue, cooperation and engagement within and across all levels of government, and provide adequate and predictable financial resources and technical support to enable capacity-building and development, for the further implementation of the plan of action, the Convention and its Protocols and the Framework;
- invites Parties, other governments and relevant organizations to facilitate the exchange of experiences, best practices and lessons learned, including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation, and to continue to support subnational governments, cities and other local authorities, as well as customary, traditional and community institutions, as and where appropriate, “to improve the implementation of the Framework, including” by strengthening their technical, institutional and financial capacities to enhance native biodiversity in urban and densely populated rural areas, including through spatial planning, urban and rural biodiversity management, the restoration of ecosystems and ecological connectivity, and environmental monitoring and reporting; and
- requests the Secretariat to continue to develop, in cooperation with partner organizations, guidance to facilitate capacity-building and development activities for facilitating the integration of contributions of subnational governments, cities and other local authorities to the implementation of the Framework into national planning, and monitoring, reporting, and review mechanisms.

Capacity-building and Development and Technical and Scientific Cooperation

This issue was addressed in plenary on Wednesday, 5 August, and in a contact group co-chaired by Holly Kelley-Weil (UK) and Martha Mphatso Kalemba (Malawi), which met until Monday, 10 August, to advance the draft recommendation.

On Wednesday, 5 August, the Secretariat presented a progress report on the implementation of the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development and the technical and scientific cooperation mechanism ([CBD/SBI/7/10](#)).

Ntakadzeni Tshidada, South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI), presented on the technical and scientific cooperation mechanism highlighting commitment to strengthening support centers by strengthening partnerships and technical support, conducting capacity needs assessment, and fostering cooperation and mobilizing financing.

Kenya, for the AFRICAN GROUP, welcomed the long-term framework of capacity-building and development and supported the work of the global coordination entity and the regional scientific entities. They emphasized the need for maintaining institutional capacity in the long-term for GBF implementation; and proposed that regional centers of excellence and cooperation should work with academic institutions in generating practical solutions. They also called training of next generation biodiversity professionals through scholarships and enhancement of national scientific infrastructure and effective technical and scientific implementation.

Fiji, for P-SIDS, lamented that the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme is the only center for Oceania, the largest Ocean region on Earth, serving countries thousands of kilometers apart, which is under-resourced. They called for strengthening the language calling for predictable multi-year contributions, and on resources from the GEF and other funds to support the centers.

EGYPT underlined that capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation are cornerstones of the Convention, but called to redefine capacity-building measures to ensure their sustainability and, with TANZANIA and SOMALIA, stressed the need to invest in institutions and organizations to reflect this.

DRC noted the need for a radical change in the scale of capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation, pointing to the central role of regional and sub-regional support centers in this regard, and, with TANZANIA, SAUDI ARABIA, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, GUATEMALA, COLOMBIA, and COSTA RICA, calling for financial support for these centers. ZIMBABWE noted that implementation gaps exist in resource mobilization, which limits the effectiveness of support centers.

BANGLADESH welcomed the progress made in the implementation of the long-term strategic framework and the technical and scientific cooperation mechanism (TSCM), but noted they need to address the financial gap to implement Target 20. They supported the draft recommendation alongside the provision of substantial financial resources for its implementation.

COSTA RICA stressed that capacity-building is a long-term process, and, with PANAMA, called to strengthen capacity-building peer-learning networks.

COLOMBIA called for operational support for the implementation of the long-term strategic framework, underlined the importance of the support centers also for IPLCs, and called for financing these centers through donor funding and the GBFF.

GUATEMALA underlined the need to improve the visibility of the support centers, and, with MOROCCO, supported the establishment of common monitoring and evaluation framework to improve the effectiveness of the support centers and the TSCM.

MALAWI recommended integrating the gaps identified in the GRI in capacity-building workplans and called for the support centers to complement external support.

INDIA supported a whole-of-government approach to capacity-building.

BENIN and ARGENTINA noted that this issue is essential for the effective implementation of the GBF, with BENIN calling for a considerable budget to be allocated to this issue.

MADAGASCAR called for a decentralized monitoring mechanism and noted that future reviews should address the strengthening of local and national institutions, which can carry forward the implementation of the GBF and the Convention.

INDONESIA underscored that the TSCM and the global coordination entity should be subject to the guidance of the COP.

SOUTH AFRICA noted the need to scale up all MoI, including capacity-building, and highlighted, with BOTSWANA, the work of the SANBI technical and scientific support center, calling for its full operationalization.

CHILE called for a programmatic and not a project approach to support parties to implement their obligations, and, with many others, supported North-South, South-South, and triangular cooperation.

CHINA supported long-term needs-based capacity-building; welcomed the role of the TSCM and regional support centers, calling for them to be more responsive; and reiterated their commitment to South-South cooperation.

On Tuesday, 11 August, Chair Souza Della Nina introduced the draft recommendation (CBD/SBI/7/CRP.8). Contact Group Co-Chair Kelley-Weil reported that the group had reached agreement on a number of issues in the draft recommendation, noting that outstanding issues remain, pointing to 17 brackets in the text.

SBI Chair Souza Della Nina noted that a small group had met to discuss the wording on “IPLCs, women and youth,” sharing that the new agreed language as “IPLCs, as well as organizations of women and youth and other relevant stakeholders.” She noted that this would be reflected in the final recommendation. She requested, and delegates agreed, to approve the CRP, with a minor amendment from the RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

On Wednesday, 12 August, delegates adopted the final recommendation.

Final Recommendation: In the final recommendation (CBD/SBI/7/L.7), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- takes note of the progress report on the implementation of the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development and the TSCM, including a draft workplan and budget for the Global Coordination Entity; and
 - requests the Global Coordination Entity to prepare a revised workplan and a revised budget, for consideration at COP 17.
- On capacity-building, the SBI recommends that the COP, *inter alia*:
- invites Parties, other governments, subnational and local governments, IPLCs, as well as organizations of women, youth, and other relevant stakeholders, to consider, as appropriate, the key messages and recommendations from the Biodiversity Capacity-Building and Development Forum in the design and implementation of their capacity-building and development

actions, according to their needs, national circumstances and legislation;

- invites Parties, other governments, subnational and local governments, IPLCs, as well as organizations of women, youth and other relevant stakeholders, to share the experiences and lessons learned in designing and implementing capacity-building and development initiatives and programmes using the guidance provided in the long-term strategic framework, through the central portal of the clearing-house mechanism, according to national legislation, as appropriate;
- requests the Executive Secretary to, among others, collaborate with the Biodiversity Finance Initiative, other initiatives and relevant organizations in order to organize capacity-building activities for Parties, including their ministries responsible for finance, economic planning and national development and other relevant ministries, on ways to mobilize domestic resources and gain access to international financing for capacity-building and development, technical and scientific cooperation and technology transfer; and convene, in collaboration with partners, a third meeting of the Biodiversity Capacity-Building and Development Forum to facilitate the sharing of experiences, good practices and lessons learned in capacity-building and development in support of the implementation of the Framework before COP 18.

On technical and scientific cooperation and technology transfer, the SBI recommends that the COP, *inter alia*:

- expresses appreciation to the Secretariat for initiating the operations of the Global Coordination Entity and providing staff to support the Entity’s work until such time as the Entity becomes fully operational;
- requests the technical and scientific cooperation support centers to take into account the gaps, challenges, and barriers noted in the global report on collective progress in the implementation of the Framework, and the seventh national reports of the Parties to the Convention, including challenges in the use of indicators when providing capacity-building and development support to Parties;
- invites Parties, other governments, subnational and local governments, and other relevant stakeholders in a position to do so to provide adequate, predictable, timely and easily accessible financial resources, in-kind contributions, or both, to support the programmes and long-term operations of the Global Coordination Entity and the technical and scientific cooperation support centers; and
- requests the Executive Secretary to, among others, increase resource mobilization efforts to support the work of the TSCM, including by actively engaging with multilateral funding sources with a view to securing adequate and predictable funding accessible by the Global Coordination Entity and the technical and scientific cooperation support centers, “while recognizing that private sector support should complement and not replace public international support for capacity-building.”

Clearing-House Mechanism and Knowledge Management

This issue was addressed in plenary. On Thursday, 6 August, the Secretariat presented its note on progress made in the implementation of the implementation of the knowledge management strategy and of the related requests to the Secretariat (CBD/SBI/7/11); and a progress report on the implementation of the programme of work for the CHM (INF/12).

Kenya, for the AFRICAN GROUP, said the CHM should not become a static information repository, encouraging South-South and triangular cooperation for knowledge exchange, and requested the Secretariat to facilitate sustained technical advisory and technical services, and to support Parties on the use of the online reporting tool. They also supported the sharing of experiences and best practices in the use of the CHM for GBF implementation.

Marshall Islands, for P-SIDS, recalled that the CHM was established as an instrument for promoting and facilitating technical and scientific cooperation, noting an unfunded instrument facilitates nothing. They lamented the lack of baseline information for the comprehensive review scheduled for COP 19, requesting that SBI 7 focus on modalities for a baseline rather than the review. Underscoring the challenge of the digital divide, they called for: tools that are usable in low-bandwidth and offline settings; interoperability with national systems, and Indigenous data; and capacity-building of developing countries, particularly SIDS, to maintain their own national databases.

SAUDI ARABIA called to ensure national and data sovereignty.

Several Parties welcomed the upgraded Bioland 2.0 CHM to track their national targets under GBF.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION, with DRC, INDIA, ZIMBABWE and YEMEN, stressed the need for the allocation of sufficient financial resources; welcomed the launch of Bioland 2.0 CHM; and noted the need to facilitate and improve the searchability of the CBD website, calling for this to be prioritized.

DRC highlighted the importance of scientific information for the implementation of the GBF and the Convention, and called for more interconnected digital platforms that integrate ILK.

YEMEN called for technology transfer especially to LDCs and countries in fragile conditions, and for support for biosafety infrastructure.

BENIN welcomed the vision to accelerate the knowledge management strategy, and recommended bilateral cooperation, while lauding cooperation with Belgium. TANZANIA called on the Secretariat to build the capacities of subregional and regional centers.

MALAWI highlighted activities with Ghana on biodiversity data management by training stakeholders to centralize and share national conservation information using the Bioland CHM portal.

NAMIBIA questioned the suggestion that data in the CHM is also reusable, indicating the need for clarity on who would be allowed to reuse and for what purposes.

CHAD suggested increasing capacity in the use of GIS and spatial data tools.

NEW ZEALAND cautioned against duplication with online data in the Global Biodiversity Information Facility.

IIFB proposed, among other things, including information on the contributions of IPLCs to knowledge management in the eighth national reports.

Chair Souza Della Nina, noting agreement during discussions, informed delegates that a CRP would be prepared on the item.

On Monday and Tuesday, 10–11 August, delegates considered the draft recommendation (CBD/SBI/7/CRP.4). On a request to strengthen the implementation of the programme of work for the CHM and the knowledge management strategy through capacity-building and development, the EU and COLOMBIA called to delete reference to “digital transformation.”

Delegates supported using agreed language on MoI, urging Parties and inviting other governments and relevant organizations, to provide financial and technical support to biodiversity capacity-building and development activities to implement the programme of work for the CHM and the knowledge-management strategy.

Delegates also considered a paragraph relating to the information to be submitted in the eighth national reports. INDIA suggested that information submission be on a voluntary basis, and that submissions may it could include the challenges encountered as well as country-specific technical and capacity needs.

The EU, with COLOMBIA, supported regional and subregional technical and scientific support centers and other interested actors in sharing knowledge and “experiences, best practices, success stories, and lessons learned in the implementation of the CHM work programme and the knowledge management work strategy.”

Delegates supported a request to the Executive Secretary to enhance the implementation of the future work on the CHM and knowledge management strategy, as set out in document [CBD/SBI/7/INF/12](#). They considered a new request to the Secretariat to prioritize the work related to interoperability and efficiency improvements resulting, *inter alia*, from the use of artificial intelligence (AI) and relevant new technologies and the further improvement of the online reporting tool and access to, search of, and usability of the information on the Convention website in support of the implementation, monitoring, and reporting on the framework. The EU proposed new text calling for regional workshops on knowledge management in regions where these did not occur earlier, with GUATEMALA proposing to convene these workshops between COPs 17 and 18.

KENYA proposed new text calling for the use of voluntary indicators to assess the functioning of national CHMs and their contribution to the implementation of the GBF. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION welcomed the suggestion but called for more time to consider it. The EU called for this to be discussed further at COP 17, noting that the indicators would need to be developed in collaboration with the Informal Advisory Group. Delegates then approved the draft recommendation.

On Wednesday, 12 August, delegates adopted the final recommendation.

Final Recommendation: In the final recommendation ([CBD/SBI/7/L.5](#)), the SBI recommends that the COP, among others:

- urges Parties, in line with Articles 20 and 21 of the Convention, and invites other governments and relevant organizations, to provide financial and technical support for biodiversity capacity-building and development activities, taking into consideration the specific situations of developing country Parties, in particular LDCs and SIDS, and countries with economies in transition, to implement the programme of work for the CHM and the knowledge management strategy;
- invites the technical and scientific cooperation support centers “and, where applicable, actors other than national governments,” to collaborate and share with Parties and through the central portal of the CHM information and experiences, best practices, success stories and lessons learned, as appropriate, in the implementation of the programme of work for the CHM and the knowledge management strategy.

The SBI also recommends that the COP requests the Executive Secretary, under the guidance of the Informal Advisory Group on Technical and Scientific Cooperation to, among others:

- prioritize work related to interoperability and efficiency improvements resulting, *inter alia*, from the use of AI and relevant new technologies and further improvements to the online reporting tool and to the access to, search of and useability of information on the Convention website, in support of the implementation and monitoring of and reporting on the Framework; and
- prepare an analysis of the implementation of the programme of work for the CHM and the knowledge management strategy for consideration by the SBI at a meeting held before COP 19, with a view to informing the review of the implementation of the programme of work and of the strategy in conjunction with the global review of collective progress at COP 19, “ensuring that such review is conducted in an inclusive and balanced manner, taking into account the varying levels of development and operationalization of national CHMs,” “and that the analysis include, where appropriate, voluntary indicators to assess where national CHMs are functioning and contributing the implementation of the Framework.”

Mainstreaming of Biodiversity Within and Across Sectors

This item was addressed in plenary on Wednesday, 5 August, and in a contact group, co-chaired by Hesiquio Benítez Díaz (Mexico) and Scott Wilson (Canada).

The Secretariat presented its note containing a progress report including a structured overview of available good practices, tools, mechanisms, guidance and relevant solutions to support biodiversity mainstreaming (CBD/SBI/7/12; and INF/16).

Vanuatu, for P-SIDS, said the proposed communities of practice excludes Large Ocean States, calling for an Ocean and Island Economy community of practice under the current recommendation on the item; that ridge-to-reef approaches be named directly in the guidance, rather than “integrated land and seascape management,” and that tourism be treated substantively. They emphasized the need to finance mainstreaming, and called for sector-specific action, and stressed that biodiversity mainstreaming needs to fit into NBSAPs without an additional reporting burden, following Article 6(b) of the Convention, which requests Parties to integrate biodiversity into sectoral plans in accordance with particular conditions and capabilities.

Ghana, for AFRICAN GROUP, said the regional and subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centers and communities of practice are valuable for technical exchange and for the achievement of GBF Target 14 (biodiversity mainstreaming), which requires whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches thorough stronger national coordination, and private-public partnerships with full participation of IPLCs, women, and youth.

CHINA presented their whole-of-society successes, noting the mobilization of enterprises and the business sector to incorporate biodiversity conservation within their core operations. They expressed support for the draft recommendation to contain references to exchanging experiences and capacity-building. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION also underscored the importance of whole-of-society approaches and suggested that this issue be merged with the draft recommendations on the engagement with subnational governments, cities, and other local authorities to enhance GBF implementation.

EGYPT, with MALAWI, emphasized that mainstreaming biodiversity is a core issue for the Convention covering all sustainable development pillars: environmental, social, and economic. They noted that investment is required beyond

workshops to achieve buy-in with business sector and decision-makers. INDONESIA, with BAHRAIN, cautioned against a one-size-fits-all approach to biodiversity mainstreaming.

BRAZIL said references to the business sector do not need to be framed around disclosures and identifying and addressing negative impacts, but should also include the positive impacts of business and enterprise to promote the concept of sustainable use of biodiversity for biodiversity mainstreaming into forestry, fisheries, and other sectors. ZIMBABWE called for targeted awareness campaigns to raise understanding among policymakers, IPLCs, private sectors, and for enhanced focus on outcomes and achievements from mainstreaming activities.

INDIA, with BAHRAIN, pointed out that mainstreaming should ensure just transition to nature-positive economies, with INDIA noting that this should include the needs of micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises. GUATEMALA shared that their country’s NBSAP is inclusive and participatory, and called to strengthen coordination between production sectors. MADAGASCAR also pointed to their NBSAP, which fosters a whole-of-society and whole-of-government approach and supported that mainstreaming be tailored to national circumstances and capacities.

ARGENTINA underlined the need for any mainstreaming plan to be voluntary. BANGLADESH and BOTSWANA supported the calls for biodiversity to be mainstreamed into national planning and budgetary processes, noting the need to bridge the data, financial, capacity and technological gaps.

PERU and TANZANIA called for strengthening collaboration with governments, the private sector, financial institutions and other stakeholders to promote mainstreaming. BENIN and TUNISIA underscored the importance of technical and scientific cooperation. CHILE underlined the need to strengthen collaboration and complementarities with the Rio Conventions and other MEAs.

SOUTH AFRICA called for biodiversity mainstreaming in business practices for industries such as mining, fisheries, agriculture, tourism and other sectors, thereby linking biodiversity to development and poverty-reduction pathways.

PANAMA underlined the need to address mainstreaming at the regional level. BAHRAIN reiterated that, on integrated management of seascapes, mainstreaming should not obstruct national development planning.

COLOMBIA emphasized that mainstreaming should transform whole-of-government decision-making on biodiversity and, with UGANDA and CÔTE D’IVOIRE, highlighted biodiversity mainstreaming in their NBSAPs.

IIFB said biodiversity mainstreaming must go beyond integrating biodiversity into sectoral policies, and must also integrate the rights, governance systems and knowledge of IPLCs across all sectors and levels of decision-making. They called for: a focus on a human rights-based approach; addressing the underlying drivers of biodiversity loss; and direct and accessible financing for IPLCs.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES MAJOR GROUP urged recognition of local and subnational governments in mainstreaming efforts. BUSINESS MAJOR GROUP suggested a “whole-of-economy approach,” mainstreaming biodiversity into the economic sector, including banks, businesses, and financial regulators.

BIOVERSITY INTERNATIONAL welcomed landscape approaches and supported the implementation of conservation and sustainable use objectives alongside agricultural production.

On Tuesday, 11 August, Chair Souza Della Nina introduced the draft recommendation (CBD/SBI/7/CRP.7). Delegates agreed on compromise language proposed by BRAZIL, NEW ZEALAND, the EU, and UK to replace four bracketed alternatives on a recommendation to encourage, promote or enable the sustainable use of biodiversity, where appropriate, as a means of supporting its conservation and integrating its multiple values into productive and economic activities, while ensuring that any use of and impacts on biodiversity are fully aligned with the Framework. The compromise remained bracketed.

On the preambular text, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION proposed removing references to mainstreaming across “the whole of government and the whole of society,” instead referring to mainstreaming across sectors, consistent with Decision 16/13 (biodiversity mainstreaming). Delegates also considered new text by VANUATU, recognizing that progress on biodiversity mainstreaming remains insufficient to achieve the goals and targets of the Framework and that enhanced efforts are needed to close existing ambition and implementation gaps.

On Wednesday, 12 August, they adopted the final recommendation.

Final Recommendation: In the final recommendation (CBD/SBI/7/L.8), the SBI recommends that the COP, *inter alia*:

- recognizes the importance of inclusive approaches to assess and report progress in biodiversity mainstreaming and also recognizes the importance of strengthening the science-policy interface for biodiversity mainstreaming and facilitating the exchange and uptake of good practices, tools, mechanisms, guidance and other relevant solutions related to biodiversity mainstreaming, including through South-South, North-South and triangular cooperation, in support of the implementation of the GBF, taking into account national circumstances and priorities;
- “invites” or “encourages” Parties, “and invites” “other Governments, IPLCs, women, youth, civil society organizations, the private and financial sectors and stakeholders from all other sectors” or “other Governments and actors other than national Governments,” or “organizations including relevant sectoral bodies, as well as IPLCs, women, youth and people with disabilities,” to accelerate the exchange of relevant good practices, tools, mechanisms, guidance and other relevant solutions related to biodiversity mainstreaming, including those arising from relevant programmes of work and cross-cutting initiatives under the Convention, through existing reporting, knowledge-sharing and cooperation mechanisms, including the clearing-house mechanism; and
- also invites Parties to strengthen and accelerate the implementation of biodiversity mainstreaming, including by, among others: closing the gap between the integration of biodiversity in regulations or policies and their effective implementation in practice; and strengthening: the institutional and technical capacities of relevant authorities; or establishing interministerial coordination mechanisms to promote coherent and effective actions in support of biodiversity mainstreaming; and the engagement of the business and public and private financial sectors at all levels, highlighting the nature-related opportunities and the responsibility of businesses to assess, disclose and reduce their risks, dependencies and impacts on nature.

The recommendation then contains heavily bracketed options related to the implementation of national sectoral plans for biodiversity mainstreaming, and the encouragement of mainstreaming in specific economic and livelihood sectors. It also contains heavily bracketed options in requests to the Executive Secretary pertaining to, among other issues, awareness promotion to enhance the uptake of the IPBES Methodological Assessment Report on the Impact and Dependence of Business on Biodiversity and Nature’s Contributions to People, and to facilitate the mainstreaming of biodiversity in the business and financial sectors.

Communication, Education and Public Awareness

This issue was addressed in plenary on Thursday, 6 August. The Secretariat presented the progress report on actions towards aligning the programme of work on CEPA with the GBF and draft global plan of action for education on biodiversity (CBD/SBI/7/13).

Marshall Islands, for P-SIDS, requested that the further development of the draft global plan include SIDS explicitly; underlined the need for resources to implement the deliverable on learning materials in Indigenous and local languages; and called for a defined share of the resources to implement the decision be disbursed at the regional level, including through the technical and scientific cooperation support centers.

South Africa, for the AFRICAN GROUP, welcomed the draft global plan of action for education on biodiversity and its acknowledgement of different knowledge and education systems. They proposed that the draft recommendation acknowledge South Africa’s hosting of events celebrating the 2026 International Day for Biodiversity under the theme, “Acting locally for global impact.” They called for the global plan to better articulate NBSAPs, stressed the need for MoI, and called for monitoring systems to build on existing systems and infrastructure.

BURUNDI noted the action plan promotes public understanding and better policymaking for the GBF implementation and for sustainable use of biodiversity. MALAWI and TANZANIA underlined the need for an explicit call for technical and financial support prioritizing LDCs and SIDS in the use of the action plan.

ZIMBABWE said the action plan, as a living document, should evolve based on national, regional and other feedback, and cautioned against oversimplification of Indigenous views.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION said the alignment of CEPA with the GBF supports broad understanding of the Framework’s goals and targets and in engagement of new partners. They said that as a living document, the action plan is not ready for adoption at COP 17, noting its refinement following its use and contributions for adoption by COP 18.

INDONESIA said implementation of the action plan should remain voluntary, nationally driven and subject to national circumstances.

INDIA called for strengthening integration and transmission of Indigenous and local knowledge, and urged revamping biodiversity repositories, aquaria, and outdoor learning to promote deeper understanding of biodiversity.

ARMENIA welcomed the draft action plan and said that this could bolster transformative action.

GHANA stressed that CEPA should promote behavioral change and collective action for biodiversity at all levels of society, and underlined the need for integration of CEPA into biodiversity monitoring and reporting systems. BOTSWANA supported linking CEPA to NBSAPs and the GBF implementation, and relying on existing reporting systems and processes.

PANAMA stressed that, for IPLCs, nature is a classroom, underscoring the role of ILK in the global plan of action.

MOROCCO said CEPA is crosscutting and urged merging the decisions with those on biodiversity mainstreaming and engagement with subnational governments.

IIFB said the plan of action must include transformative, innovative, and transdisciplinary formal, non-formal and informal education that recognizes diverse world views, values and the knowledge systems of IPLCs. They lauded the Secretariat for knowledge products in relation to the Local Biodiversity Outlook; and proposed that the decision mention direct access to funding for IPLCs, women, and youth, and the inclusion of their own reporting, including through community-based monitoring and information systems, in monitoring, evaluation, and reporting.

GYBN said transformative education is a priority for youth as affirmed by the invitation in decision 16/10 to collaborate with others to develop a global education plan, and welcomed its emphasis on co-creation and intergenerational knowledge exchange. They proposed changing the title to, “global plan of action on education for biodiversity.”

CALIFORNIA GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY ALLIANCE urged strengthening the role of subnational governments in the action plan implementation. UNESCO highlighted their education mandate and support to Parties in strengthening biodiversity education in classrooms and in nature including through UNESCO World Heritage Sites.

Chair Souza Della Nina noted broad agreement following the first reading, and informed delegates that a CRP will be prepared on this item.

On Tuesday, 11 August, delegates considered the draft recommendations (CBD/SBI/7/CRP.5). On financial support, views diverged over references to “actors other than national Governments,” with several developing countries supporting specific mention of IPLCs, women, and youth as recipients of direct, dedicated and accessible resources. BAHRAIN proposed that such support also flow through authorized national mechanisms.

Further discussions focused on the process for finalizing and implementing the plan. ARGENTINA and INDIA proposed references to national frameworks and circumstances in the peer-review process, while the EU, CANADA and others opposed adding a new monitoring framework, noting that one already exists.

ARGENTINA, INDIA, KENYA, PERU and others questioned the exhaustive list of international initiatives to be considered, preferring broader language. SAUDI ARABIA proposed that digital education resources be available in all six UN official languages, while the EU and BRAZIL sought clarity on who would facilitate their development.

On Tuesday, 11 August, delegates considered a draft decision. On integrating biodiversity education into NBSAPs and educational plans, they discussed the EU’s suggestion to qualify this as, “where applicable.”

On Wednesday, 12 August delegates addressed the final decision. Some issues remain bracketed including a provision encouraging Parties to use and implement the draft global plan of action, pending agreement on whether Parties should be encouraged to “use” or “implement” it.

Delegates adopted the final recommendation.

Final Recommendation: In the final recommendation (CBD/SBI/7/L.6), the SBI recommends that the COP, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the successful hosting by South Africa of the global celebration of the International Day for Biological Diversity in 2026 under the theme “Acting locally for global impact”;
- welcomes the draft global plan of action for education on biodiversity, and recommends its use, including as a basis for further inputs, noting that it is a living document that will be further developed;
- invites Parties, other governments and “actors other than national Governments” and/or “other relevant stakeholders” to consider providing adequate, predictable and accessible technical and financial support for the development, uptake and implementation of the global plan of action, in order, *inter alia*, to meet the needs of developing countries, in particular LDCs and SIDS, “including by providing dedicated and easily accessible resources to IPLCs, women, and youth for such education activities as community-led education initiatives” “in accordance with national legislation and through appropriate national mechanisms”;
- requests the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources and in consultation with the Informal Advisory Committee on CEPA, to, among others: submit an updated version of the draft global plan of action for consideration by the SBI at a meeting held before COP 18, with a view to its consideration at COP 18; keep abreast of developments in other relevant international education initiatives and processes, “such as UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Greening Education Partnership, the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Action for Climate Empowerment and the Programme for International Student Assessment climate literacy assessment,” with a view to encouraging appropriate cooperation in the development, implementation and promotion of communication, education and public awareness plans at the national level and under relevant international processes; and
- encourages Parties, taking into account national circumstances and legislation, to, among others: integrate education on biodiversity in NBSAPs, where applicable, and national and subnational educational plans, where applicable and as appropriate, taking into consideration the outcomes of the first GRI and building on existing education-related monitoring frameworks, including by considering formal, non-formal and informal education programmes and initiatives; and mainstream biodiversity across formal education curricula by integrating biodiversity and conservation concepts, ecosystem stewardship and care, and sustainable use considerations into relevant subjects and disciplines, taking into account national education systems and priorities.

The annex contains the draft global plan of action for education on biodiversity.

Administrative and Budgetary Matters

This item was addressed in plenary on Thursday, 6 August, and in an informal Parties-only consultation facilitated by Patience Gandiwa (Zimbabwe) that convened on Tuesday, 11 August, with a view to advance inputs for COP 17 decisions.

The Secretariat introduced the proposed budget for the programmes of work of the Convention and its Protocols for the biennium 2027–2028 (CBD/SBI/7/15), the progress report on the functional review of the Secretariat (CBD/SBI/7/15/Add.1), the Administration of the Convention and its Protocols for the biennium

2025–2026 ([CBD/SBI/7/14](#)), and the progress report on the implementation of the outstanding audit recommendations ([CBD/SBI/7/14/Add.1](#)).

Namibia, for the AFRICAN GROUP, lamented that the sustainable use targets have no staff resources allocated to them, and called for this gap to be closed. They underlined that core mandates require core funding, stressing, with EGYPT, that the core mandates of the Convention cannot rest on voluntary contributions. Pointing to the 10 new proposed staff posts, they requested that no further steps on these posts be taken before COP 17.

Fiji, for P-SIDS, lamented, with BRAZIL, that only one delegate is funded for all meetings of Subsidiary Bodies, noting that this is unacceptable, and called for this to be remedied, given that the voluntary trust funds had surplus funds at the end of the last financial year. They requested that: allocation of participation funding for LDCs and SIDS be reported; and the functional review be revised to address how the Secretariat will service the standalone island biodiversity mandate agreed at COP 16.

GHANA and CAMEROON said the persistent funding shortfall in the special voluntary fund for participation undermines the principle of inclusivity and equitable participation.

NEW ZEALAND, CHINA, and JAPAN queried the efficiency of the Secretariat, noting concern over the 10 additional posts proposed for new staff, while 14 posts in the Secretariat remain vacant including those approved at COP 16. CHINA further welcomed the Secretariat's internal institutional adjustment, expressing hope that the new architecture would enhance implementation of the GBF. On meeting scheduling and duration of meetings, they noted that requests for extensions and more meetings do not take into account prior scheduling by other multilateral processes.

BRAZIL requested more discussions on staffing posts related to DSI and staffing related to SB8j.

INDONESIA called for maximizing efficiency gains and making greater use of cost-effective online activities before new expenditure. DRC noted that the staffing priorities in the budget are unclear and underlined the need for developed countries to remit their contributions.

NAMIBIA stressed that the core budget has not expanded with the expansion of the workload, noting that nominal restraint, in these circumstances, is not fiscal discipline but rather a decision to underdeliver with the shortfall borne by developing country Parties. They noted that the budgets for the two Protocols have fallen, while staff allocations have been made to other parts of the Convention, calling for clarity on which posts have been removed.

JAPAN emphasized zero nominal growth as their principle for all multilateral processes, underlining that the next biennium must be kept at the same nominal level as the current biennium. They underlined that outcomes of the functional review should first be discussed with Parties and supported by clear rationale and analysis. BELGIUM urged a transparent, affordable and predictable budgetary framework and called for clarification on how overspending in the current biennium will be addressed.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION welcomed the results of the functional review and called for a consolidated document of staffing needs to facilitate discussions.

The EU supported the underlying rationale of the budget in relation to the implementation of the GBF and appreciated all the supporting documentation for budget discussions.

Supporting further information on how to generate efficiencies, CANADA expressed interest in further discussions on how best to work with the Secretariat to continue to assist them in the hosting of CBD meetings.

IIFB called for clarity on the recent relocation of the Peoples and Biodiversity Unit to the Engagement and Cooperation Unit under the Economic and Societal Transformation Division, rather than maintained under the Science, Monitoring and Capacity Division.

Parties engaged in informal consultations and these discussions will continue at COP 17.

Closing Plenary

On Wednesday, 12 August, Rapporteur Bilal Qtishat (Jordan) introduced the meeting's report ([CBD/SBI/6/L.1](#)). The EU confirmed that during the meeting, Ireland spoke on behalf of the EU, asking that this be corrected in the report. TÜRKIYE stated that there are no groups within its territory that it considers falling under the term "Indigenous Peoples," and expressed their belief that the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples refers to the exercise of self-determination, in line with UN Charter obligations regarding non-interference in the sovereignty, integrity, and political unity of states. Chair Souza Nina confirmed that the meeting report would reflect these statements, and the SBI adopted the report.

In closing remarks, CBD Executive Secretary Astrid Schomaker lauded delegates for a very productive meeting over the past 10 days, noting that they could leave Nairobi "with a reasonable sense of satisfaction" over what had been achieved. She cautioned, however, that "a lot more determination, commitment and stamina" will be required to reach the finish line in Yerevan, and called on delegates to "recharge their batteries" ahead of COP 17. She also highlighted the forthcoming Kunming Dialogue as an opportunity to bring together Parties and stakeholders outside the negotiations to strengthen Party-led peer review and whole-of-society engagement.

ARMENIA, as incoming COP 17 President, said they would take from Nairobi not only the outcomes of SBI 7 but also the gratifying momentum that would be essential for a successful COP 17.

SBI 7 Chair Souza Della Nina thanked delegates and the Co-Chairs for their hard work, adding the shared commitment to implementing the GBF remained as strong as ever. She said the recommendations emerging from SBI 7 will provide important contributions to COP 17 and called on delegates to arrive in Yerevan ready to finish what they had started in Rome and continued in Nairobi. Expressing sadness that she would not be joining delegates at COP 17, she said it had been an honor to chair the meeting and thanked delegates for their commitment, which had been an inspiration to her own work. She gavelled the meeting closed at 6:16 pm.

A Brief Analysis of the Meetings

The Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF), adopted in 2022, established a pathway towards a world living in harmony with nature by 2050, with 23 targets to be achieved by 2030. Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) recognized at the outset that political goodwill alone would not be enough, but that the Framework's ambition would require everyone on board, all of government and all of society, doing their part to turn ambition to action.

But countries began the journey from vastly different starting lines and, three years on, some of the most megadiverse regions continue to lag behind, while bearing the greatest burden and cost of

biodiversity loss. Historical inequalities in implementation are seen as the central challenge to whether the ambition will be realized. For developing countries and countries with emerging economies, these inequalities have taken the shape of persistent gaps in financial resources and scientific, technological, and institutional capacities. In the global review of collective progress in implementation of the GBF (GRI), these inequalities have been classified as gaps, hurdles, and barriers to progress.

The signals from the first global review of collective progress and the meetings of SBSTTA 28 and SBI 7 are clear: progress is uneven and implementation is not adequate to put the 2030 targets and mission within reach.

This brief analysis examines how the Nairobi meetings responded to the implementation challenges facing the GBF, assessing progress, and gaps and barriers revealed by the GRI. It considers whether the outcomes of the meetings provide the necessary means, momentum, and direction to accelerate implementation at the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 17) later this year.

Three years later...

At both SBSTTA 28 and SBI 7, Parties to the CBD lauded the Secretariat for producing the most comprehensive evidence base on GBF implementation than any single biodiversity reporting stream available. The GRI synthesizes national reports from 129 Parties, NBSAPs from 89 Parties and national targets from 162 Parties, complemented by scientific information, Indigenous and traditional knowledge, and other knowledge systems.

The overarching message of the GRI is that the GBF has generated unprecedented engagement, action and learning, but progress is not yet occurring at the pace or scale needed to secure the 2030 mission. This message captures both the level of progress in three years, yet also the significance of the shortcomings that undermine the ambitions of the 2030 mission, “to take urgent action to halt and reverse biodiversity loss to put nature on a path to recovery for the benefit of people and planet.”

The brakes, however, come from the clear unevenness of this progress. While the GRI shows clear signs of momentum, progress is far from uniform across the 23 targets, across regions, and between different dimensions of implementation. The traffic-light indicators used in the GRI provide a visual snapshot of the pace of progress across the 23 targets, distinguishing areas where implementation is advancing from those where significant gaps remain. Only one target reached the green category (Target 8, on minimizing the impacts of climate change and ocean acidification on biodiversity), while most remain in amber, orange or red, signaling that progress is occurring but is not yet at the necessary pace or scale.

The geographical unevenness in progress was widely understood as reflecting the different starting lines of developed and developing countries, once again bringing to the fore the familiar call for a level playing field. The message from the meetings was that while ambition may be shared, the means and capacities to act are not, and countries differ significantly in their ability to collect and use data, establish institutions, mobilize finance to implement the targets, build technical expertise required, and translate global commitments into action on the ground.

Delegates raised data accuracy and inferences as an area of concern. They noted that significant data deficiencies could skew the picture, particularly for regions and countries with limited capacity for data collection, monitoring and reporting. Brazil, India, Fiji,

Egypt and others cautioned against drawing premature conclusions from the incomplete data submitted, emphasizing the distinction between gaps in implementation and gaps in data, monitoring, and reporting. P-SIDS stressed that due to inability to assess timely financial assistance, most of their region is not represented in the GRI.

Delegates also cautioned against ranking Parties’ performance based on the GRI, saying this is unproductive and regressive. The GRI, delegates said, should instead provide a facilitative basis for identifying successes, gaps, challenges and opportunities and, crucially, for directing greater support and action where they are most needed.

The gaps and hurdles exposed by the first global review show, however, that the foundations laid over the past three years must now translate into accelerated and more equitable action. Bridging these disparities will be essential to turning the GBF’s ambition into implementation at the pace and scale required by 2030.

The Finance Gap: A hurdle to implementation

Will increased funding solve everything? Not on its own. But without adequate, predictable, and accessible finance, implementation will remain impossible and accelerating progress out of reach for those already underrepresented in the GRI.

Finance emerged as the clearest implementation hurdle. Developing countries raised concern that the ninth replenishment of the Global Environment Facility (GEF-9) represents a reduction of close to 27% compared with GEF-8, at precisely the moment when Parties are expected to accelerate GBF implementation. One delegate underscored the broader implication of withdrawal of support by a major global power, warning, “when you have one major donor withdrawing support, it can have a ripple effect on an entire finance mechanism.” Many developing countries also highlighted unreasonable debt burdens and economic interests that continue to undermine biodiversity.

At the same time, those developed countries with obligations under the Convention to provide financial resources emphasized the need to broaden the contributor base. In a joint statement, Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, and the UK called for a broader and more sustainable base of contributors and questioned whether the list of developed country Parties, unchanged since 2006, continues to reflect current economic realities. The exchange underscored a growing fault line regarding how to reconcile the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR) and developed countries’ obligations to provide means of implementation with calls for a broader sharing of the financial burden in light of changing economic circumstances.

This debate over who should contribute, and on what basis, also fed into concerns over the governance of the Cali Fund. Developing countries questioned the transparency of a memorandum of understanding signed between the CBD Secretariat, acting as interim Secretariat of the Cali Fund, and the UN Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office in the absence of COP approval. For some, this raised a deeper concern that governance arrangements could shift the Fund away from its foundational purpose of directly serving the needs of developing countries and towards a more donor-driven endeavor.

Another global contradiction highlighted by CBD Executive Secretary Astrid Schomaker shows while investment in nature is growing, means of implementation continue to lag, in part because financial flows remain fundamentally misaligned with biodiversity objectives. Citing findings from [UNEP’s State of Finance for Nature](#)

[report](#), she reported that for every USD 1 invested in protecting nature, around USD 30 is spent on activities that destroy it.

Finance also cannot be considered in isolation from capacity. Countries need not only money, but the institutions, technical and technological expertise, data systems, and knowledge needed to turn resources into implementation. The means of implementation are therefore interconnected: finance without capacity may not deliver results, while capacity without predictable finance cannot be sustained.

Amid these challenges, a glimmer of hope emerged in Nairobi. The Kunming Biodiversity Fund Secretariat announced a Call for Proposals to support developing countries in addressing implementation gaps identified in the GRI. Such targeted support offers a hopeful indication of how finance, when directed towards clearly identified gaps and national priorities, can begin to translate the GRI's outcomes into concrete accelerated actions.

The Yerevan Pathway

All roads now lead to Yerevan. The destination is still as clear as when Parties took their first step on the road to GBF implementation. However, delegates leave Nairobi for Yerevan with a central question, "What will it take to implement the GBF in the four years remaining that the past three years have not been able to achieve?"

The answer cannot simply be another reaffirmation of ambition. The message from Nairobi is thus one of accelerating implementation, but also closing capacity gaps, mobilizing resources, improving data and knowledge, aligning policies, and strengthening the institutions and partnerships that can translate global commitments into action on the ground.

Three years into the journey, the choice is no longer whether to move forward. It is whether we can move fast enough, and together, put nature on a path to recovery by 2030.

Upcoming Meetings

UN Convention to Combat Desertification COP 17: Delegates at the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties will address the interconnected challenges of desertification, land degradation, and drought under the theme "Restoring Land, Restoring Hope." **dates:** 17–28 August 2026 **location:** Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia **www:** unccd.int/cop17

70th Meeting of the International Whaling Commission (IWC70): The IWC is responsible for management of whaling and conservation of whales. The IWC work programme now also includes bycatch and entanglement, ship strikes, ocean noise, pollution and debris, and sustainable whale watching. **dates:** 27 September – 2 October 2026 **location:** Hobart, Australia **www:** iwc.int/events-and-workshops/iwc70-2026

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
ABNJ	Areas beyond national jurisdiction
AHSTAG	Ad Hoc Scientific and Technical Advisory Group
AHTEG	Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group
BBNJ	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
BCH	Biosafety Clearing-House
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBDR	Common but differentiated responsibilities
CEPA	Communication, education and public awareness
CHM	Clearing-House Mechanism
COP	Conference of the Parties
CP	Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety
CRP	Conference room paper
DRC	Democratic Republic of the Congo
DSI	Digital sequence information
EBSAs	Ecologically or biologically significant marine areas
FoC	Friends of the Chair
FPIC	Free, prior and informed consent
GBF	Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
GBFF	Global Biodiversity Framework Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GRI	Global review of collective progress in the implementation of the GBF
GRULAC	Latin American and Caribbean Group
GYBN	Global Youth Biodiversity Network
IIFB	International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity
ILK	Indigenous and local knowledge
IPBES	Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
IPLCs	Indigenous Peoples and local communities
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
LDCs	Least developed countries
LMMCs	Like-minded Megadiverse Countries
LMOs	Living modified organisms
MEAs	Multilateral environmental agreements
MoI	Means of implementation
MOP	Meeting of the Parties
MoU	Memorandum of understanding
NP	Nagoya Protocol
NBSAPs	National biodiversity strategies and action plans
OECMs	Other effective area-based conservation measures
PMRR	Planning, monitoring, reporting, and review
P-SIDS	Pacific small island developing states
SB8j	Subsidiary Body on Article 8(j) and Other Provisions of the Convention Related to Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities
SBI	Subsidiary Body on Implementation
SBSTTA	Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice
SIDS	Small island developing states
ToR	Terms of reference
TSCM	Technical and scientific cooperation mechanism
UAE	United Arab Emirates
UNEP	UN Environment Programme