

Briefing on opportunities for climate-biodiversity synergies across international agendas

Edgar Fernández Fernández, Ximena Bénard-Tertrais, Juan Pablo Sierra Suárez
September 2024



This briefing¹ provides advice on the main opportunities available to raise the profile of and make progress on enhancing climate and biodiversity synergies by linking both international agendas, as part of the negotiation space offered at the upcoming 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP16) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in Cali, Colombia, and on the way to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) COP29 in Baku, Azerbaijan, and COP30 in Belém do Pará, Brazil.

In short

To promote climate-biodiversity synergies, it is recommended for Parties at COP16 to²:

1. [Ensure the development of additional GBF indicators for Targets 8 and 19\(e\)](#)
2. [Encourage coherence between revised NBSAPs and next NDCs](#)
3. [Encourage greater collaboration between IPBES and IPCC](#)
4. [Support the establishment of a joint work program between the three Rio Conventions](#)
5. [Formalize the role of CBD Action Agenda Champions](#)

Why are synergies between the climate and biodiversity regimes important?

Climate and biodiversity, as well as the global crises of climate change and biodiversity loss, are inextricably connected. One crisis cannot be solved without solving the other, and they both have negative consequences on people and the ecosystems they depend on. Ecosystems have been paramount to the planet's resilience in the face of anthropogenic greenhouse gases: [59% of emissions](#) from 1850 to 2019 was absorbed by the land and ocean sink. Besides playing an essential role in climate mitigation, they also provide key [adaptation options](#). Still, their effectiveness in delivering mitigation and adaptation benefits decreases with every fraction of global temperature rise.

Despite their contribution to people and climate stability, ecosystems are negatively affected by climate change, which is the [third driver](#) of biodiversity loss. Furthermore, climate action narrowly focused on mitigation and adaptation may also negatively affect natural systems and further reduce their limited natural capacity to adapt.




¹ Cite as: Fernández Fernández, E., Bénard-Tertrais, X., Sierra Suárez, J.P. (2024) '**Briefing on opportunities for climate-biodiversity synergies across international agendas**'. Transforma.

² This is not intended to provide an exhaustive list of opportunities. Other opportunities related to areas such as local communities and indigenous peoples, environmental and social safeguards and specific outcomes of the first GST remain to be explored further.

This close relationship has raised awareness of the potential of leveraging existing synergies between climate mitigation and adaptation and action to halt and reverse biodiversity loss. The [Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework](#) (GBF) adopted in 2022 includes, for instance, three targets that promote these synergies – Target 8, Target 11 and Target 19e (Table 1) – and calls to integrate them into policy and planning. The [first Global Stocktake](#) (GST) at COP28 (2023) also emphasized “the importance of conserving, protecting and restoring nature and ecosystems towards achieving the Paris Agreement temperature goal, including through enhanced efforts towards halting and reversing deforestation and forest degradation by 2030, [...] and by conserving biodiversity [...] in line with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework”.

Therefore, there is currently momentum to push for more complementary decisions between CBD and UNFCCC COPs with the upcoming COP16 Cali (Oct. 2024), COP29 Baku (Nov. 2024), and COP30 Belém do Pará (Nov. 2025).

Table 1: Climate-biodiversity synergies-related GBF targets

	<p>GBF Target 8: <i>Minimize the impact of climate change and ocean acidification on biodiversity and increase its resilience through mitigation, adaptation, and disaster risk reduction actions, including through nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches, while minimizing negative and fostering positive impacts of climate action on biodiversity.</i></p>
	<p>GBF Target 11: <i>Restore, maintain and enhance nature’s contributions to people, including ecosystem functions and services, such as regulation of air, water and climate, soil health, pollination and reduction of disease risk, as well as protection from natural hazards and disasters, through nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches for the benefit of all people and nature.</i></p>
	<p>GBF Target 19(e): <i>Substantially and progressively increase the level of financial resources from all sources, in an effective, timely and easily accessible manner, including domestic, international, public and private resources, in accordance with Article 20 of the Convention, to implement national biodiversity strategies and action plans, by 2030 mobilizing at least 200 billion United States dollars per year, including by: e) Optimizing co-benefits and synergies of finance targeting the biodiversity and climate crises.</i></p>

Source: [The Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework 2030 targets](#).

Opportunities for synergies

1. GBF targets' indicators and monitoring framework

Recommendation: To ensure the development of additional GBF indicators for targets 8 and 19(e)³ that enable the monitoring of progress on climate and biodiversity synergies and hence facilitate the implementation of relevant policies.

- COP16 provisional agenda item 10: Mechanisms for planning, monitoring, reporting and review

COP15 adopted the [monitoring framework](#) for the GBF and decided to consider its review in order to finish its development at COP16. In this line, the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators (AHTEGI) was established to advise on the further operationalization of the monitoring framework, and the CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) was requested to review the outcomes of the AHTEGI, to complete the scientific and technical review of the monitoring framework, and to report its findings for subsequent consideration of the CBD Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI) and COP16.

The framework includes four types of indicators:

1. Headline indicators: a minimum set of mandatory, high-level indicators intended to capture the overall scope of the goals and targets of the GBF. They may not capture all components of a goal or a target, but for analytical purposes, they can be complemented, as appropriate, with the component and complementary indicators.
2. Global level indicators collated from binary yes/no responses in national reports: These mandatory indicators provide a count of the number of countries having undertaken specific activities.
3. Component indicators: a list of optional indicators that, together with the headline indicators, cover components of the goals and targets of the GBF.
4. Complementary indicators: a list of optional indicators for thematic or in-depth analysis of each goal and target.

In its [gap analysis](#) of the GBF monitoring framework, the AHTEGI concludes that some gaps remain, and that as a result of these gaps, most of the goals and targets are not completely covered by the framework.

³ For this briefing, we focused on the examples of Targets 8 and 19(e) while acknowledging that a similar analysis should also be made for Target 11.

Headline indicators are missing for Targets 8 and 19(e) of the GBF, which are relevant for climate-biodiversity synergies. On Target 8, the AHTEGI concluded that its binary indicator partially covers the target's elements (67%). It recognized, however, that this binary indicator “provides no information about the resilience of biodiversity nor about how these impacts are changing and therefore only partially allows progress tracking” and that only the Bioclimatic Ecosystem Resilience Index ([BERI](#)) complementary indicator partially addresses biodiversity and resilience to climate change. Regarding Target 19(e), the AHTEGI concluded that no indicators are available to track progress.

As the AHTEGI has indicated, it is for Parties to decide if the gaps identified need to be filled, and to what extent the monitoring framework should cover all elements of all targets. **It is, therefore, important for Parties at COP16 to keep alive the possibility of continuing to work on filling the gaps on indicators, including those appropriate for measuring outcomes related to climate-biodiversity synergies-related targets.**

In this line, SBSTTA's draft decision recommendation on the [monitoring framework for the GBF](#), to be considered at COP16, contains paragraphs 28 and 29 (both in square brackets⁴), which decide to review the use of the monitoring framework indicators at COP17, in conjunction with the global review of collective progress in the implementation of the GBF to be conducted at COP17, and that the SBSTTA should consider additional indicators, if relevant and available, at a meeting held before COP17 for submission to this COP, as part of the review of the implementation of the GBF. Paragraph 30 of the draft decision recommendation (in square brackets as well) requests the Executive Secretary to work with Parties, the secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements, and others to fill the gaps in the monitoring framework, and in particular those described in Annex III of the draft decision (in square brackets). In this annex, it is indicated that the binary indicator for Target 8 “is focused on the measures and processes in place but fails to address the impacts of climate action, climate change and ocean acidification on biodiversity,” and that for Target 19(e) “the optimization of co-benefits and synergies of finance for climate and biodiversity is not well covered.” **Thus, it is important that these paragraphs and Annex III are maintained as they are in the final COP16 decision.**

One opportunity for cooperative work between CBD and UNFCCC on these synergies-related targets is to take advantage of the ongoing 2-year [UAE-Belém Work Programme on Indicators](#) for measuring progress towards the adaptation targets set out at COP28, mainly the target of “reducing climate impacts on ecosystems and biodiversity, and accelerating the use of ecosystem-based adaptation and nature-based solutions, including through their management, enhancement, restoration and conservation and the protection of terrestrial inland water, mountain, marine and coastal ecosystems.” Collaboration on indicators for the GBF and the Global Goal on Adaptation was one of the areas for further strengthening cooperation identified in the [Bern III Conference](#).

⁴ Square brackets are used in international negotiations to indicate a lack of agreement about the text they contain and, therefore, the need for further discussion.

The above-mentioned SBSTTA's draft decision recommendation on the monitoring framework for the GBF contains paragraph 11 (in square brackets) that welcomes the ongoing work on monitoring conducted under multilateral environmental agreements and other initiatives, with a specific mention, among others, to the UAE-Belém Work Programme on Indicators. It also contains paragraph 12 (in square brackets too) that invites the secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements and relevant initiatives to share information of relevant monitoring initiatives with the CBD Executive Secretary, "while stressing the need to ensure consistency with existing mandates," and requests the Executive Secretary to make such information available to Parties. **However, a stronger call could be made by COP16 for Parties to the CBD that are also Parties to the Paris Agreement to actively engage with work under the UAE-Belém Work Programme on Indicators, and for SBSTTA to take into consideration the outcomes of the UAE-Belém Work Programme on Indicators (expected to be adopted at COP30 in Belém) as part of its consideration of additional indicators for the GBF at the above-mentioned meeting to be held before COP17**, which would serve as input for the GBF implementation global review at COP17. This would not only benefit the quality and coherence of the indicators under both regimes, but would also help to reduce reporting burdens for Parties to both agreements.

2. Coherence between NBSAPs and NDCs

Recommendation: To call for alignment and coherence in planning and implementing revised National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs).

- COP16 provisional agenda item 13: Cooperation with international organizations and bodies established under other conventions
- COP16 provisional agenda item 25: Biodiversity and climate change

At CBD [COP15](#), Parties were requested to revise and update their NBSAPs, aligned with the GBF and its goals and targets, and to submit them by COP16 (Cali, 21 Oct-1 Nov 2024). At the same time, Parties not in a position to submit their revised NBSAPs by COP16 were requested to communicate national targets reflecting, as applicable, all the goals and targets of the GBF by COP16. Revised NBSAPs and national targets communicated will be subject to a global analysis of information at COP16⁵, to assess the contribution towards the GBF. Meanwhile, Parties to the Paris Agreement have to submit their next NDCs [at least 9 to 12 months](#) before COP30 (Baku, 11-22 Nov 2025). This coincidence in the timing for the preparation of both instruments represents a golden opportunity for national coordination in order to ensure synergies among the revised NBSAPs, biodiversity national targets, and NDCs.

⁵ In a [notification](#) to Parties, the Executive Secretary communicated that only those national targets and revised NBSAPs submitted by 1 August 2024 could be reflected in documentation for the global analysis.

Currently, no decision has been made by the CBD and UNFCCC governing bodies to align the revised NBSAPs or national targets with the next NDCs. Nevertheless, a strong political push was given to this linkage by the [COP28 Joint Statement on Climate, Nature and People](#), which was signed in the margins of COP28 by the UNFCCC COP28 and COP30 Presidencies, the CBD COP15 and COP16 Presidencies, and 14 other countries that are chairs or leads of voluntary partnerships, initiatives and coalitions. Among others, they affirmed their commitment to foster stronger synergies, integration and alignment in the planning and implementation of national climate, biodiversity and land restoration plans and strategies, with specific emphasis on ambition, comprehensiveness and coherence between the next round of NDCs, updated National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), and forthcoming revised NBSAPs. They also committed to work with their respective secretariats⁶ and member countries towards the achievement of those objectives.

The promotion of synergies among climate and biodiversity plans would, however, strongly benefit from robust political signals coming from decisions of the governing bodies of CBD and UNFCCC. As of 6 September 2024, [64](#) Parties have submitted national targets and [20](#) have submitted revised NBSAPs. For those Parties submitting national targets, the online reporting tool allows for national targets to be [revised](#) by Parties on an ongoing basis and for additional details to be added or revised as they become available, and some information related to the national targets may be updated or added later as NBSAPs are finalized. Hence, these Parties still have the possibility to align their national targets and revised NBSAPs with their next NDCs, if that is not the case yet. **COP16 is thus the first opportunity for a COP decision to call on Parties to revise their NBSAPs and prepare their next NDCs in a coordinated way, through a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach, in order to ensure coherence and alignment between them both at the moment of their planning and further implementation.**

SBSTTA's draft decision recommendation on [biodiversity and climate change](#) for COP16 already encourages Parties to integrate and promote, where appropriate, nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches to climate change adaptation and mitigation and disaster risk reduction into their NBSAPs and relevant national targets, and to promote synergies with other national planning processes established under the UNFCCC and other biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements.

Meanwhile, SBI's draft decision recommendation on [cooperation with other conventions and international organizations](#) invites Parties to the CBD that are also Parties to the UNFCCC and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) "to consider, as appropriate, opportunities to foster stronger synergies and coordination in the planning and implementation of national climate, biodiversity and land restoration plans and strategies and to strengthen, as appropriate, coherence among" revised NBSAPs, the next round of NDCs and the updated NAPs.

⁶ The secretariats of collaborating partnerships, coalitions and initiatives drafted a [statement of intent](#) to support actioning the COP28 Joint Statement agenda and formed the "Climate-Nature Coordination Platform", which is co-led by NDC Partnership and NBSAP Accelerator Partnership.

Both draft decision texts seem to cover appropriately the need for CBD COP16 to send signals on the need for alignment and coherence between NBSAPs and NDCs and should be, at a minimum, kept in the final COP decisions. However, **it could also be possible for COP16 to send a stronger signal on what the next NDCs should contain in order to align with revised NBSAPs, or, more broadly, with the GBF.** A precedent for this is CBD COP14 decision on [biodiversity and climate change](#), which encouraged Parties and other Governments “to integrate ecosystem-based approaches when updating their nationally determined contributions, where appropriate, and pursuing domestic climate action under the Paris Agreement, taking into account the importance of ensuring the integrity and functionality of all ecosystems, including oceans, and the protection of biodiversity”.

Such signals from COP16 could serve as a hook for UNFCCC COP29 to call on Parties to ensure alignment between the next NDCs, new or updated NAPs and revised NBSAPs. But **CBD COP could also address directly to UNFCCC COP by inviting the UNFCCC governing body to collaborate with the CBD in the promotion of synergies between such instruments.**

3. Increased collaboration between IPBES and IPCC

Recommendation: To encourage stronger and more formal collaboration between the Intergovernmental Science–Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to address a pressing need for joint work⁷.

- COP16 provisional agenda item 16: Scientific and technical needs to support the implementation of the Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, including implications for the programmes of work of the Convention
- COP16 provisional agenda item 25: Biodiversity and climate change

Joint work between IPBES and IPCC has been practically nonexistent. Although the IPCC and IPBES informally [exchange information](#) on ongoing and upcoming work at various levels and share experiences regarding the implementation of their work programmes, a more systematic collaboration is needed. This is a crucial gap to address as the information generated and gathered by both institutions is the primary and most trusted source of up-to-date scientific information on synergies available to policymakers and other stakeholders.

Traditionally, the interest about close collaboration has come from the IPBES side. This was the case, for example, of the [IPBES-IPCC co-sponsored workshop](#) that took place virtually

⁷ Ideally, and in line with recommendation number 4 on increased coordination across the Rio Conventions, joint work and enhanced collaboration between IPBES and IPCC should also include the [UNCCD Science–Policy Interface](#) (SPI).

in 2020. This workshop originated from an [IPBES 7th Plenary decision](#), but was never formally recognized by the IPCC [Plenary](#).

Recently, the IPBES Secretariat has prepared and submitted notes for consideration at the [60th](#) and [61st](#) sessions of the IPCC (both in 2024) under the agenda item on matters related to UNFCCC and other international bodies, in order to describe outcomes of the [IPBES 10th Plenary session](#), including with regards to the engagement of IPBES and IPCC, and to update on current work of IPBES relevant to the work of IPCC. From the IPCC side, there has been no concrete response yet to the efforts for engagement made by the IPBES. Discussions have continued at [IPCC-60](#) and [IPCC-61](#) without getting to any decision.

Today, there is a clear opportunity for joint work and collaboration between the IPBES and the IPCC, particularly since the seventh assessment cycle (AR7) of the IPCC and the second global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services are still in their initial stages. However, the current picture is that the [IPCC Strategic Planning Schedule](#) for the entire seventh assessment cycle does not include any explicit activity or product related to filling knowledge gaps on climate and biodiversity synergies, nor do the six assessments currently ongoing or planned in the period up to 2030 from the IPBES, except for [the nexus assessment](#) which will be considered by the IPBES Plenary at IPBES-11.

As part of its agenda item on scientific and technical needs to support the implementation of the GBF, COP16 still has to decide whether inviting or not the IPBES to consider a request, or requests, for additional assessments, and their topics. Even though the SBSTTA26 recommendation under its agenda item on [matters related to the IPBES](#) identified five topics, one of those being “biodiversity and climate change”, in the draft decision for COP16 contained in the same recommendation the issue appears in square brackets, with no text inside. Agreeing to invite IPBES to produce an assessment on this topic could be a hook for CBD COP16 and IPBES to reiterate to the IPCC the urgent need for joint work between both intergovernmental bodies. In this line, **COP16 could invite the IPCC to consider working jointly with the IPBES on this assessment when considering again, at IPCC-62 (December 2024), the reiterated requests from IPBES for enhancing collaboration.** Important here is to recall the precedent of [IPCC Technical Paper V](#) on Climate Change and Biodiversity (2002), which was produced in response to [an invitation](#) from CBD SBSTTA.

In its recommendation on [biodiversity and climate change](#) adopted on 19 October 2023, SBSTTA encouraged “further collaboration” between IPBES and IPCC, “reaffirming the need for transparency for any activity, in conformity with the decisions of the Panel and the Platform and their respective policies and procedures”; however, it did not include anything along these lines in its draft decision recommendation to COP16. **Hence, it would be important to bring this or stronger language, such as an invitation for “joint work” between IPBES and IPCC, into the decision text at COP16.** The current text in the draft decision recommendation merely welcomes [IPBES decision 10/1](#) (2 September 2023), in which the Plenary decided to foster further collaboration between IPBES and IPCC.

4. Increased coordination across Rio Conventions

Recommendation: To support establishing a joint work program between the three Rio Conventions to maximize synergies.

- COP16 provisional agenda item 13: Cooperation with international organizations and bodies established under other conventions
- COP16 provisional agenda item 25: Biodiversity and climate change

Cooperation between the Rio Conventions has traditionally been limited to collaboration among their secretariats; there has been no coordinated work or decisions on substantive issues among the decision-making bodies of the conventions. A [Joint Liaison Group](#) was established in 2001 by the secretariats to enhance coordination between the three Conventions, including the exchange of relevant information, and explore options for further cooperation, including the possibility of a joint work plan. However, this group seems less active in recent years, as its last report dates from [2016](#). Still, some activity remains through the [Rio Conventions Joint Capacity-building Programme](#).

As the climate, biodiversity and land crises become more severe and intertwined, there is an urgently increasing need to address climate change, biodiversity loss and land degradation in an integrated manner at the level of the governing bodies of the respective conventions.

An option to foster greater collaboration between the three Conventions and, ultimately, leading to coherent implementation of environmental action at the national level from a more comprehensive and holistic perspective that does not isolate issues or creates artificial separations, would be to establish a joint work programme to pursue the implementation of national and international efforts under the three Conventions in a coherent and synergistic manner.

As context, the UNFCCC has no experience implementing joint work programmes with other conventions beyond cooperation of the UNFCCC secretariat with other secretariats such as those of [the International Civil Aviation Organization \(ICAO\)](#) and [the International Maritime Organization \(IMO\)](#). On the other hand, the CBD and the UNCCD have had a joint work programme between them on biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands. The joint work programme was developed by the secretariats of both Conventions at the request of CBD COP5 in 2000 and was welcomed at CBD [COP7](#). CBD has also had a joint work programme with the Convention on Migratory Species (2002-2005), which was also developed by the secretariats of the Conventions and welcomed by the CBD COP.

Currently, two paragraphs in draft decisions recommended by the SBSTTA and SBI for adoption at COP16 make reference to the potentiality of establishing a joint work programme among the Rio Conventions:

- Recommendation adopted by the SBI on 29 May 2024: [4/9. Cooperation with other conventions and international organizations](#), para 18: “Requests the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources: ... (b) To strengthen collaboration with the secretariats of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa, through such modalities as the Joint Liaison Group of the Rio Conventions, to identify opportunities for the facilitation of national efforts to implement those conventions, facilitate the exchange of relevant information, continue to stress the importance of interlinkages between climate and biodiversity issues and explore the potential for a joint work programme among the Rio conventions”.
- Recommendation adopted by the SBSTTA on 19 October 2023: [25/8. Biodiversity and climate change](#), para 14: “Further requests the Executive Secretary to bring the present decision to the attention of the secretariats of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in order to discuss it in the context of the Joint Liaison Group of the Rio Conventions and the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions and to assess options for better integration, including by considering establishing a joint work programme to operationalize such integration at future meetings of the Conference of the Parties”.

These two paragraphs refer to a joint work programme that would be established and implemented by the secretariats of the three Rio Conventions. So it would be up to the secretariats to determine together the areas of work and the activities to be undertaken. Areas of work could include topics such as the formulation and implementation of aligned and coherent NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs, long-term strategies, and commitments under the UNCCD, safeguards to avoid negative impacts on biodiversity and land from climate mitigation and adaptation measures, and the protection and restoration of ecosystem integrity of natural carbon reservoirs. The proposed joint work programme by the secretariats would need to be welcomed or endorsed by the governing bodies of the three Rio Conventions.

The joint work programme contained in the draft decisions recommended by the SBI and the SBSTTA has of course budgetary implications, and there still could be some Parties that would find such a work programme somewhat invasive of the respective mandates of each convention. Still, it seems today as an option for broadening the scope of the current joint work between the three Rio Conventions secretariats, which is limited to their joint capacity-building programme, and enhancing synergies among the Conventions. **Hence, the text in the draft decisions should be maintained in the final COP16 decisions.**

But a joint work programme implemented by the secretariats of the Conventions should be complemented by, and should not replace, work on synergies under the formal processes of

each Convention that would lead to coherent and eventually mutually supportive decisions⁸ among the three COPs. **In this line, the text about the joint work programme could also be complemented by invitation from COP16 to the UNFCCC and UNCCD governing bodies to consider options for better integrating the GBF into programmes of work and other processes under those Conventions.** This could be a hook, for example, for the UNFCCC governing body to decide to establish a workstream on climate and nature and/or an ad-hoc technical expert group for the implementation of Article 5 of the Paris Agreement in a manner that is consistent with the GBF.

5. CBD Action Agenda High-Level Champions

Recommendation: To formalize the role of CBD Action Agenda High-Level Champions to promote the implementation of the GBF, including through synergistic climate-biodiversity action.

- COP16 provisional agenda item 17: Mainstreaming biodiversity within and across sectors

In 2014, the [Lima-Paris Action Agenda](#) under the UNFCCC was launched to highlight the important role of individual and collective commitments of non-state actors in the global response to climate change. One year later, at [COP21](#), Parties decided that the Presidents of the current and incoming COPs should each appoint one High-Level Champion to act on behalf of them to facilitate the execution of existing efforts and the scaling-up and introduction of new or strengthened voluntary efforts, initiatives and coalitions. The High-Level Champions serve for two years, with their terms overlapping for a full year to ensure continuity. In response to the COP21's invitation to all interested Parties and relevant organizations to provide support for the work of the champions, the UNFCCC secretariat immediately provided a small operational support unit. In 2016, the High-Level Champions launched the [Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action](#) to provide a foundation for how the UNFCCC process would catalyse and support climate action by Parties and non-Party stakeholders. Today, the High-Level Champions are supported by [a global team of experts](#) that helps them deliver on their mandate, and they lead several campaigns, such as [Race to Zero](#) and [Race to Resilience](#).

In 2018, the CBD COP14 and COP15 Presidencies and the CBD Secretariat launched [The Sharm El-Sheikh to Kunming Montreal Action Agenda for Nature and People](#) as an online platform to showcase commitments and contributions to biodiversity from non-State actors, to contribute to the formulation and implementation of the GBF. In July 2022,

⁸ CBD CP015 decision 15/13 invited the governing bodies of biodiversity-related conventions and relevant multilateral environmental agreements, as well as international organizations and other relevant programmes, "to contribute to the implementation and monitoring of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, in particular by further strengthening cooperation at the global level within their respective mandates and enhancing synergies among themselves, to encourage mutually supportive decisions, (...)"

Manuel Pulgar-Vidal was named the first [Action Agenda Champion for Nature and People](#). This role is the equivalent of the UNFCCC High-Level Champions, but has not been formalized by a CBD COP decision.

For many of the topics at stake at COP16, formalizing the role of a couple of CBD High-Level Champions through a COP decision could promote actions from sub-national governments, civil society and the private sector that support the implementation of the GBF, including a synergistic approach to climate and biodiversity policies. This would be a good way to keep up with the momentum for action towards meeting biodiversity targets during the two years between each CBD COP and ground the work of the CBD High-Level Champions on a comprehensive work plan to 2030.

The COP16 decision that formalizes the role of the CBD High-Level Champions should invite Parties and other stakeholders to provide support to the champions work, so that they can build a solid team of experts on which to rely. **The COP16 decision could also define a mandate for these champions to promote synergistic climate and biodiversity action of various relevant stakeholders, including by coordinating with the UNFCCC High-Level Champions.** Once the decision is adopted at COP16, the Presidents of COP16 and COP17 could nominate their High-Level Champions, with a term of one year for the COP16 champion and two years for the COP17 champion.