

WCS recommendations for CBD CoP17

Yerevan, Armenia, 19-30 October 2026



[WCS](#) will have additional overview materials highlighting our engagement at CBD CoP17. This document specifically addresses the text to be negotiated by Parties as part of the formal agenda. Please contact Alfred DeGemmis (adegemmis@wcs.org) regarding these recommendations.

Our comments below are in line with the overarching priorities outlined in our one-page summary.

Quick links, based on the CoP17 agenda:

- 7: Administration of the Convention on Biological Diversity
- 8a: Resource mobilization
- 8a: Financial mechanism
- 9a: Global review of collective progress in the implementation of the KM-GBF
- 9b: Monitoring framework for the KM-GBF
- 13: Cooperation with international organizations and other conventions
- 17a: Strategic review and analysis of the programmes of work under the CBD
- 17c: Strategic review of and updates to the programme of work on protected areas
- 17d: Areas of potential further work in the context of the Framework
- 18a: Biodiversity and climate change
- 18b: Sustainable wildlife management
- 18c: Marine and coastal biodiversity and island biodiversity
- 18f: Biodiversity and health

Agenda Item 7: “Administration of the Convention on Biological Diversity...”

Current draft decision: [CBD/COP/17/4](#)

Regarding the draft CoP17 decision, a brief note:

- We recommend that Parties align on a schedule for three intersessional meetings, one of each Subsidiary Body, to reduce transaction costs for the Secretariat, Parties, and Observers.

Agenda Item 8a: “Resource mobilization”

Current draft decision: [SBI/REC/7/2](#)

Regarding the draft CoP17 decision, we recommend that Parties:

- **Retain** [remove brackets on] text in OP2 that acknowledges a long-term, historical increase in biodiversity related flows, but recognizes that international public finance remains insufficient at present. Current levels of finance remain substantially below what is required to achieve the goals and targets of the KM-GBF and this shortfall is particularly acute for least developed countries and small island developing States that harbor

globally important biodiversity. Sustained, increased public flows should not prevent the CoP from adopting other calls around all countries correcting policy and financial incentives (see below), unlocking new domestic finance to move past a project cycle, and unlocking new and additional private sector finance through evidence-based programs.

- **Add text into this decision related to Target 18, which would call for reforming, repurposing and eliminating harmful incentives, including environmentally harmful subsidies.** Public expenditures that incentivize biodiversity loss often exceed investments directed toward biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. Reforming, repurposing and eliminating harmful incentives, including environmentally harmful subsidies, can generate substantial benefits by reducing pressures on nature while simultaneously freeing public resources for biodiversity-positive investments. This must be emphasized as part of a complete package on resource mobilization.

Agenda Item 8b: “Financial mechanism”

Current draft decision: [SBI/REC/7/3](#)

Regarding the draft CoP17 decision, we recommend that Parties:

- **Retain [remove brackets on] text in OP11: “while facilitating the full and effective participation of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, women and youth.”** In Decision 16/34 paragraph 4(l) it lays out the enabling action of “ensuring the full, equitable, inclusive, effective and gender-responsive representation and participation in decision-making of indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth.”
- **Retain [remove brackets on] text in OP12(f) on dedicated direct access modalities.** In addition to intermediary organizations who flow funds to communities, it is important for the GEF to facilitate simplified procedures and support Indigenous Peoples and local communities directly. There is an expanding ecosystem of Indigenous- led and territorial funds which have opened new strategic options for donors and are offering communities financing pathways designed and governed by their own movements, yet funding going directly to these and territorial organizations is still very small.

Agenda Item 9a: “Planning, monitoring, reporting and review: global review of collective progress in the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework”

Current draft decision: [SBI/REC/7/1](#) [part A]

Regarding the draft CoP17 decision, we recommend that Parties:

- **Retain [remove brackets on] text in OP22 (original) encouraging or inviting Parties to strengthen the scope and coverage of national commitments specifically to address key gaps.** Where the Global Review has noted key gaps in translating key concepts within global Targets, such preventing pathogen spillover under Target 5, into national targets, that information may be useful for Parties in providing elective/voluntary updates to national targets. We welcome the reference - currently bracketed - to the need to address existing gaps in KM-GBF implementation in marine ecosystems, but we would want to balance this against the opportunity to address other gaps identified in the global review but not included in the short list of targets.
- **Retain [remove brackets on] text in OP39 encouraging Parties to develop national ecosystem maps.** Ecosystems are a critical expression of biodiversity and provide a clear link to policy fora outside of the CBD. We support retaining the bracketed text in OP39,

which encourages Parties to develop national ecosystem maps from which other data and analyses can be derived or built. This is also responsive to Key Message A.4 of the Global Report, which *spatial planning, as elaborated in Target 1 of the Framework...could provide a foundation for building policy coherence and mainstreaming.*” Our experience supporting partners in Mozambique to [undertake](#) national-scale ecosystem mapping has enabled significant conservation action which would be challenging otherwise, including the identification of high-integrity ecosystems in line with Target 1 of the KM-GBF.

- **Retain** text in OP32 to maintain momentum on policy coherence and synergistic implementation. The science is clear that biodiversity and climate goals are interlinked, and no objectives of any individual biodiversity-related convention can be achieved in a vacuum. This paragraph responds directly to the Global Review findings, and echoes both civil society calls and [evidence](#) that biodiversity and climate strategies lack concrete linkages at the national and subnational level. [See also: OP12 in Agenda Item 9(b), below]. The challenge, however, is operationalizing a mainstreaming agenda, which must be reflected in requests to the Executive Secretary and budget discussions.
- **Retain** [remove brackets on] text in OPs 35 and 37 urging Parties to strengthen the engagement of all in planning and implementation, and text specifically about enabling the full and effective participation of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, women and youth.
- **Add** a new OP (after OP35), or include within the Leaders’ Declaration, a call for more investment in the people on the front lines of conservation. Initiatives such as the [Women Ocean Guardians](#) demonstrate how voluntary commitments are translated into KM-GBF implementation through a global partnership with a focus on gender-transformative ocean governance and women's leadership in marine conservation. Rangers, ecoguards, fisherfolk, and other people operating on the front lines of conservation are critical players in KM-GBF implementation, but these people and their management systems do not figure prominently into calls on enhancing implementation from 2026 to 2030.

Agenda Item 9b: “Monitoring Framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework”

Current draft decision: [SBI/REC/7/1](#) [part B]

Regarding the draft CoP17 decision, we recommend that Parties:

- **Retain** text in OP7 calling for the second global review to enhance the assessment of outcomes and effectiveness, and consider amending the ASHTAG’s mandate in this regard. The Global Review was clear about a lack of *“technical infrastructure and baselines needed to assess ecosystem health or management effectiveness. Gaps are particularly acute in marine and deep-water ecosystems...”* First, we would propose amending the language in OP7 to tie more directly to the 2050 Goals of the KM-GBF (e.g., outcomes as they pertain to enhancing ecosystem “integrity, connectivity, and resilience”). Second, WCS has extensive experience in deploying technological tools to streamline data collection and management for biodiversity monitoring and measuring outcome, including in the marine realm. Finally, we note the ongoing work of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas to explore these issues on [outcomes](#), and on ecological integrity.
- **Retain** [remove brackets on] text in OP11 and 22(j) looking forward to the second global review, and the value of informing investment in the areas needed. We acknowledge uncertainty regarding what might exist between 2030 and 2050 as an amended version of the KM-GBF. However, we strongly support language that would build directly on the

findings of global reviews rather than being developed in a vacuum. The design of the second global review should take this into account while remaining focused on historical efforts to implement the existing 2030 targets.

- **Retain**, within the ToR for the ASHTAG [Annex II, Paragraph 1(b)], language regarding the development of methodologies, particularly use of disaggregations, to assess whether monitoring gaps relate to data availability, technical capacity, or other barriers to reporting. The Global Report makes note of incomplete information on biome- or ecosystem-specific trends, which is a key means guiding investments in capacity building, methodological refinement, and more. However, there is also language on national or standalone indicator submissions that would be disaggregations of Headline indicators. This deserves greater analysis and clear recommendations, potentially worthy of consideration by any post-CoP17 expert group. Where methodological and data limitations hinder reporting on key threats to biodiversity (such as water pollution and indicator 7.1), we may need further technical guidance on how to address these challenges.

Agenda Item 13: “Cooperation with other conventions and international organizations”

Current draft decision: [SBI/REC/6/6](#)

Progress report on Biodiversity and Climate Change: [COP/17/11](#)

Regarding the draft CoP17 decision, we recommend that Parties:

- **Amend the placeholder in OP11 to welcome the multilevel roadmap.** A multilevel road map with options to enhance policy coherence is a concrete and actionable document that can be considered by Parties further. The work that went into the document published at [COP/17/11](#) was valuable and reflects expert input. This should be the basis for further cooperation.
- **Amend text to the requests to the Executive Secretary OP16(c) to include the multilevel roadmap in outreach to the Secretariats of the Rio Conventions.** While CBD Parties cannot decide for Parties to the other ‘Rio’ Conventions in Yerevan, they can ensure that every effort is made by this Convention to seek greater cooperation, efficiencies, and mutually reinforcing technical work. Sharing the multilevel roadmap is one way to advance conversations based on a concrete proposal. Elements can also be excerpted or discussed in the abstract.

Agenda Item 17(c): “Strategic review of and updates to the programme of work on protected areas”

Current draft decision: [SBSTTA/REC/28/5](#)

Regarding the draft CoP17 decision, we recommend that Parties:

- **Retain** text in OP14(c)(ii) calling for the Secretariat to compile perspectives on lessons learned with regards to Target 3 and “Ecological integrity..and resilience...including in the context of climate change.” It is critical that our efforts to establish, manage, monitor, and report on area-based conservation measures maintain a focus on the long-term objectives of the KM-GBF. Without integrating area-based measures into broader ecosystem conservation strategies, and without considering the impacts of climate change on those broader strategies, individual near-term measures will be destined to fail. This is an essential process to capture views from Parties, which can also inform the World Congress

on Protected and Conserved Areas being convened by the Government of Panama and the IUCN in 2027.

- **Amend** text in OP6, sub-paragraph (c)(v) to call for greater examination of nature-culture connections. A key aspect is missing within this programme of work: the connection between the KM-GBF and the management of biocultural linkages and integrity that is often managed in partnership with culture and other ministries. In an era of decreasing resources, the power of nature-culture connections can and should be enhanced, building on the work and expertise under tools like the World Heritage Convention.
- **Retain** [remove brackets on] text in OP 14(c)(iii) in line with the principles of no contact, intangibility, and precaution. Indigenous Peoples in voluntary isolation require a standard of no contact as the means to respect their rights to self-determination.

Agenda Item 17(d): “Areas of potential further work in the context of the Framework”

Current draft decision: [SBSTTA/REC/27/6](#)

Regarding the draft CoP17 decision, we recommend that Parties:

- **Retain** the text in Draft Decision B. Pollution is a critical threat to biodiversity, and often links different ecological realms and management authorities (e.g., land-based pollution [affecting](#) marine protected areas). This is a unique and pressing challenge for halting and reversing biodiversity loss, and the CBD is well placed to invest more in this area. Should specific forms of pollution be mentioned we would urge references to wastewater, noise, and other forms of pollution negatively impacting marine species and ecosystems.

Agenda Item 18(a): “Biodiversity and climate change”

Draft CoP17 decision: [SBSTTA/REC/27/3](#)

Progress report on Biodiversity and Climate Change: [COP/17/11](#)

Regarding the draft CoP17 decision, we recommend that Parties:

- **Retain** the text in OP6, sub-paragraph (a) of the draft CoP17 decision, particularly that focused on ecosystem integrity. In line with submissions from [South Africa](#), [Colombia](#), and [New Zealand](#), it is essential that ecosystem integrity be considered as a key nexus for synergistic actions on biodiversity loss and climate change. Evidence is clear that ecosystem integrity drives climate regulation services and provides outside returns on investment for both climate mitigation, climate adaptation, and the recovery of biodiversity.
- **Amend** text in OP15 to request that the Executive Secretary take into consideration the multilevel roadmap in outreach to counterparts within other Rio Conventions, including the UNFCCC. The multilevel roadmap and its elements provide a concrete basis for further discussion among Parties to the different Rio Conventions, as well as their governing bodies.

Agenda Item 18(b): “Sustainable wildlife management”

Draft CoP17 decision: [SBSTTA/REC/28/4](#)

Regarding the draft CoP17 decision, we recommend that Parties:

- **Retain** the principles and thematic areas within the voluntary guidance ensuring that sustainable use of biodiversity does not impact ecological integrity. Piecemeal implementation and/or unforeseen cumulative impacts are a key driver of ecosystem collapse. The Thematic Area within the guidance on ecological integrity, including the safeguards that sustainable wildlife management “*should maintain ecosystem integrity and biodiversity, ensuring that management does not result in long-term habitat degradation, loss of ecosystem function or the introduction and spread of invasive alien species,*” is an essential guardrail to ensure that sustainable use is truly sustainable.
- **Amend text to add Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) into OP2.** Paragraph 23 of the voluntary global guidance on the sustainable management of wildlife explicitly mentioned that decision making processes should be guided by free, prior and informed consent as per the following: “23. Decision-making processes affecting wildlife use and management should be guided by the principle of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), ensuring that indigenous peoples and local communities are able to participate effectively and make informed decisions throughout planning, implementation, monitoring and review processes.” A specific reference to FPIC in the context operative paragraph 2 would carry that important concept into the CoP decision.

Agenda Item 18(d): “Biodiversity and health”

Draft CoP17 decision: [SBSTTA/REC/27/10](#)

Progress report by CBD Secretariat on Biodiversity and Health: [COP/17/Z](#)

Please note: A 1-pager regarding the list of indicators compiled in Annex II of Document 17/7 will be made available on [wcs.org/cbd](#). However, we recognize and support an expert workshop prior to the next meeting of SBSTTA in 2027/2028.

Regarding the draft CoP17 decision, we recommend that Parties:

- **Retain** [remove the brackets on] text in OP2 welcoming the WHO Agreement on Pandemic Prevention, Preparedness and Response. The adoption of the WHO Agreement is a landmark agreement with significant implications for management of biodiversity in order to prevent the next pandemic of zoonotic origin. The Global Action Plan was designed to be compatible and complementary to the activities considered under the WHO Agreement. However, greater dialogue and support to Parties is essential to ensure that biodiversity-related or relevant strategies for prevention at source, or deep prevention, is integrated into national One Health strategies and plans.
- **Retain** [remove the brackets on] text in OP7, particularly in the un-bracketed sub-paragraph which requests the Secretariat to synthesize information from Parties on the implementation of the Global Action Plan and the mainstreaming of biodiversity and health interlinkages. There is no formal reporting mechanism for the Global Action Plan, and this is a critical interim step until indicators and metrics can be better integrated into KM-GBF implementation and the planning, monitoring, reporting, and review cycle.