UNITED NATIONS

UNEP/EA.7/INF/6

United Nations Environment Programme

Distr.: General
17 October 2025

English only

UNEDITED ADVANCE VERSION

United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme
Seventh session
Nairobi, 8–12 December 2025
Item 10 of the provisional agenda*

Cooperation with multilateral environmental agreements.

Background note to support discussion on agenda item 10 on cooperation with multilateral environmental agreements

Note by the secretariat

I. Introduction

1. The sixth session of the United Nations Environment Assembly adopted resolutions 6/4 and 6/6 which in their respective operative paragraphs 2(b) and 3(b) requested the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to collect and synthesize good practices and to analyse case studies, success stories and lessons learned from national-level synergies in the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs).

2. The report annexed to the present note, entitled Learning from experiences to facilitate national synergies in the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements, presents an analysis of 20 national case studies illustrating practical approaches to synergistic implementation of MEAs. The document highlights good practices, tools and lessons learned from across all United Nations regions, offering insights into enabling conditions, institutional mechanisms and benefits that can inform further efforts to strengthen cooperation across MEAs at the national level.

3. The report annexed to the present note has been prepared to support the consideration of the agenda item on cooperation with multilateral environmental agreements and the exchange of views between Member States and stakeholders in the high-level dialogues organized under this agenda item. The report is presented without formal editing.

* UNEP/EA.7/1.

Annex*

Learning from Experiences to Facilitate National Synergies in the Implementation of Multilateral Environmental Agreements

Contents

I. Introduction 3

II. Background 3

III. Overview of Cases 5

IV. Analysis of National Experiences....11

A. Enabling Conditions and Good Practices....11

B. Approaches and Tools for Synergistic Implementation....13

C. Benefits from Synergies in National MEA Implementation....15

V. Lessons learned from national implementation....16

VI. Conclusions 18

VII. Resources for Further Information....18

VIII. Appendixes 19

A. Appendix 1: Examples of National Approaches to the Collaborative Implementation of MEAs 19

B. Appendix 2: Questionnaire Used to Collect National Case Information....62

C. Appendix 3: Approach to Selection and Analysis of National Case Studies....68

* The annex has not been formally edited.

I. Introduction

1. This background document has been developed in response to two resolutions adopted at the 6th session of the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA) that address MEA implementation at the national level. UNEA Resolution 6/4 on Promoting synergies, cooperation or collaboration for national implementation of multilateral environmental agreements and other relevant environmental instruments requests that UNEP "collect and synthesize good practices, tools, success stories, and lessons learned and share them with Member States, relevant partners and stakeholders".[1] UNEA Resolution 6/6 further mandates UNEP to analyse case studies, success stories, and lessons learned from national level synergies in the implementation of MEAs.[2] The resolutions build upon the years of work and partnership between UNEP and MEA Secretariats in supporting countries in the coherent and synergistic implementation of MEAs through the provision of capacity-building and practical tools for institutional cooperation. Further details on UNEP's activities in support of the implementation of these two resolutions are provided in the corresponding Progress Report of the Executive Director.[3]

2. The compilation of national experiences in this document also serves as a background document for the 7th session of UNEA agenda item on "Cooperation with multilateral environmental agreements," including the "MEAs Day". The MEAs Day aims to highlight cooperation between UNEP and MEAs as well as among MEAs - celebrating success stories, championing integrated solutions, and inspiring greater collective environmental action, giving Member States the opportunity to showcase how they implement and promote synergies across MEAs in their national contexts. In addition, this document supports UNEP's current and future Medium-Term Strategies[4] by strengthening convergence and dialogue between UNEP and the MEAs around shared strategic priorities, while also raising the visibility of the relevant decisions made by MEA governing bodies over the years.

3. The 20 case studies presented in this background document were selected to reflect a broad geographic and thematic spread of the activities as well as considering the different thematic clusters of MEAs (Table 1). Although not exhaustive in scope, they offer a valuable evidence base on how countries are addressing challenges and realizing synergies in MEA implementation. By documenting and synthesizing selected national-level experiences, this analysis seeks to provide practical insights and guidance to inform global policy discussions and to provide models on the synergistic implementation of MEAs on the ground for replication and scaling up action at the national level. The findings from the case studies reveal recurring themes and give insights on enabling conditions, challenges, and innovations while also demonstrating that there is no one-size-fits-all approach to implement MEAs in a coherent and synergistic manner; each case offers a unique example of how countries are approaching contemporary challenges.

II. Background

4. This call for collaboration in the implementation of MEAs has a long history. The 1992 Earth Summit gave rise to the three Rio Conventions and emphasized the importance of coherence across the growing landscape of environmental agreements.[5] Twenty years later, the United Nations

[1] Resolution 6/4 Promoting synergies, cooperation or collaboration for national implementation of multilateral environmental agreements and other relevant environmental instruments. Available at: https://docs.un.org/en/UNEP/EA.6/RES.4.
[2] Resolution 6/6 Fostering national action to address global environmental challenges through increased cooperation between the United Nations Environment Assembly, the United Nations Environment Programme and multilateral environmental agreements. Available at: https://docs.un.org/en/UNEP/EA.6/Res.6.
[3] Report of the Executive Director on Progress in the implementation of resolution 6/4 on promoting synergies, cooperation or collaboration for national implementation of multilateral environmental agreements and other relevant environmental instruments and resolution 6/6 on fostering national action to address global environmental challenges through increased cooperation between the United Nations Environment Assembly, the United Nations Environment Programme and multilateral environmental agreements (UNEP/EA.7/9). Available at: https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/48328/UNEP_EA7_9.pdf.
[4] UNEP current strategy is for 2022-2025, while the strategy for 2026-2029 is a draft stage: UNEP/CPR/171/5.
[5] Outcome documents of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 3–14 June 1992. Available at: https://www.un.org/en/conferences/environment/rio1992.

Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) recognized both the significant contributions of MEAs to sustainable development and the progress already achieved in enhancing synergies, particularly in the chemicals and waste cluster through the Basel, Rotterdam, and Stockholm Conventions. The outcome document The Future We Want further encouraged Parties to consider additional measures to promote policy coherence, improve efficiency, and reduce unnecessary duplication among MEAs, including the Rio Conventions, and in cooperation with the wider UN system.[6]

5. UNEA was established in 2012 as a body with universal membership to replace the limited membership of UNEP's Governing Council, and to strengthen UNEP's role as the leading global environmental authority[7]. Since its establishment, UNEA has made comprehensive calls for cooperation with and among MEAs, including by mandating UNEP to support effective programmatic collaboration.[8]

6. In parallel, many MEA governing bodies have themselves adopted decisions facilitating cooperation and synergies in the implementation of MEAs. Recent outcomes from the Conferences of Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the UN Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa (UNCCD) invite UNEP to support cooperation across conventions, strengthen coordination among national focal points, and promote integrated approaches linking biodiversity, climate change and land degradation. Other conventions such as the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm (BRS) Conventions, Minamata Convention on Mercury, Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), among others, have similarly adopted decisions mandating cooperation across conventions and with UNEP.[9]

7. The importance of synergies was also underscored by the 2024 Nexus Assessment of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), which underscored that integrated policy approaches can generate cumulative and amplified progress across multiple global MEA goals while fostering enabling conditions for future actions.[10]

8. MEA implementation can benefit from integrated approaches at national, regional, and global scales that reduce duplication, enhance coherence, and maximize impact, particularly in addressing the three planetary environmental crises and associated challenges impacting people and the planet. While the overall ambition for cooperation between MEAs may be facilitated at the international level, it is at the national level where synergies are most tangibly realized.

9. Broader policy frameworks such as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

[6] Paragraph 89 of 'The Future We Want' - Outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 20–22 June 2012. Available at: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/futurewewant.html.

[7] Paragraph 88 of 'The Future We Want' - Outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 20–22 June 2012. Available at: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/futurewewant.html.

[8] UNEA resolutions relevant to MEA cooperation include: 1/12 (effective programmatic cooperation with MEAs); 2/5 and 2/17 (promoting and enhancing synergies at all levels, including through UNEP regional offices); 2/18 (fostering mutually supportive programmes of work); 4/10 (cooperation in line with CBD decision 14/30); and more recently 6/4 and 6/6 (strengthening cooperation and analysing national-level synergies).

[9] UNFCCC Decision 1/CP.21; UNFCCC Decision 4/CMA .1; UNFCCC Decision 1/CMA.5 on the outcome of the first global stocktake; CBD COP 15, Decision 15/4; CBD COP 15, Decision 15/8, CBD COP 16, Decision 16/32; CBD COP 16, Decision 16/33; Basel Convention COP 17, Draft Decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention; Rotterdam Convention COP 12, Draft Decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties of the Rotterdam Convention; Stockholm Convention COP 12, Draft Decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention, Minamata Convention on Mercury, COP 6, Working Document 6/20, International Whaling Commission, Resolution 2003-1.

[10] IPBES. (2024). 'Summary for Policymakers of the Thematic Assessment Report on the Interlinkages among Biodiversity, Water, Food and Health of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services'. Available at: https://zenodo.org/records/13850289.

(KM-GBF), and the Global Framework on Chemicals (GFC) further reinforce this direction by providing strong platforms for national-level implementation and encouraging whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches to cooperation across MEAs. In this context, the Party-driven Bern Process, launched in 2019 and facilitated by UNEP, has responded to the need for greater coherence by providing a forum for strategic discussions on MEA synergies and for identifying opportunities for collaboration. Initially focused on biodiversity-related conventions, it has since broadened to other thematic clusters of MEAs, including land degradation and desertification, chemicals and waste, and climate change. Through its meetings, the Process has fostered dialogue among Parties, MEA secretariats, and stakeholders, promoting the exchange of knowledge, tools, and experiences. Its contribution has been recognized by twelve MEA governing bodies, some of them underscoring UNEP's role in facilitating cooperation and advancing synergies at various levels and across thematic clusters.[11]

10. While the value of striving for synergies is widely recognized, their practical application remains complex. MEAs all differ in their scope, memberships, and operational processes, including financial mechanisms which in turn shape how cross-convention coordination and implementation is organized at the national level.[12] Countries must navigate and interpret a large volume of decisions and processes at the national level to fulfil their obligations under multiple MEAs.[13] Implementation also varies depending on national circumstances, priorities and resources available as well as financial mechanisms used. For this reason, mutual dialogue and learning among countries are essential for effective and efficient MEA implementation.

III. Overview of Cases

11. This background document draws on case studies from 20 Member States, showcasing synergistic approaches in the implementation of a range of MEAs from different thematic areas. The national case studies, covering all UN regions, describe synergistic implementation efforts involving 31 MEAs (including conventions and protocols). Drawing on InforMEA's environmental topics[14], they are organized into five thematic clusters that highlight national contributions and patterns observed across the twenty case studies included in the analysis. The cases span across biodiversity, climate, land, chemicals and waste related MEAs, as well as other agreements. All case studies demonstrate integrated work across multiple conventions from different clusters (Table 2). While most of the case studies focused on implementation of global MEAs, several countries reported that their case study also contributed to the implementation of regional conventions. The regional MEAs can support Member States in meeting their obligations under global MEAs and some have been opened for global membership.[15]

12. A summary of the 20 case studies is provided in this section. Further details of the national case studies can be found in Appendix 1, the survey used to obtain the information in Appendix 2, and information on case selection and analysis in Appendix 3.

[11] CBD (decision 16/35), CITES (SC78 Doc.16 (Rev. 1)), CMS (Resolution 11.10 (Rev.COP14)), Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (WHC) (decision 46 COM 5A), International Whaling Commission (IWC) (resolution 2024-2), International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) (resolution 1/2023 and resolution 13/2023), International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) (CPM-18 Draft Report Part 2), Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (COP15 Doc.23.4 (Rev.2)), UNCCD (decision 8/COP.16), BRS Conventions (draft decisions BC-17/23, RC-12/10, SC-12/24), Minamata Convention on Mercury (decision MC-5/17) and Framework Convention on the Protection and Sustainable Development of the Carpathians (Carpathian Convention) (decision 7/4).

[12] Hu, Y. et al. (2021). 'Synergy between the Convention on Biological Diversity and the UNFCCC in China', *Advances in Climate Change Research,* 12(2), pp.287-295. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accre.2021.03.011.

[13] Velázquez Gomar, J.O. et al. (2014). 'Regime Complexes and National Policy Coherence: Experiences in the Biodiversity Cluster', *Global Governance,* 20(1), pp.119-145. http://dx.doi.org/10.5555/1075-2846-20.1.119.

[14] InforMEA. *Environmental Topics.* Available at: https://www.informea.org/en/treaties.

[15] For example, the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes, serviced by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, initially negotiated as a regional instrument for the pan-European region and, following an amendment procedure, has been opened up for accession to all UN Member States in 2016.

Table 1

Clusters of MEAs addressed by the country case studies.

Cluster	Multilateral environmental agreement
Biological diversity	Convention on Biological Diversity (**CBD**)
	CBD **Cartagena Protocol** on Biosafety
	CBD **Nagoya Protocol** on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization
	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (**CITES**)
	Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (**CMS**)
	Ramsar **Convention on Wetlands** of International Importance
	International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (**ITPGRFA**)
	International Plant Protection Convention (**IPPC**)
	Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Convention; **WHC**)
	Agreement on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (**BBNJ Agreement**)[16]
	Convention for Co-operation in the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African Region (**Abidjan Convention**)
Chemicals and Waste (incl. Pollution)	**Basel Convention** on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal
	Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade
	Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants
	Minamata Convention on Mercury
	International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (**MARPOL**)
	Bamako Convention on the ban of the Import into Africa and the Control of Transboundary Movement and Management of Hazardous Wastes within Africa
Climate and Atmosphere	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (**UNFCCC**)
	Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
	Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer
	Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer
	Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (**Air Convention**)
Land Degradation and Desertification	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa (**UNCCD**)
Other	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (**UNCLOS**)
	International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments (Ballast Water Management Convention; **BWM**)
	Convention on the Law of the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses (**Watercourses Convention**)
	Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (**Aarhus Convention**)
	The Kyiv Protocol on Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (**PRTR Protocol**)
	Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (**Espoo Convention**)
	Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment (**SEA Protocol**)
	Regional Agreement on Access to Information, Public Participation and Justice in Environmental Matters in Latin America and the Caribbean (**Escazú Agreement**)

[16] At the time of the case study analysis, the BBNJ Agreement had not yet entered into force. As of 9 August 2025, the Agreement has 75 Parties, accessible here: https://treaties.un.org/PAGES/ViewDetails.aspx?chapter=21&clang=_en&mtdsg_no=XXI-10&src=TREATY and is expected to enter into force in early 2026.

Table 2

Overview of country case studies by region and MEAs addressed. The full cases are in Appendix 1.

Regional Group	Country	Actions described	MEA/Protocol addressed synergistically in the country case
Africa	Cameroon	National Ecosystem Assessment and sectoral footprint study	CBD, CITES, CMS, Convention on Wetlands, WHC Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention, MARPOL UNFCCC, Kyoto Protocol, Vienna Convention, Montreal Protocol UNCCD UNCLOS, Abidjan Convention, Bamako Convention
	Madagascar	Integrated action plans and enforcement measures to protect precious wood species	CITES, WHC
	Rwanda	Steering Committee for synergistic MEA implementation	CBD, Nagoya Protocol, Cartagena Protocol, Convention on Wetlands Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention, Minamata Convention UNFCCC, Montreal Protocol UNCCD
	South Africa	National target setting for the KM-GBF	CBD, CITES, CMS, Convention on Wetlands, WHC UNCCD
	Uganda	Strengthening synergies and cooperation across MEAs	CBD Basel Convention, Stockholm Convention, Minamata Convention
Asia-Pacific	Fiji	Mainstreaming biodiversity in climate action	CBD UNFCCC
	United Arab Emirates (UAE)	National reporting on biodiversity and desertification	CBD, Nagoya Protocol, Cartagena Protocol, CITES, CMS, Convention on Wetlands UNFCCC UNCCD
	Uzbekistan	Promoting synergistic MEA accessions	Air Convention Espoo Convention, SEA Protocol, Aarhus Convention, PRTR Protocol
	Vanuatu	Community-led nature-based climate action	CBD UNFCCC
Eastern Europe	Armenia	Joint actions towards environmental goals	CBD, CITES, CMS, Convention on Wetlands UNFCCC UNCCD Aarhus Convention
	Czech Republic	Integrating research, policy, and community into regional action	Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention, Minamata Convention Air Convention Aarhus Convention, PRTR Protocol
Latin America and Caribbean	Antigua & Barbuda	Learning from local recyclers and communities for waste solutions	CBD, CMS, Convention on Wetlands Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention, Minamata Convention UNFCCC UNCCD Escazú Agreement

Regional Group	Country	Actions described	MEA/Protocol addressed synergistically in the country case
	El Salvador	Institutional strengthening for chemical management	Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention, Minamata Convention, MARPOL Montreal Protocol
	Mexico	Synergies for the implementation of the KM-GBF	CBD, Nagoya Protocol, Cartagena Protocol, Convention on Wetlands Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention, Minamata Convention UNFCCC UNCCD Escazú Agreement
	Panama	Panama's Nature Pledge	CBD, Convention on Wetlands Basel Convention UNFCCC, Vienna Convention, Montreal Protocol UNCCD BWM, Escazú Agreement
Western Europe and Others	Australia	Nature Repair Market for biodiversity action aligned with climate measures	CBD, Convention on Wetlands UNFCCC UNCCD
	Finland	Cooperation between conventions – The Bern Process	CBD, CITES, CMS, Convention on Wetlands, ITPGRFA, WHC, BBNJ Agreement Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention UNFCCC UNCCD
	Ireland	The Irish Peatland Standard - An ecosystem certificate	CBD, CMS, Convention on Wetlands, WHC UNFCCC Watercourses Convention
	Switzerland	Linking biodiversity science with policy	CBD, CITES, CMS, Convention on Wetlands, ITPGRFA, IPPC, WHC
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (UK)	Reviewing and adapting indicators to align with the KM-GBF	CBD, CMS, Convention on Wetlands

13. Table 3 below shows where synergies have been operationalized through the engagement of different sectors. Countries were selected from a reference list reflecting the core sectors of MEA implementation, with the option to include additional ones.

14. Across the cases, the sectors most frequently mentioned in synergistic MEA implementation were *Agriculture, Forestry, and Fishing* (mentioned in 18 cases) followed by *Health* (13), *Waste management and Sewerage* (12), *Customs and Trade* (8), and *Tourism* (7). Other sectors, such as *Energy generation* (6), *Construction* (5), *Mining* (5), *Manufacturing* (3), and *Transport* (2), were less prominent in the assessed cases. All cases involved the *Environment and Climate* sector.

Table 3

Sectors engage in the studied cases of synergistic implementation of MEAs, as identified by countries

Regional Group	Country	Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing	Construction	Customs & Trade	Energy generation	Health	Manufacturing	Mining	Tourism	Transport	Waste management & Sewerage
Africa	Cameroon	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Madagascar	✓		✓							
	Rwanda	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓			✓
	South Africa	✓		✓		✓					✓
	Uganda	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓
Asia-Pacific	Fiji	✓									
	UAE	✓									✓
	Uzbekistan		✓		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓
	Vanuatu	✓									
Eastern Europe	Armenia	✓				✓			✓		
	Czech Republic					✓					✓
Latin America and Caribbean	Antigua & Barbuda	✓	✓			✓			✓		✓
	El Salvador	✓		✓	✓	✓					✓
	Mexico	✓				✓			✓		✓
	Panama	✓			✓	✓					✓
Western Europe and Others	Australia	✓							✓		
	Finland	✓		✓		✓		✓			✓
	Switzerland	✓	✓			✓			✓		
	UK	✓		✓							
	Ireland	✓			✓			✓	✓		
Total References		18	6	8	6	13	3	5	7	2	12

Sector	Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing	Construction	Customs & Trade	Energy generation	Health	Manufacturing	Mining	Tourism	Transport	Waste management & Sewerage	Total
Number of mentions, across all cases	18	6	8	6	13	3	5	7	2	12	80
Proportion of countries which have reported each sector (%)	90%	30%	40%	30%	65%	15%	25%	35%	10%	60%	100%
Proportion of mentions of each given sector (%)	22.5%	7.5%	10%	7.5%	16.25%	3.75%	6.25%	8.75%	2.5%	15%	100%

15. While environmental agencies remain central to the synergistic implementation of MEAs, cooperation often extends across ministries and departments, reflecting the cross-cutting nature of national implementation. Beyond government institutions, MEA cooperation also involves a wide range of regional actors and non-governmental stakeholders.

16. Countries identified the relevant groups from a reference list reflecting key actors commonly engaged across MEAs, with the option to add others. National Governments participated in all cases (20 cases), followed by the specific mention of Private Sector & Industry (12), Local Authorities (12), Non-Governmental Organisations (12), and the Scientific and Technological Community (11). Other prominent stakeholders included Indigenous Peoples & Local Communities (8), and Women (7), Children & Youth (7), Farmers (6), and Workers & Trade Unions (1). This diversity of stakeholder engagement reflects that cooperation for synergistic MEA implementation is often multi-actor, engaging governmental, civil society, private sector, as well as regional and knowledge actors.

17. The mapping of MEAs, sectors, and stakeholders involved provides a baseline view of how cooperation is structured in the cases examined. These patterns are illustrative rather than exhaustive, as other agreements may form unique linkages depending on national priorities and institutional arrangements. More detailed information for each country is provided in Appendix 1.

IV. Analysis of National Experiences

18. UNEA Resolution 6/4 encourages efforts to "enhance knowledge and understanding of the potential co-benefits of synergies, cooperation or collaboration" and requests UNEP to collect and synthesize good practices, tools, success stories and lessons learned.[17] From the 20 national cases assessed here, the analysis has been structured into three subsections— (a) enabling conditions and good practices, (b) approaches and tools, and (c) benefits—to reflect the spectrum of what enables and results from synergistic implementation. This arrangement is intended to distinguish between (a) the types of actions that have proven effective in practice, (b) the concrete mechanisms and institutional arrangements that facilitate those actions, and (c) the observed, perceived, or expected outcomes that help build the case for more integrated approaches. While many of the 20 case studies included information relevant to all three subsections, specific country examples are presented in Table 4 (subsection A) and Table 5 (subsection B). Benefits that countries have reported through the 20 case studies are listed in Table 6 (subsection C).

19. Together, these categories provide a policy-relevant synthesis to support informed decision-making on synergistic implementation of MEAs. The analysis highlights opportunities, approaches, and lessons that can inform further dialogue and action as appropriate.

A. Enabling Conditions and Good Practices

20. The national experiences from the cases show that successful synergistic MEA implementation depends on creating supportive enabling conditions for coordination, technical progress, innovation and long-term sustainability. While contexts differ, common elements recur across countries, which can be categorized into five different primary conditions:

    (a) technical capacity and collaboration

    (b) coherent institutional and legal frameworks

    (c) continuity of skilled staff

    (d) effective partnerships,

    (e) and the integration of diverse knowledge systems in decision-making.

21. Good practices illustrate how these key conditions for success are applied, helping countries to strengthen coordination, maintain institutional memory, and ensure legitimacy and ownership of outcomes of the synergistic implementation of MEAs. Table 4 summarizes these enabling conditions, the practices used to sustain them, and country examples that demonstrate their application.

[17] UNEP/EA.6/Res.4, available at https://docs.un.org/en/UNEP/EA.6/RES.4

Table 4

Enabling conditions and good practices, with illustrative examples of their use. Similar practices may have been reported in other countries too; see Appendix 1 for details.

Enabling condition	Good practices	Country examples
Technical capacity and collaboration	Investing in systems and processes that generate information to support coordinated implementation of multiple MEAs	The **UK** uses its Biodiversity Indicators which are accredited official statistics compiled from around 100 organizations, revised through collaboration with data custodians and expert consultation to align with the KM-GBF and mobilize diverse data sources.
Institutional and legal coherence	Establishing norms and procedures that mainstream MEA implementation across sectors with coherence	**El Salvador** established an inter-institutional technical committee and a working group with the Customs Directorate to review regulatory proposals under the Rotterdam Convention and to monitor hazardous substances, chemicals, and waste; **Madagascar** adopted and strengthened the enforcement of several new legal texts and monitoring strategies (informed by Decision 47 COM 7A.14 of the World Heritage Committee) to combat the exploitation and trade of precious woods listed under CITES in the World Heritage site of the rainforests of the Atsinanana.
Institutional memory and continuity of skilled staff	Training, professional development, and preserving institutional memory	**Mexico** encouraged the retention of specialized staff and promotion of their training to consolidate progress, ensure continuity and support a long-term vision in the effective implementation of MEAs.
Formal coordination mechanisms	Fostering inter-institutional mechanisms for cross-sectoral collaboration	**Armenia** fostered inter-institutional cooperation through inter-ministerial groups, stakeholder dialogues and pre-COP coordination meetings with diverse stakeholders as early as the project design phase to facilitate the synergistic implementation of conventions; **Rwanda** uses two National Coordination meetings between MEA focal points per year: one at the beginning to serve as a joint planning platform and another at the end of the year to evaluate planned activities related to MEAs.
Integration of diverse knowledge systems in decision-making	Inclusive and culturally appropriate channels for knowledge exchange	**Antigua & Barbuda** recognizes local communities as environmental stewards who can gather information on chemical risks and waterway contamination, and whose insights can inspire innovative solutions for the implementation of chemicals-related MEAs; **Vanuatu** is developing databases and training programs to document and use traditional knowledge according to cultural protocols and intellectual property rights. This knowledge informs decision-making in implementing nature-based solutions which address both biodiversity and climate conventions.
Adequate financing, including collaborative financing	Mobilizing resources through demonstrated co-benefits	In **Uganda**, strategies for mercury management under chemicals-related MEAs are being developed and implemented jointly by different government sectors and non-governmental organisations, promoting resource mobilization and collaborative financing.

B. Approaches and Tools for Synergistic Implementation

22. Countries rely on a mix of approaches and tools to implement their international commitments at the national level. Seven main types of tools, designed to simultaneously address multiple MEA obligations and to foster cross-sectoral alignment, have been identified from the 20 cases (Box A). Countries rarely applied these tools in isolation but rather adapted them to national contexts and combined them to strengthen alignment, build capacity, and enhance participation. Table 5 synthesizes these main approaches and associated tools with selected country examples to illustrate how they have been applied in different national contexts. These tools complement the enabling conditions outlined in Section A by providing practical means to operationalize coordination and cooperation across MEAs.

Box A. The seven types of tools reported across the cases

Knowledge platforms and databases
- National geoportals and integrated environmental databases
- Centralized biodiversity information systems
- National platforms for monitoring, reporting, and evaluation of MEAs
- Databases documenting traditional knowledge, with cultural safeguards

Geospatial and monitoring systems
- Geographic information systems (GIS) and remote sensing for land use, forest cover, and ecosystems
- National forest monitoring and REDD+ MRV systems
- Artificial intelligence-powered monitoring (such as automated soil and vegetation analysis)
- Digital platforms for greenhouse gas emissions/removals tracking
- Local on-site patrol mechanisms for improved monitoring

Indicators and reporting frameworks
- Harmonized biodiversity–climate–desertification indicators
- Compliance traffic light systems for tracking MEA commitments
- National MEA implementation status reports (annual or periodic)
- Reproducible analytical pipelines for national biodiversity indicators

Participatory and institutional tools
- National science–policy platforms to validate results and inform policy
- Standing committees or inter-ministerial working groups on MEAs
- International coordination forums on MEAs to align national positions
- Multi-sectoral technical working groups for implementation coordination

Sectoral integration and planning tools
- Sectoral footprint analysis methodologies
- Biodiversity-compatible sectoral scenarios and trajectories
- Guidance for mainstreaming biodiversity into productive sectors
- Green and blue accounting integrated into GDP and budget processes

Communication and outreach tools
- Videos, documentaries, and fact sheets to share local voices and evidence
- Monthly biodiversity newsletters and online information systems
- Ecosystem certificates and other market-based instruments to incentivise sustainable land management

Specialized instruments
- National seed banks for conserving genetic resources
- Mangrove management plans and other ecosystem-specific planning tools
- Artificial intelligence-assisted analysis of MEA targets to identify synergies across MEAs

Table 5

Approaches and tools, with illustrative examples of their implementation. Similar approaches may have been reported in other countries tool; see Appendix 1 for details.

Desired outcome	Tools	Country examples
Strategic planning and policy alignment	National strategies, action plans, and sectoral scenarios	**Fiji's** National Adaptation Plan (NAP) aims to address governance and institutional barriers in the synergistic implementation of various MEAs by promoting vertical integration, including the incorporation of ecosystem-based adaptation approaches into sub-national development planning.
Capacity development and outreach	Training programmes, workshops, media, and databases	The **Swiss** Biodiversity Forum supports communication between stakeholders, including scientists and policymakers involved with MEAs by providing tools such as policy fact sheets, an information system with monthly updates, and an online database to support biodiversity policy and research uptake.
Participatory coordination mechanisms	Forums, platforms, Inter-institutional committees and steering committees	**Finland** coordinates national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions through a biodiversity working group chaired by the Ministry of the Environment, inviting the focal points of the other MEAs to join the meetings as appropriate. National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) are developed through a whole-of-government approach, ensuring consistency with strategies on climate change, pollution control, and sustainable development. **South Africa** created International Relations and MEAs Forums within the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment to address issues of common interest and to form common positions on issues discussed by various MEAs.
Knowledge and information systems	Knowledge platforms, monitoring systems, inventories, and geospatial databases	**Panama** used an artificial intelligence (AI)-powered analysis of the targets across different Conventions to identify synergies and create space for dialogue and understanding across Conventions; in **Uzbekistan,** the many digital platforms run by various national entities, for instance, to foster open data sharing, engage the public in discussions on draft policy and legal frameworks and state ecological expertise, and collect information on air pollution, directly reinforce MEA synergies; in the **Czech Republic**, complex data repositories and visualization platforms are used to share information with policymakers and other stakeholders within relevant MEAs on issues relating to health and the environment.
Monitoring, assessment and mapping	Global information system tools, ecosystem assessment frameworks, surveillance systems, and remote sensing	**Cameroon** applied sectoral footprint analyses, biodiversity scenarios, integration guides, and ecosystem mapping to support national planning and reporting under the CBD and UNFCCC; in the **UAE,** advanced environmental monitoring tools, including AI-powered soil drones and satellite-based systems, are deployed to enhance ecosystem assessments serving multiple MEAs.
Resource mobilization	Financing initiatives, investment mechanisms, and partnerships	Peatland Finance **Ireland** was seed funded by various government departments and agencies to provide a certification system that enables landowners and farmers to access funding for peatland restoration, developed with broad stakeholder input and aiming to make restoration commercially viable while delivering ecological and community benefits to meet the targets of several Conventions; **Australia's** Nature Repair Market establishes a marketplace where individuals and organizations can

Desired outcome	Tools	Country examples
		undertake projects and attract funding, using their Biodiversity Assessment Instrument to describe biodiversity changes in a consistent way that enables investors to compare projects addressing various MEAs.

C. Benefits from Synergies in National MEA Implementation

23. The review of cases indicates that promoting synergies and collaboration in the implementation of MEAs can reduce duplication of efforts and to generate wider institutional, social, and financial benefits at the national level. Multiple countries emphasized that the gains from coherent implementation and/or cooperation among MEAs exceeded the sum of individual efforts, creating added value that strengthened both governance and practice. Reported benefits include stronger institutions, more coherent policies, enhanced analytical capacity, and improved participation and financing. Table 6 highlights selected benefits, explaining how collaboration produced them and showcasing country experiences that exemplify these outcomes.

Table 6

Types of benefits identified in national cases of synergistic MEA implementation, with examples. Similar benefits may have been reported in other countries tool; see Appendix 1 for details.

National Benefit	How collaboration produced it	Country examples
Strengthened institutional capacity	Coordinated implementation reduced duplication of effort and created stronger technical expertise	**UAE** reported benefits such as long-term governmental commitment and institutional clarity, reduced duplication of efforts, timely and consistent reporting, alignment of local actions with national and international obligations as set out by MEAs, and measurable results through coordination and innovative environmental management; **Madagascar** highlighted stronger synergistic implementation of MEAs yielding positive results for improved species protection, forest restoration and enhanced enforcement against illegal logging and trade.
Regulatory and policy coherence	Harmonized frameworks improved consistency and reduced fragmentation	**El Salvador** achieved improved coordination among institutions, streamlined oversight, and strengthened legal, regulatory, and institutional mechanisms for implementing MEAs on chemicals and waste, alongside enhanced health and environmental monitoring, risk prevention, and reporting; **Australia** reported greater policy coherence resulting from improved coordination and information sharing across MEAs and national policy areas.
Enhanced monitoring and analytical capacity	Shared studies and joint assessments avoided parallel exercises and built stronger evidence bases	The **UK** strengthened national biodiversity indicators, making them relevant across multiple MEAs and accessible to diverse stakeholders; **Cameroon** saw increased analytical capacity through training in modelling, valuation, and sectoral analysis, reduced duplication in reporting, and harmonized indicators across Conventions.
Improved institutional coordination	Coordination platforms and inter-ministerial mechanisms reduced silos and improved planning	**Mexico** reported that institutional coordination advanced inter-institutional coherence, identified synergies in MEA implementation, and strengthened opportunities for international cooperation and resource mobilization; the Swiss Biodiversity Forum in **Switzerland** provides a national platform that has facilitated exchange and collaboration between the international IPBES process, the Swiss policy and science communities on biodiversity, and the public, thereby supporting MEA implementation; **South Africa** reports that strengthening cooperation in responding to issues of common interest through Forums fosters a sense of ownership of national targets, thereby supporting the implementation of MEAs; MEA focal points coordination meetings in **Rwanda** support the production of an

National Benefit	How collaboration produced it	Country examples
		annual MEA implementation status report to reflect on its achievement of MEA targets.
Cross-sectoral and societal dialogue	Platforms enabled communication between ministries, sectors, and stakeholders	The Peatland Finance **Ireland** model results from a process of cross-sectoral engagement which has supported the achievement of targets across various government departments relating to both climate and biodiversity MEAs; **Armenia**, through pre-COP coordination meetings, have created a basis to share information by fostering regular communication and coordination among MEA focal points and creating a culture of cooperation; **Finland** reports the use of inclusive and coordinated approaches to sustain a dialogue across government agencies, local governments, the private sector and rights holders towards the effective implementation of conventions and global targets.
Community empowerment and ownership	Linking MEA objectives to local practices fostered ownership and long-term commitment	In the **Czech Republic**, collaborative actions with communities and stakeholders created a motivated community engaged over multiple years to provide information and recommendations related to the health impacts of environmental factors, thereby supporting robust scientific analysis to inform the implementation of chemicals-related MEAs; **Uzbekistan** reported the essential role of shared systems of information across MEAs in fostering citizen engagement and trust by facilitating accountability and public participation
Livelihoods and resilience	Linking cross-MEA action provided tangible socio-economic and ecological benefits	In **Vanuatu**, the registration of 20+ Community Conservation Areas and women-led nature-based solutions initiatives protected key ecosystems while creating income opportunities and improving community resilience to cyclones and droughts, supporting both CBD and UNFCCC objectives; **Antigua & Barbuda** reported that the achievement of local ownership and the buy-in of processes for waste reduction, repurposing and reuse contribute to a circular economy which can both conserve land resources, reduce waste and improve waste management, and improve livelihood and food security in affected areas.
Resource mobilization and efficiency	Coordinated financing addressed multiple MEAs simultaneously, maximizing impact with fewer resources	The Nature Pledge in **Panama** fosters understanding between MEA focal points for the Rio Conventions using technical support and working groups, which facilitate the alignment of goals stated in national strategies to unlock the potential for better allocation of resources and implementation efforts; in **Fiji**, integrated targets such as planting 30 million trees by 2035 and designating 30% of its Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) as marine protected areas are included in both the Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) and NBSAP, strengthening coherence and increasing Fiji's ability to mobilise donor funding and partnerships; **Uganda**'s clearing house approach to strengthen the linkages between MEAs has attracted development partners to complement the government's efforts in aligning its NBSAP with global targets.

V. Lessons learned from national implementation

24. Strengthening national-level collaboration across focal points and responsible agencies is essential for synergistic implementation of MEAs. Many countries reported facing persistent and interconnected challenges that could constrain such collaboration and, in turn, limit the overall effectiveness of MEA implementation and the potential benefits from coordination. The lessons from national case studies are presented here under the main themes that emerged.

25. Financing and Efficiency: Integrated planning can maximize efficiencies and scale up MEA financing:

(a) Strategic national planning directed funding toward cross-cutting priorities.

(b) Integrated project frameworks and shared financial planning tools improved resource efficiency and accountability.
(c) Coherent and synergistic MEA implementation opened pathways to diversify and integrate financing opportunities.
(d) Multi-purpose funding proposals targeting multiple MEA goals can attract international investment and reduce duplication.

26. Accountability and Coherence: Harmonized indicators and joint reporting can strengthen coherence and accountability:

(a) Harmonized indicators and/or monitoring approaches across MEAs enabled consistent tracking of progress and policy alignment, and greater efficiency in national reporting.
(b) Joint reporting cycles and shared national reporting platforms promoted stakeholder trust and institutional accountability.
(c) Integrated monitoring systems reduced administrative volume of work and improved the efficiency of national reporting.
(d) Centralized data management platforms supported transparency and evidence-based decision-making, alongside building coherence with regional and global indicator-based monitoring systems.
(e) Periodic indicator reviews involving cross-MEA coordination strengthened the relevance of indicators and supported adaptive management across MEAs.
(f) Capacity-building in data modelling and use strengthened countries' ability to report and adapt effectively.
(g) National efforts linking ecosystem assessments to economic planning demonstrated the value of integrated reporting for broader policy coherence.

27. Participation and Ownership: Inclusive participation can build legitimacy and resilience in MEA implementation:

(a) Institutional mechanisms for engagement, co-management, and local participation increased alignment between national plans, sectoral plans, and community priorities.
(b) Inclusive engagement with rightsholders and stakeholders—across government, civil society, academia, Indigenous Peoples, and local communities—enhanced legitimacy and resilience.
(c) Participatory governance models, such as multi-stakeholder committees, strengthened both social ownership of MEA objectives and practical implementation.
(d) Complementary use of relevant scientific, traditional, and local knowledge improved data quality and fostered acceptance of MEA-related policies.
(e) Structured stakeholder mapping and regular consultations helped to build diverse perspectives into decision-making.
(f) Digital platforms and knowledge-sharing tools fostered transparency and ongoing dialogue.

28. Governance and Political Commitment: High-level commitment and inter-ministerial platforms can reduce fragmentation:

(a) High-level political commitment and integration of MEA goals into national development strategies supported sustained action, with mainstreaming of MEA agendas across sectoral frameworks and planning cycles.
(b) Strong institutional coordination reduced fragmentation and duplication in MEA implementation.
(c) Regular, structured stakeholder dialogue enhanced policy coherence and fostered cross-sectoral collaboration.
(d) Inter-ministerial committees and cross-convention platforms facilitated alignment across MEA agendas at the national level.
(e) Tools such as policy alignment matrices and joint implementation roadmaps improved coherence across national and international commitments.
(f) Cross-MEA coordination at both national and subnational levels supports consistency from planning to implementation.

29. Sustained engagement and capacity: Building commitment and long-term institutional capacity can sustain MEA implementation:

(a) Sustained political commitment is essential for long-term success.
(b) Long-term capacity strategies should include formal training for MEA focal points, technical cooperation, and staff development pipelines, enabling staff to undertake requisite activities that serve multiple MEAs.
(c) Retention of skilled staff helped preserve institutional memory and continuity across project cycles and political transitions.

(d) Partnerships with academic institutions and training programs helped to bridge the gap between scientific knowledge and decision-making.
(e) Development of specialized institutions and national research centres enhanced analytical and regulatory capacity.
(f) Investing in shared data infrastructure (such as remote sensing tools, monitoring systems) reinforced the technical backbone of MEA implementation.
(g) Toolkits and guidance documents supported institutional learning and consistent implementation practices across MEAs.

VI. Conclusions

30. This assessment provides a starting point to deepen understanding of how synergies in the implementation of MEAs are being approached at the national level. Using a diverse set of experiences, tools, and outcomes from 20 Member States, the analysis illustrates some of the practical ways in which collaboration and cooperation are being pursued and the general benefits that promoting synergistic implementation of MEAs can foster. Mutual learning remains an important opportunity to enhance engagement and strengthen implementation of MEAs. National contexts vary widely, and the findings reinforce that there is no one-size-fits-all approach to synergistic implementation. Continued documentation and exchange of diverse national experiences across regions and levels of governance can be beneficial in increasing the understanding that synergistic implementation of MEAs may bring.

31. Creating and strengthening inclusive spaces for those engaged directly in implementation, whether government officials, community organizations, or other stakeholders, can support synergistic progress towards shared goals for people and nature. Gaining insight into their experiences may increase the general understanding which approaches work, why they succeed, and under what conditions.

32. Strengthening knowledge exchange and practical collaboration between countries can help ensure that country level action to promote synergies across MEAs deliver more coherent, effective, and inclusive outcomes.

VII. Resources for Further Information

33. Below a list of resources for further information:
    (a) UNEA Resolution 6/4. Promoting synergies, cooperation or collaboration for national implementation of multilateral environmental agreements and other relevant environmental instruments
    (b) UNEA Resolution 6/6. Fostering national action to address global environmental challenges through increased cooperation between the United Nations Environment Assembly, the United Nations Environment Programme and multilateral environmental agreements
    (c) Report of the Bern III Conference on Cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions for the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
    (d) IPBES Transformative Change Assessment: Summary for Policymakers
    (e) IPBES Nexus Assessment: Summary for Policymakers
    (f) IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6) Summary for Policymakers
    (g) Sourcebook of opportunities for enhancing cooperation among the Biodiversity-related Conventions at national and regional levels (2015)
    (h) Key entry points for mutually supportive action on biodiversity and chemicals & waste (Background for the Capacity-Building Workshop: Implementation of Biodiversity and Chemicals and Waste Multilateral Environmental Agreements held in Senegal in November 2024)
    (i) Key Actions and Entry Points for National Coordination Across Biodiversity and Climate Change Clusters (Background for the Sub-regional workshop and dialogue for the Pacific small island developing States held in Samoa in May 2025).

VIII. Appendixes

A. Appendix 1: Examples of National Approaches to the Collaborative Implementation of MEAs

This compilation of case studies from 20 Member States provides information on the diversity of approaches which contribute to the collaborative implementation of MEAs at the national level.

Antigua & Barbuda - "Increased coherence in national reporting requires a Whole-of-Society, Whole-of Government Approach: Antigua's empowered community development practices in waste management" (2025-ongoing)

This case study presents an ongoing initiative to address the risks posed by growing and diversifying waste streams in small islands economically dependent on tourism. Chemicals and waste create specific risks across the islands' wetlands, marine, and land ecosystems as well as to the health of local communities. The sustainable development practices demonstrate a people-centred approach that focuses on empowering stakeholders, providing evidence that engaged and empowered local communities are locally leading implementation of activities that effectively help achieve global goals. Drawing from the circular economic model, local waste pickers and recyclers remove pollution from the natural ecosystems and transform some materials into resources, lowering risks to human and environmental health and avoiding harmful practices such as waste burning. Antigua & Barbuda aim to address growing concerns about increasing waste and its negative impacts (soil degradation, ground water contamination, air pollution etc.) on people and ecosystems, showcasing how partnerships can be built and strengthened to meet the needs of the island communities regarding waste disposal, use, and repurposing while meeting global goals.

The initiative is locally led and focused on creating partnerships and educating communities, particularly people who live around and work in the landfill and whose health is affected by contaminated soils and fumes from the widely used practice of waste burning. The project provides job opportunities for these marginalized communities that actively build capacity for new skills and support mindsets in order to effect behavioural changes in regard to waste. Positive local actions produced people-centred benefits by stopping or reducing the flow of chemicals, oils and hazardous substances, and other leaching residues seeping into soils and vegetation. Additional partnerships are being forged with the private sector, such as hotels, to engage in recycling. The project engages various civil society organizations. Community cultural centres have fostered a positive reputation and have expanded opportunities for networking. Additional capacity building opportunities are made available to the men and women who come through other programmes such as the Boys Training School and Antigua and Barbuda Skills Training and Empowerment Programme (ABSTEP). They are given an opportunity to gain skills and have a livelihood, and in turn they are building awareness around environmental stewardship. Educational outreach is coordinated to bring awareness to younger generations, and there are plans to expand and create a state-of-the-art educational centre to provide tours for both children and tourists.

The project can continue to scale up, tackling the island's waste challenges by introducing circular economic models, improving safety measures for storage and handling of waste, increasing safeguards to avoid contamination, and developing an educational centre to promote awareness raising. This approach also connects national processes and institutions to highlight the critical role of partnerships in stopping harm to people and ecosystems. Partnerships and coordination are essential. For instance, the tourism sector must be engaged because hotels and cruise ships which want to uphold global standards push their waste streams to the islands, but the local recycling operations do not have the facilities to repurpose the new and growing waste streams. Even though there is a willingness to repurpose, the technology and equipment is absent. Local solutions need to be met with support and resources in order to maximize the benefits locally and continue to contribute to the MEAs.

MEAs addressed in the case study: CBD, CMS, Convention on Wetlands, Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention, Minamata Convention, UNFCCC, UNCCD, Escazú Agreement					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**
Antigua & Barbuda's project focuses on local communities as environmental stewards to gather their observations and knowledge. Local stakeholders can be acknowledged as first responders of potentially harmful situations to people and ecosystems. Examples of sightings include the use of hazardous chemicals in mosquito fogging programmes which harm local pollinators, the identification of people and vehicles throwing rubbish in the mangroves, the contamination of waterways from plastic and waste which block drains and heighten risks of flooding. Regular site visits have encouraged and supported local stakeholders by informing them of the impact of their work in Antigua & Barbuda's efforts to meet global targets and agendas. Presentations on ongoing activities at the project site were shared at national events to contribute	Knowledge management products were developed through the collaboration of diverse stakeholders, starting with local communities. The case study reports that national sharing, advocacy and outreach helps to build new partnerships to ensure every citizen takes on local ownership and to secure buy in of processes towards local solutions for chemicals and waste reduction, repurposing and reuse. This case study supports the reduction of the generation of waste and hazardous materials, enabling their environmentally sound management and contributing to a circular economy. It supports the promotion of resource efficiency, reducing pressure on natural resources, decreasing waste and pollution, and contributing to sustainable consumption patterns. Circular economies reduce the reliance on new land and virgin resources, thereby conserving land resources and preventing further degradation. UNCCD objectives are supported by decreasing pollution,	Videos and documentaries were produced with the support of the Caribbean Development Fund accredited to the GCF and the Japanese Embassy, to place local voices on the front line of the design of local solutions. This is a continued effort to highlight the stories from the ground and share them in various international fora.	There is a need for funding for equipment to successfully upscale, with the vision of a national environmental centre for children, youth, residents and visitors to showcase the use of different waste streams towards fostering innovative ideas for livelihoods in the management of chemicals and waste. Much waste emanates from the tourism sector and construction sector, which both generate most to the country's GDP along with significant risk for local people's livelihoods and the health of ecosystems. Current recycling facilities are not yet equipped to tackle new waste streams from tourism infrastructures and cruise ships. The lack of recognition for local stakeholders is a challenge which must be overcome through greater visibility and cooperation.	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation include: • Children & Youth • Farmers • Indigenous Peoples & local communities • National Government • Non-Governmental Organizations • Private Sector & Industry • Women The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Construction • Environment & Climate • Health	• SDG 1 • SDG 3 • SDG 4 • SDG 5 • SDG 8 • SDG 9 • SDG 10 • SDG 11 • SDG 12 • SDG 13 • SDG 15 • SDG 16 • SDG 17 The case study supports the OECS regional project related to the Research Strategy for the Collection of Environmental Data for Antigua and Barbuda and Action Plan for Antigua and Barbuda, particularly small projects related to the Integrating Water, Land and Ecosystems Management in Caribbean Small Island Developing States (IWEco Project).

to the 6th national reporting for the CBD.	preserving natural ecosystems, reducing GHG emissions through lower production demands, and creating economic opportunities that can improve livelihoods and food security in affected areas. The reduction of the energy-intensive extraction of raw materials and mitigation of GHG emissions from landfill decomposition and manufacturing processes supports the UNFCCC aims. As a core component of a circular economy, recycling helps transform consumption patterns, aligning with the Paris Agreement's call for low-emission development and a shift to sustainable practices.			• Waste management & Sewerage • Tourism	

Armenia - "Joint Actions Towards Environmental Goals in Armenia" (2024-ongoing)

Armenia is a landlocked mountainous country in the South Caucasus region which faces environmental challenges including land degradation and drought, deforestation, biodiversity loss and vulnerability to climate change. Sustainable management of natural resources is therefore a key priority. As party to a number of MEAs, Armenia has taken concrete steps to align its national environmental governance with international commitments, which are reflected in key national frameworks, such as the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) under the Paris Agreement, the National Action Plan to Combat Desertification, and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). Implementation is supported by national policies and cross-sectoral strategies to strengthen cooperation and create synergies, contributing to Armenia's broader sustainable development goals and regional cooperation efforts (such as EU4Environment and Eastern Partnership initiatives).

To implement this integrated strategy, Armenia has established multi-stakeholder platforms that facilitate dialogue, joint planning, and resource mobilization among ministries, civil society, local communities, and international partners. Notably, Armenia's role as host of the upcoming CBD COP 17 provides a valuable platform to showcase and promote these synergies at regional and global levels. Just as all ecosystems in nature are interconnected and harmonized, Armenia illustrates here that fostering cooperation between MEAs improves policy coherence, optimizes resource use, and ensures broad stakeholder engagement.

MEAs addressed in the case study: CBD, CITES, CMS, Convention on Wetlands, UNFCCC, UNCCD, Aarhus Convention

Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation	Tools developed in the case study	Barriers encountered in implementing the case study	Sectors & stakeholders involved	SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study
Armenia is: • creating inter-ministerial working groups to enforce the synergistic implementation of conventions. They include representatives from government, civil society, and academia, who are engaged from the project design phase—reviewing and improving actions to ensure alignment, transparency, and shared ownership; • building capacity among focal points; • mobilizing international funding; • promoting regular stakeholder dialogue to ensure effective coordination and implementation of MEAs. The Ministry of Environment plays a central coordinating role across the MEAs: • organizing Pre-COP coordination meetings to ensure coherent national positions ahead of international negotiations with National focal points for UNCCD, UNFCCC,	A cross-sectoral approach was applied to promote cooperation in natural resource conservation and sustainable development, thereby strengthening the implementation of National Action Plans (NAPs) through joint strategies, coordinated actions, and the identification of policy gaps. Armenia has reduced policy fragmentation by aligning interventions—such as sustainable land and water management and nature-based solutions—to address desertification, climate change, and biodiversity loss simultaneously. This integrated approach ensures efficient use of resources, avoids duplication, and maximizes impact. Multi-stakeholder platforms were particularly effective in supporting regular dialogue, data and knowledge sharing, and institutional coordination, while collaborative efforts have unlocked international financing for priority actions (e.g. wetland restoration, drip irrigation, abandoned mining site restoration, forestation, and sustainable pasture management etc.)	Armenia is working to establish a national geoportal with integrated environmental data using modern GIS and remote sensing technologies to ensure effective monitoring and harmonized reporting. Strong institutional coordination and regular stakeholder dialogue were used to overcome fragmentation.	The main barriers encountered are insufficient institutional capacity, limited mandates of focal points, lack of funding for cross-sectoral initiatives, and the absence of consistent daily coordination needed to effectively implement environmental policies across sectors. Establishing a consistent, daily dialogue and coordination among all stakeholders is a challenge when attempting to implement joint actions and effectively mobilize resources to translate policy commitments into real action on the ground.	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation include: • National Government • Women • Children & Youth • Indigenous Peoples & local communities • Local Authorities • Non-Governmental Organizations • Scientific & Technological Community The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Environment & Climate • Health • Tourism	• SDG 1 • SDG 5 • SDG 11 • SDG 13 • SDG 15 • SDG 16 The case study supports the following regional and national-level strategies for MEA implementation: • Government Decree (May 6, 2021 N 725-L) on Approval of the land degradation neutrality (LDN) program in the Republic of Armenia • LDN national target: by the year 2040, the Carbon stock lost between 2000 and 2010 will be recovered and increased by 2.8% relative to present. • UNCCD NAP • Armenia's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). • National adaptation plan: the national target is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and build resilience to climate change impacts. The country aims to reduce emissions by 40% by 2030 compared to 1990 levels and achieve climate neutrality by 2050. • Armenia's LDN target-setting process, which cuts

CBD, Convention on Wetlands, CMS, CITES and Aarhus Convention[18]. • strengthening public access to environmental information and promoting stakeholder engagement in environmental decision-making. Strong institutional coordination and regular stakeholder dialogue were reported as critical to overcome fragmentation while capacity-building and resource mobilization significantly enhance the ability to translate policies into action. However, sustained political commitment and continuous communication remain essential to ensure long-term success.	Pre-COP coordination meetings have become a basis to share information by fostering regular communication and coordination among MEA focal points and creating a culture of cooperation. Environmental impact assessments are conducted with public input, fostering transparency and accountability in environmental planning across sectors like mining, infrastructure, energy, reforestation, etc.				across land use, agriculture, and forestry, helping to ensure coherence between land use planning, climate action, and biodiversity conservation. • Long-term low greenhouse gas emission development strategy of the Republic of Armenia

Australia - "Nature Repair Market to bolster biodiversity and land action and align with climate action" (2025-ongoing)

In Australia, the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment, and Water (DCCEEW) is responsible for delivering on six[19] of the 17 SDGs, as well as housing the focal points for the three Rio Conventions (CBD, UNCCD, and UNFCCC) and almost 20 other MEAs, relating to biodiversity, species, heritage, chemicals and waste. The Department also has regular coordination meetings among representatives from across the three Rio Conventions to discuss synergies and share information, which has fostered improved policy coherence. Australia sees progress towards the CBD's KMGBF targets as delivering outcomes across other MEAs and also notes the utility of cross-MEA mapping of synergies that has been presented by UNEP.

[18] Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention)

[19] Namely, Goal 6 – Clean water and sanitation; Goal 7 – Affordable and clean energy; Goal 12 – Responsible production and consumption; Goal 13 – Climate action; Goal 14 – Life below water; and Goal 15 – Life on land.

In 2025, the Australian Government opened the Nature Repair Market, a voluntary national biodiversity market that supports land managers for taking actions that protect, conserve, and restore biodiversity. The scheme establishes a marketplace where individuals and organizations can undertake nature repair projects and attract investors.

By encouraging domestic biodiversity conservation work, the market may also help the meet Australia's international biodiversity commitments. It will complement existing efforts in multiple MEAs including the Rio Conventions (CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD). As a practical example of synergistic implementation, the Nature Repair Market aligns with the Australian Carbon Credits Unit (ACCU) Scheme. Project proponents can design projects that could earn both a biodiversity certificate and ACCUs, where they meet the requirements of the "Replanting native forest and woodland ecosystems" method and the applicable ACCU method. The Nature Repair Market's legislative framework includes a number of requirements related to assessing and responding to climate change; this includes requirements for methods set out in the Biodiversity Integrity Standards embedded in the legislation.

By launching the Nature Repair Market, the government is encouraging buy-in by the private sector, providing a robust, government-backed framework to verify, describe and compare biodiversity outcomes to bring in private funding in support of biodiversity management. The first method under the market supports replanting of native vegetation on historically cleared landscapes and is aligned with a replanting method under the ACCU scheme. Both schemes are administered by the Clean Energy Regulator, making it easier for applicants to understand how they can participate in both schemes and have multiple benefits recognized.

See: https://www.dcceew.gov.au/environment/environmental-markets/nature-repair-market

MEAs addressed in the case study: CBD, Convention on Wetlands, UNFCCC, UNCCD					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**
Cross-focal point coordination across DCCEEW is used, as appropriate, for a unified national approach and coordination on international commitments. Multiple working groups have been established to develop and guide the Nature Repair Market initiative and ensure alignment with the Australian Carbon Credit Unit Scheme. The Nature Repair Committee is an independent advisory body appointed by the Minister for the Environment and Water. The committee supports the integrity of the market, including by advising the minister on methods and	Greater policy coherence has been observed as a result of coordination and information sharing among national policy areas. The market framework makes it easier to attract investment in support of biodiversity management from different sources.	The PLANR tool makes it easier for landholders and investors to scope Nature Repair Market projects by providing a platform to: • plan biodiversity and carbon projects, • forecast biodiversity benefits • estimate costs, and • serve as a marketplace to connect proponents and investors. The Biodiversity Assessment Instrument sets out elements that methods need to include, so they describe biodiversity and biodiversity changes in a consistent and comparable way. This enables investors to compare different types	Australia has not reported specific barriers encountered in implementing the case study.	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation include: • Farmers • Indigenous Peoples & local communities • National Government • Private sector The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include:	• SDG 12 • SDG 13 • SDG 14 • SDG 15 The case study supports the following regional and national-level strategies for MEA implementation: • National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) • (indirectly) Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC)

undertaking periodic reviews of methods. The committee's advice is published via the department's website. The Biodiversity Assessment Expert Reference Group supported the department to develop the Biodiversity Assessment Instrument and the science and knowledge systems that underpin the Nature Repair Market.		of nature repair projects and identify those they want to invest in. DCCEEW partnered with CSIRO to deliver the Ecological Knowledge System (EKS). The EKS provides the science and environmental information that underpins the market.		• Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Environment & Climate • Tourism Eligible participants in the Nature Repair Market include: • landholders • farmers • First Nations people and organizations • conservation groups • investors	

Cameroon - "Study 1: National Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Assessment (NBESA)" (2017-2022) / "Study 2: Sectoral Footprint on Biodiversity in Cameroon (BIODEV2030)" (2019-2023)

Study 1: Cameroon's National Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Assessment (NBESA), conducted between 2017 and 2022 under the coordination of MINEPDED with support from UNEP-WCMC and the BES-Net/IPBES initiative, aimed to provide a scientific analysis of the state, trends and contributions of ecosystems and their services. The study covered all the country's major ecosystems (forests, savannahs, wetlands, coastal and marine ecosystems) and assessed their role in food security, climate regulation, water supply and their cultural value. It included a participatory approach mobilizing scientists, government institutions, and local communities to combine scientific knowledge and traditional knowledge. The NEA highlighted the national economy's dependence on ecosystem services and identified major pressures such as deforestation, agricultural expansion, mining and climate change. Its findings have served as the basis to revise the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP III). The study informs COMIFAC (Convergence Plan) and Central African Forest Initiative (CAFI) initiatives on sustainable forest management and REDD+, in addition to serving as a reference for transboundary projects (TRIDOM, Gulf of Guinea Large Marine Ecosystem). The study strengthened national capacities in ecosystem services assessment and created a framework for more inclusive and cross-sectoral science-policy dialogues in Cameroon.

Study 2: The Sectoral Footprint Study, conducted between 2020 and 2023 as part of the BIODEV2030 project coordinated by Expertise France and IUCN with support from AFD, assessed the impact of key productive sectors – agriculture, forestry, mining, energy and infrastructure – on biodiversity and ecosystem services in Cameroon. Its main objective was to identify sectoral pressures and propose development trajectories compatible with national and international commitments on biodiversity, climate and sustainable development. This study adopted a multisectoral and participatory approach, bringing together ministries, the private sector, civil society and researchers. It mapped areas of high pressure,

quantified impacts (deforestation, habitat fragmentation, pollution) and identified levers to reduce the ecological footprint of value chains. The resulting recommendations include promoting sustainable agricultural practices, ecological spatial planning, restoring degraded land and integrating biodiversity into sectoral policies.
The study's findings contributed to national cross-sectoral dialogues and serve as a reference for regional cross-sectoral dialogues (BIODEV2030, Great Green Wall Initiative) and the formulation of scenarios for the revision of NBSAP III and NDCs. It provides a basis for public policies aimed at reconciling economic growth and biodiversity conservation, while supporting COMIFAC's regional commitments (Vision 2030; AFR100) and the global objectives of the KMGBF.

Both studies support the integration of the objectives of MEAs, such as the CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD as well as the Convention on Wetlands, into development strategies (SND30).

MEAs addressed in the case study: CBD, CITES, CMS, Convention on Wetlands, WHC, Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention, MARPOL, UNFCCC, Kyoto Protocol, Vienna Convention, Montreal Protocol, UNCCD, UNCLOS, Abidjan Convention, Bamako Convention					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**
Barriers were addressed through the creation of the Permanent National Biodiversity Committee, an official body coordinated by MINEPDED, bringing together the focal points of the CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD, Convention on Wetlands, CITES Flora and Fauna, TIRPAA and sectoral ministries (agriculture, mines, forests, energy). This committee, reinforced by the National Science-Policy Platform established during the National Ecosystem Assessment (NEA) and consolidated by the sectoral footprint study, serves as a permanent mechanism for dialogue and integrated planning for biodiversity and ecosystem services. It harmonizes the indicators and	The integration of CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD and the Convention on Wetlands' commitments into a single analytical framework has facilitated the mobilization of stakeholders and enabled the use of harmonized monitoring indicators. The use of the SDGs and the KMGBF as references has helped to align national priorities with international commitments. Cooperation between ministries (environment, agriculture, mining, infrastructure) has strengthened policy coherence and reduced overlaps or contradictions. The two studies have enabled national executives to be trained in the use of modelling tools, economic assessment of	1. Tools developed or applied by NBESA: • IPBES methodological framework: Adapted to identify and assess ecosystem services and provide data that can be used by the CBD, The Convention on Wetlands and UNCCD. • GIS mapping of ecosystems: Production of maps of the main ecosystems (forests, savannahs, wetlands) useful for national planning and CBD and UNFCCC reporting. • Proposal for common biodiversity-climate-desertification indicators: the NEA has suggested a set of indicators that could be used by MEAs, but these indicators still	Barriers reported include institutional and governance barriers, particularly the fragmentation of responsibilities between ministries (MINEPDED, MINFOF, MINADER, MINMIDT, MINEE) with limited coordination and the lack of a harmonized legal framework for integrating MEAs into sectoral policies. Technical and scientific barriers were also reported, such as insufficient up-to-date data on biodiversity, land use, and ecosystem services and lack of harmonized tools to	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation include: • Children & Youth • Farmers • Indigenous Peoples & local communities • National Government • Non-Governmental Organizations • Private Sector & Industry • Local Authorities • Scientific & Technological Community The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Customs & Trade • Energy generation	• SDG 2 (Targets 2.4) • SDG 3 (Targets 3.9) • SDG 6 (Targets 6.6) • SDG 8 (Targets 8.4) • SDG 9 (Targets 9.4) • SDG 12 (Targets 12.2/ 12.6) • SDG 13 (Targets 13.1/ 13.2) • SDG 14 (Targets 14.2/14.5) • SDG 15 (Targets 15.1/15.2/15.3/15.5/15.9) The case study supports the following regional and national-level strategies for MEA implementation: • Nationally Determined Contribution • National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP 1&2)

data needed for monitoring and reporting on MEAs, reduces duplication of effort and facilitates the joint prioritization of actions in national policies (NBSAP III, CDN, SND30). This collaborative practice improves consistency between international commitments and national needs, while creating a channel for ongoing consultation between government, civil society, the private sector and regional initiatives (COMIFAC, BIODEV2030). Integrated and multisectoral approaches were reported by Cameroon as important: assessing ecosystems in isolation from economic dynamics is not sufficient. The sectoral footprint bridges this gap by linking conservation and development planning. Key approaches to foster collaboration include: • the mobilization of national universities and research centres (University of Yaoundé I, IRAD, CIFOR) to fill data gaps • the use of spatial data and GIS tools provided by UNEP-WCMC and IUCN to map ecosystem services and sectoral pressures	ecosystem services and sectoral analysis. This increase in skills creates a sustainable national basis for updating future assessments without being totally dependent on foreign experts. The two studies also harmonized indicators and data on terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and migratory species, reducing duplication of effort and resources when reporting to the various conventions. The NBESA provided a scientific basis on the status of ecosystems and species that supports both CBD and CMS obligations (e.g., assessment of wetlands of international importance that serve as habitats for migratory species). This alignment facilitated the integration of common conservation and restoration objectives into NBSAP III. Both studies have highlighted climate- and soil-related ecosystem services (carbon storage, fertility, water regulation), enabling the design of nature-based solutions that simultaneously address conservation (CBD), mitigation/adaptation (UNFCCC) and land degradation neutrality (UNCCD) objectives. However, the studies have also revealed the need for a permanent mechanism to collect and update data (akin to	need to be harmonized and validated by national institutions. 2. Tools developed or applied by the sectoral footprint study (BIODEV2030): • Sectoral footprint analysis methodology: Quantifies the pressures and impacts of productive sectors on biodiversity, applicable to CBD and UNFCCC commitments. • Biodiversity-compatible sectoral trajectory scenarios: Strategic planning tool, integrating CBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD objectives. • Guide to integrating biodiversity into productive sectors: Currently being adopted to help align sectors with MEAs. 3. Cross-cutting tools common to both studies • National Science-Policy Platform (PN-SPBES): Participatory framework for validating results and preparing the harmonization of indicators. • Integrated geospatial database: Compilation of	link sectoral pressures to ecological impacts (modelling, GIS). Difficulties are encountered when harmonizing monitoring indicators for MEAs. While there is an insufficient use of local and Indigenous knowledge in analyses, mobilizing stakeholders (local authorities, private sector) for a long and technical process can be a challenge. Financial and logistical barriers included limited funding and dependence on donors for data collection and validation workshops, along with logistical constraints (access to remote areas, high field costs). Conflicts of interest between conservation and development (e.g. infrastructure projects in protected areas) and economic and social pressures (population growth, demand for agricultural land, mining) form major challenges to overcome.	• Environment & Climate • Health • Manufacturing • Mining • Tourism • Transport • Waste management & Sewerage • Construction Both studies facilitated cross-sectoral actions, such as: • the development of an integrated monitoring framework based on ecosystem services • the analysis of the impacts of agricultural expansion (cocoa, oil palm, cotton) on deforestation • the analysis of interactions between agriculture, soil fertility and pollinator regulation; production of recommendations for climate-smart agriculture and agroforestry • the inclusion of community forests and concessions in the assessment of ecosystem services • the application of the One Health approach to	• Climate Change Adaptation Plan • One Health Strategy • National Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Assessment (NBESA) • Agreement on Joint Regulations on Fauna and Flora in the Lake Chad Basin - Accord sur les Règlements Conjoints de la Faune et de la Flore dans le Bassin du Lac Tchad • Commission des Forêts d'Afrique Centrale (COMIFAC) • Tri-National de la Sangha (TNS) • Tri-National Dja-Odzala-Minkébé Initiative (TRIDOM) - Initiative du Tri-National de Dja-Odzala-Minkébé (TRIDOM) • Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) - Accord de Partneriats Economiques (APE) • COMIFAC Convergence Plan - Plan de convergence de la COMIFAC • National Programme of the Central African Forest Initiative - Programme national d'investissement forestier durable (CAFI)

• the integration of local and indigenous knowledge through participatory workshops and community consultations, strengthening the relevance of the results • the Adoption of a 'One Process – Multiple MEAs' approach: integration of CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD and the Convention on Wetlands' requirements into common indicators and recommendations • the establishment of intersectoral dialogues via BIODEV2030, facilitating voluntary commitments from productive sectors (agribusiness, mining) • the referencing of NBESA results and sectoral footprint in reports submitted to MEAs (Sixth CBD Report, revised NIPs) • Raising awareness among policy makers and parliamentarians about the economic benefits of ecosystem services • Promoting nature-based solutions that reconcile conservation and development (e.g. agroforestry, blue carbon) • Highlighting co-benefits for local communities (income, food security, climate resilience) to ensure their buy-in	a national biodiversity observatory). This has facilitated the development of cross-cutting policies such as forest landscape restoration (AFR100) and the Great Green Wall. Stakeholders involved in the study emphasized that this integrated approach reduces dependence on isolated initiatives and promotes consistency of action over the long term. Regarding stakeholder engagement, the active participation of local communities and traditional knowledge improved data quality and promoted social acceptance of the recommendations. The science-policy dialogues organized through BIODEV2030 created a unique space for exchange between researchers, decision-makers and the private sector, increasing the reach of the results. Participatory approaches, although positive, have shown that inter-sectoral coordination needs to be institutionalized (beyond one-off projects). The results of the NEA and the sectoral footprint now serve as a reference for the revision of NBSAP III and for the integration of biodiversity into the National Development Strategy 2030 (SND30).	data from both studies, used on a preliminary basis for CBD and UNFCCC reports. • National Standing Committee on Biodiversity (CNPB): New institutional mechanism to coordinate cooperation between MEAs and steer future harmonization of indicators.		forest and wetland ecosystems • the production of recommendations for sustainable agricultural practices • the assessment of the impacts of mining (gold, bauxite, cobalt) on critical habitats • Proposals for sustainable certification tools (FSC, SFI) and integration with targets to fight deforestation • Assessment of the economic costs of biodiversity loss by sector • Identification of opportunities for innovative financing (payment for ecosystem services, carbon credits)	• Forest Landscape Restoration (AFR100)

• Optimizing resources by combining NEA workshops and sectoral footprints with other national processes (revision of NBSAP, preparation of MEAs reports) • Adopting a phased approach to studies to prioritise key ecosystems and sectors for rapid results despite limited resources	They have also helped to influence the formulation of the revised NDCs and forest restoration policies (AFR100, Great Green Wall).				

Czech Republic - "For a Healthy Future – Integrating Research, Policy, and Community into Regional Action" (2017-ongoing)

There is a need to strengthen cooperation among Central European countries to formulate common regional priorities and strategies in response to a lack of data on human and environmental health. This case study contributes to the implementation of the BRS Conventions, Ostrava and Budapest Declarations, and targets of the Global Framework of Chemicals related to the risk reduction and generation of validated national/subregional data on factors affecting population health and well being in the Czech Republic and beyond. At the core of The Czech Republic's example lies a well-planned, systematic and coordinated capacity building strategy in sound chemical management at the national and international level, using gradual stakeholder engagement. Two main science-policy and capacity building platforms were used: (1) the National Centre for Toxic Compounds (acting as national coordinator for in-country chemicals management and overarching chemical risk assessment authority) and (2) the Stockholm Convention Regional Centre (SCRC), both hosted by the RECETOX Centre, Masaryk University.

This case study is a follow up of the European Longitudinal Study of Pregnancy and Childhood (ELSPAC), initiated in the 1980s by the WHO in six countries. In the Czech Republic, the ELSPAC study followed 5,738 children born in Brno and 1,851 children born in Znojmo since birth. The main objective of the ELSPAC study was to determine which biological, psychological, social, economic, and environmental factors had an impact on pregnancy, birth, adaptation after birth, child development, and the health of children and adolescents. The RECETOX Centre then took over the implementation of the ELSPAC study and prepared a follow up TNG survey (the Next Generation) to follow former ELSPAC children and complement the previously gathered decades of information with a new generation of children (2017-2024). The main TNG survey motivates its participants to join smaller studies on soil health, air quality, urban resilience, agriculture practices and through citizen science mobilizes population groups, raises awareness and shares knowledge, but also provides data for actionable risk mitigation measures. The results are communicated to participants and to local authorities in Brno and national organizations to implement relevant environment-health strategies and action plans.

In March 2024, the Ministry of Environment and RECETOX organized a V4+ Conference on Environment and Health, bringing leading scientists and experts from nine Central European countries to Brno with representatives of the best European research institutes on environmental exposures and public health, as well as high level representatives of the World Health Organization and director of the European Environment Agency. More than 100 participants agreed jointly to protect people's health in the Central European region from the negative consequences of chemical exposures and strongly supported the need to strengthen cooperation between the environment and health sectors in the sub-region. Much attention was paid to participatory programmes and public involvement in research activities that can be used not only to obtain data on population health and behaviour but also to educate children and adults. The conclusions of the conference were presented at a follow-up meeting of Central European Environment Ministers, where the possibility of promoting a European research mission on the healthy physical and mental development of children and young people in the face of complex environmental, socio-economic and political crises was presented.

MEAs addressed in the case study: Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention, Minamata Convention, Air Convention, Aarhus Convention, PRTR Protocol					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**
A lot of emphasis was placed on stakeholder engagement to demonstrate benefits stemming from crossing strictly delineated sectoral boundaries. Intersectoral cooperation is fostered through joint projects and platform, thereby tackling often limited understanding of complex linkages between health and environment areas. It is vital to develop concepts that are easily understood and cover complex environment and health issues that are very often difficult to explain (such as the Exposome). To develop a personalized approach to the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of chronic conditions, a better understanding of the relationships between genetic predispositions, environmental, and social stressors and individual behaviour is needed. Collaborative efforts are also needed in the region (among countries) to develop this knowledge, supported by research infrastructures and their networks. MEA focal points are regularly updated on the progress of work (every 5-6 months).	Czech Republic reports a variety of benefits from its approach to cooperation in MEA implementation: 1. Research benefits: Information collected in the Czech Republic is shared with national, European and international researchers. Access to such high-quality, long-term data from a well-defined area and population group(s) enables robust scientific analysis and method validation for novel approaches (e.g. non target screening), building harmonized data repositories and inclusion into broader continental research networks. 2. Community benefits: Participants receive personalized health and environmental data about their exposure to chemicals, plus actionable guidance on how to minimize their further exposure, where possible. Mitigation options (risk reduction measures to toxic chemical exposure) are proposed to local and national authorities, and these are usually included into urban development plans (such as the climate action plan of the City of Brno). This knowledge is also used to create specific maps showing the quality of environment/air/water. This pool of knowledge, recommendations, and collaborative actions with communities and stakeholders creates a motivated	Czech Republic used regular workshops, summer schools, and other trainings on human biomonitoring, along with regulatory risk assessment trainings. International partnerships and research infrastructures are used to develop and test novel methods, such as Non-Target Screening, including harmonization of internationally recognized methodologies and data. Complex data repositories and visualization platforms developed by the RECETOX Centre are used to share information with policymakers and other stakeholders nationally and within relevant MEAs. Data harmonization	Barriers were encountered when attempting to facilitate cooperation between the environment and health sectors.	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation include: • Children & Youth • Local Authorities • National Government • Non-Governmental Organizations • Private Sector & Industry • Scientific & Technological Community The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Environment & Climate • Health • Waste management & Sewerage	• SDG 3 • SDG 4 • SDG 6 • SDG 9 • SDG 11 • SDG 12 • SDG 17 The case study supports the following regional and national-level strategies for MEA implementation: • Budapest Declaration adopted at the 7th Ministerial Environment and Health Conference in Budapest (5 – 7 July 2023) • Roadmap for Healthier People, a Thriving Planet and a Sustainable Future 2023-2030 • ASD 2030 • the implementation of the ICCM's Global Framework on Chemicals • SAICM • Strategic Framework Czech Republic 2030

	community that stays engaged over multiple years or even decades. 3. International benefits: The regional approach provides a scalable model for other regions and contributes validated data and methods to international frameworks such as the Stockholm Convention Global Monitoring Plan and Data Warehouse, WHO Food Gems database, EU Partnership for the Assessment of Risks from Chemicals (PARC), and global policy processes.	standards across multiple providers and networks are used as well.			• National Environment Policy 2030 • National Programme for Emissions Reduction • Strategic Framework Circular Czechia • National Waste Management Plan 2015-2024 • State Environmental Education Programme

El Salvador - "Institutional strengthening for El Salvador for the implementation of the Basel, Stockholm, Rotterdam, and Minamata Conventions and the strategic approach to international chemicals management" (expected completion in 2026)

This case aims to strengthen national institutions through an integrated approach to address the sound management of chemicals and waste. It improves public institutional capacity to manage chemicals and waste throughout their life cycle by supporting the active participation of different institutions, including government, the private sector, academia, and workers.

Considering El Salvador's national development strategies and priorities, and to meet the MEA goals, mechanisms and processes are needed to increase national capacity in risk management regarding hazardous substances, chemicals, and waste. Lists of prohibited waste, substances, and chemicals must be updated to reflect those in the BRS Conventions and the Minamata Convention. These lists will also include a ban on equipment and materials containing mercury and mercury compounds, improving waste management and preventing exposure to contaminants.

Another key aspect is the need to incorporate the globally harmonized system to identify chemical risks, which will require reforms to the national regulatory framework for chemical substances - an important aspect given the involvement of several institutions in the regulation of chemical substances and products.

MEAs addressed in the case study: Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention, Minamata Convention, MARPOL, Montreal Protocol					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**
To overcome communication and follow-up challenges, permanent communication was essential. Collaborative practices were facilitated by:	In this case study, the implementation of each MEA was facilitated by strengthening the legal, regulatory, and institutional aspects of chemical management.	El Salvador created a registry of authorized companies with environmental permits that	Frequent changes in personnel in the competent institutions, such as national authorities for the implementation of	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation include:	• SDG 6 (Target 6.3) • SDG 9 (Target 9.4) • SDG 12 (Target 12.4) • SDG 13 (Target 13.2)

• the establishment of an inter-institutional political working group with the participation of high-level representatives (Ministers/Directors) from the Ministries of Environment, Agriculture, Labor, Economy, Foreign Affairs, and Health, to address agenda items under the conventions on hazardous chemicals and waste (the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm, Minamata Conventions and Montreal Protocol). • the establishment of an inter-institutional technical committee to review regulatory proposals and requests for consent under the Rotterdam Convention. • the establishment of a working group with the General Directorate of Customs for the surveillance and control of hazardous substances, chemicals, and waste. • the use of technical oversight to facilitate communication on El Salvador's commitments to new decision-makers and achieve better coordination between institutions.	Using updated lists of all chemical substances regulated by various institutions and those covered by MEAs on chemicals and waste, this case supports the establishment of a national registry of industrial, commercial, and service activities that use hazardous substances in their manufacturing, processing, and consumption processes. A shared data system will be available for all institutions that, by law, require authorization or monitoring of these activities. These institutions include the Ministry of Health (MINSAL), the Ministry of the Interior, and the Ministry of the Environment. The Ministry of the Interior and Territorial Development, through its Fire Department, issues certification and approves the emergency plan for companies and activities that handle hazardous materials in support of the mandates of other institutions. The information collected will strengthen and improve health and environmental monitoring of activities or businesses, prevent illicit trade in substances, control the generation of hazardous waste, prepare national reports on waste treatment and disposal, evaluate technologies and implement best environmental practices to prevent the risk of toxic substance emissions, and identify potential environmental risks associated with hazardous materials.	annually report emissions, discharges, and quantities of waste generated, among other environmental aspects. This Annual Operational Report includes the following sections: General Company Data; Solid Waste; Air Emissions; Wastewater; Hazardous Waste.	conventions and border surveillance, was reported as a major barrier for synergistic MEA implementation. Communication and information exchange was challenging to maintain for decision-making related to the implementation of the agreements between the competent national authorities.	• National Government • Private Sector & Industry • Scientific & Technological Community • Workers & Trade Unions The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Customs & Trade • Energy generation • Environment & Climate • Health • Waste management & Sewerage	The case study supports the following regional and national-level strategies for MEA implementation: • National Climate Change Plan 2022 – 2026 • Nationally Determined Contributions of El Salvador • Plan Nacional de Acción sobre Residuos Marinos de El Salvador 2022 – 2032

Fiji - "Mainstreaming biodiversity in climate action in Fiji" (2020-ongoing)

Fiji's integration of biodiversity and climate policy through an ecosystem-based approach was endorsed by Cabinet and embedded in its National Adaptation Plan (NAP), guiding resilience, carbon sequestration and biodiversity protection across sectors. This approach was initiated in response to Fiji's high vulnerability to climate change and the recognition that ecosystem-based adaptation offers multiple co-benefits. The NAP was the result of extensive inter-ministerial deliberations, with multi-stakeholder engagement and inputs from technical experts in the private sector, civil society, academia, and sub-national government, increasing its legitimacy.
Fiji's National Climate Change Policy recognizes Ecosystem-based adaptation as a technology to build the resilience of communities to climate change and disasters. Climate policies are underpinned by an ecosystem-based approach across sectors—coastal, forest, and agricultural—and embedded in institutional arrangements involving multiple ministries and stakeholders. Human rights and gender equity principles are embedded throughout, with emphasis on traditional knowledge, community participation, and equitable benefit-sharing.

MEAs addressed in the case study: CBD, UNFCCC					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**
Collaboration in this case study was supported by the NAP Steering Committee, an inter-ministerial and multi-stakeholder body comprising high-level representatives from relevant ministries to oversee the National Adaptation Plan process. Its development was supported by fourteen technical working groups, including members from government, the private sector, civil society, academia and sub-national governments. The Committee continues to engage expert stakeholders and forms dedicated working groups as needed to support decision-making and inclusive implementation. For example, the National Adaptation Plan (2018)	Collaboration between biodiversity and climate frameworks in Fiji has generated national benefits, although they are difficult to measure. First, ecosystem-based measures such as mangrove rehabilitation, watershed reforestation and integrated coastal zone management reduce vulnerability to coastal flooding, storm surges, and erosion while enhancing carbon sequestration and biodiversity habitats. Second, the tree-planting target of 30 million by 2035, included in both the NDC and NBSAP, creates efficiency by advancing	Fiji has developed forest surveillance systems and a national forest information system under its national REDD+ programme. A Mangrove Management Plan is also under development, and the NAP promotes integrating green and blue accounting into GDP and budget processes.	Developing an integrated approach to address biodiversity loss and climate change remains a challenge, which requires stronger cross-sectoral collaboration and coordination across policy frameworks. The National Adaptation Plan (2018) identified several adaptation barriers and limits, including governance and institutional adaptation barriers that require action. However, Fiji is largely unable to address natural and biological adaptation limits—particularly coral	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation primarily include the National Government. The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Environment & Climate	• SDG 2 • SDG 6 • SDG 13 • SDG 14 • SDG 15 The case study supports the following regional and national-level strategies for MEA implementation: • Fiji's Third National Communication (2020) • National Adaptation Plan (2018) • Second National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) (2020) of Fiji • Second Nationally Determined Contribution (2020) - The NDC has

aims to address governance and institutional barriers by promoting vertical integration, including the integration of ecosystem-based adaptation approaches into sub-national development planning. This collaborative governance structure supports integrated implementation of the UNFCCC, Paris Agreement and CBD by promoting ecosystem-based adaptation across levels of government. More specific committees also include the National REDD+ Steering Committee, which is a multi-sectoral body tasked with reviewing and approving REDD+ activities, incorporating stakeholders from key sectors related to land use and ecosystem governance. In the case of Fiji, high-level political engagement has played a crucial role in enabling the integration of multistakeholder inputs. For example, Fiji co-hosted the 2017 UN Ocean Conference and deposited 17 voluntary commitments to conserve and sustainably use ocean and marine resources under SDG 14. These actions helped build momentum for aligning national climate adaptation strategies with biodiversity and ocean conservation goals.	climate mitigation, strengthening biodiversity corridors, and protecting water catchments. Third, the commitment to designate 30% of the EEZ as marine protected areas by 2030 safeguards biodiversity and at the same time strengthens the resilience of fisheries and coastal livelihoods to climate change. Finally, the NAP Steering Committee and multi-stakeholder processes have improved institutional coordination, reducing duplication and enabling Fiji to mobilize resources more effectively across both biodiversity and climate agendas.		bleaching, which is already being observed due to rising ocean temperatures and acidification—as these impacts are driven by global greenhouse gas emissions and depend on mitigation efforts beyond Fiji's control. The Third National Communication highlights additional challenges, such as the fact that restoration efforts lack community engagement, suffer from inadequate coordination among government and non-government actors and face difficulties in securing landowner participation, which has led to a focus on short-term plantation species. In addition, limited data and weak monitoring systems for ecosystem services hinder effective follow-up on ecosystem-based approaches and nature-based solutions.		four key biodiversity-related targets: Target 7 promotes nature-based solutions and early warning systems, Target 10 addresses biodiversity conservation and ecosystem service protection, Target 11 sets a target to plant 30 million trees by 2035, and Target 12 commits to designating 30% of the EEZ as marine protected areas by 2030. This aligns with SDG Target 15.9, which calls for the integration of ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, as well as with Targets 13.1, 14.2, 14.5, 15.1 and 15.2, which collectively promote climate resilience, marine ecosystem protection, and sustainable use and conservation of terrestrial ecosystems and forests.

Finland - "Cooperation between biodiversity related conventions and other MEAs – Finland's participation in the Bern process" (2018-ongoing)

The outcomes of the Party-led Bern consultation workshops (Bern Process) include concrete conclusions on the involvement of the relevant conventions, including those outside the biodiversity cluster, in the development and implementation of the KMGBF. Finland (CBD focal point) has actively participated in the Bern process and provided national examples. As concluded by the Bern Process reports, if multiple MEAs are involved in the implementation of the Framework, the process and its outcome can centralize reported information for the global review of progress in an efficient and coherent manner. An integrated approach limits duplication of efforts and saves resources while building on current tools and processes.

Finland emphasizes the need for continuous follow-up and corrective actions in its achievement of shared global goals including the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in light of the following:

• The achievement of SDG 14's target to conserve 10% of Finland's total marine area has been reached. On the other hand, Finland is still far from ecological sustainability (SDG 15), especially when it comes to forests and other terrestrial ecosystems.
•As for SDG 17, Finland has actively pursued international partnerships to advance sustainable development. At the national level, parity is extremely important for social cohesion, to ensure that all of society supports sustainability and that people feel included and are better equipped for future challenges through models such as life-long education.
•Global challenges continue to increase at an accelerated pace. Tackling the interlinked challenges in a continuously changing geopolitical context requires new approaches and closer collaboration between different actors.

MEAs addressed in the case study: CBD, CITES, CMS, Convention on Wetlands, ITPGRFA, WHC, BBNJ Agreement, Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention, UNFCCC, UNCCD					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**
Finland reported the use of regular meetings through the national biodiversity working group chaired by the Ministry of the Environment to gather MEA focal points for the biodiversity-related conventions. Also focal points or representatives of other conventions such as chemicals conventions are regularly invited to participate in the biodiversity working group. Collaboration with a range of partners has facilitated consultations to determine the	Finland reports various benefits from cooperation in the implementation of multiple MEAs: • Monitoring and reporting on achievement of the targets benefit significantly from using existing data sources, including those used by other MEAs. There are tools that can support this, such as DaRT, but cooperation is crucial to ensure parties and secretariats are aware of available data and interpret them in consistent ways. • Cooperation on development and use of indicators across conventions	Tools for cooperation include the Bern process's platform for enhancing cooperation and synergies, the Data Reporting Tool for MEAs (DaRT), which is used horizontally in national reporting. In Finland national tools such as the voluntary biodiversity	Knowledge management is one of the key strategic means of implementation that underpin the achievement of the goals and targets of the KMGBF. Easy and timely access to the best available, fit-for-purpose biodiversity data, information and knowledge assets is	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation include: • National Government • Local Authorities • Non-Governmental Organizations • Scientific and Technological Community	• SDG 12 • SDG 13 • SDG 14 • SDG 15 • SDG 17 The case study supports the following regional and national-level strategies for MEA implementation: • the implementation of the ICCM's Global

needs, opportunities and possible ways forward. Furthermore, efforts have been made to build a coherent landscape of knowledge tools such as to develop national indicators to be used in country reports. Developing a culture of knowledge sharing and fostering collaborative networks and online communities of practice requires analysing, sharing, and leveraging experiences and lessons learned from various biodiversity knowledge management initiatives. National planning and the monitoring of national plans and commitments has been essential to identify where action is needed. Dialogue and active engagement in a "whole-of society approach" is also essential, for the development of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) consistent with other national plans and strategies, including those for climate change mitigation and adaptation, pollution control and sustainable development.	increases consistency and improves efficiency. One opportunity identified is collaboration on indicators for the KMGBF and the global review under the CBD. Reporting and data management should facilitate effective and coherent participation of MEAs in the CBD global review. The aim is to accelerate cooperation and synergies in MEA implementation and support the KMGBF, with evidence of global progress. • At the national level, effective implementation of the KMGBF requires inclusive and coordinated approaches that support sustained dialogue across government agencies, with local government, with the private sector, and with rights holders and other stakeholders. • Finland considers the country reviews particularly useful as they provide an opportunity to uncover and correct potential blind spots, strengthening a whole-of-society approach. This facilitates a shift from a single-solution orientation to a systems-based approach. Continuous stocktaking and strategic forecasting facilitate adaptive management.	protection programmes HELMI, METSO and AHTI including the Biodiversity monitoring platform (biodiversity.fi) have been important for different ecosystems.	critical for effective planning, policy formulation, decision-making and implementation. Data further may be in some instances fragmented, difficult to find, or inaccessible.	The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Customs and Trade • Environment & Climate • Health • Mining • Waste Management & Sewerage	Framework on Chemicals • Finland's NBSAP • The EU biodiversity strategy • Finland's Nationally Determined Contributions

Ireland - "The Irish Peatland Standard - An Ecosystem Certificate offering a multi-credit bundle of emissions reductions, water retention, biodiversity uplift, flood risk reduction, fire risk reduction, and amenity benefits" (2025-ongoing)

Ireland is home to a significant portion of Europe's peatlands which are essential in regulating water, supporting biodiversity and storing carbon. However, many have been severely degraded due to human activity and peatland restoration is not always sufficiently incentivized. Irish peatlands emit more than 2.3 $MtCO_2$ per year (excluding use in horticulture or

eventual peat burning), half of which are from peat soils under grasslands and one third from domestic peat extraction. With effective restoration, healthy peat soils in Ireland have the potential to capture and sequester up to 4.5 $MtCO_2$ per year, thereby removing more than 5% of national emissions.

Reducing emissions is a national priority currently using government spending through direct exchequer, carbon tax revenues and a small proportion of the Irish Sovereign Green Bond. Establishing a resilient model for large-scale peatland commodification is required, as current models do not meet the amount of funding needed for restoration, nor do they yet capitalize on the significant amount of finance available for the broad range of ecosystem services offered by healthy peatlands.

Following the cessation of commercial extraction, local communities require incentives to engage with peatland restoration. Peatland Finance Ireland offers an innovative model for funding and rewarding peatland restoration that mobilizes all stakeholders. Developed over the last 15 months and seed funded by various governments departments and agencies, the Peatland Standard for Ireland is a pioneering certification designed to empower landowners and farmers to showcase the environmental benefits of peatland restoration. The certification was created in collaboration with academic institutions, governmental bodies, semi-state agencies and civil society groups, to provide landowners with the opportunity to unlock financial support to accelerate their peatland restoration efforts. Commercially viable, community-led peatland initiatives have the potential to both restore habitats and make positive economic contributions to local communities who are being encouraged to forego the use of a highly affordable fuel source.

The initiative aligns closely with Ireland's Climate Action Plan - which identifies peatland restoration as a key strategy for reducing emissions - and assists Ireland in achieving its National Biodiversity Action Plan targets.

MEAs addressed in the case study: CBD, CMS, Convention on Wetlands, WHC, UNFCCC, Watercourses Convention					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**
Respectful engagement with landowners, from as early a stage as possible, has been useful in overcoming barriers. So has ensuring that financial incentives to modify management practices are of a scale that offsets the (sometimes substantial) opportunity costs of modifying the management practices. Ireland highlights that mutual respect for stakeholders has been essential, notably the acknowledgement of the varying and sometimes contradictory remits of various State and semi-State organizations involved.	Aside from establishing a community of practice in Ireland, Peatland Finance Ireland has also been instrumental in establishing the Peatland Finance Collective, a group of likeminded peatland restoration initiatives across Ireland, Scotland and England, with expectations to expand this to Finland, Estonia and Sweden in the coming year. A long process of cross-sectoral engagement initiated the development of Peatland	The seed funded Irish Peatland Standard presents an innovative combination of ecosystem services as a singular Ecosystem Certificate, combining emissions reductions, water retention and purification, and biodiversity to encourage landowners to change management practices through the value it generates by offering non-public sources of finances.	Ensuring that landowners understand what the Irish Peatland Standard does not do, rather than what it does, was the main challenge reported. The Irish Peatland Standard does not purchase land or sell the certificates to the highest bidder. They do not allow companies to increase their emissions unabated. Other standards and forms of Measurement, Reporting and Verification have created negative perceptions and	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation include: • Farmers • Indigenous Peoples & local communities • Local Authorities • National Government • Non-Governmental Organizations • Private Sector & Industry • Scientific & Technological Community	• SDG 3 • SDG 6 • SDG 7 • SDG 11 • SDG 14 The case study supports the following regional and national-level strategies for MEA implementation: • National Biodiversity Action Plan • Sectoral Climate Adaptation Plans • National emissions reductions targets • Peatland Strategy

	Finance Ireland from which the Peatland Standard for Ireland emerged. This has allowed various government departments to meet various sectoral targets for climate (DCEE), biodiversity (NPWS) and food production (DAFM). The multi-credit bundle ensures that cross-sectoral reporting can be achieved without double / triple counting.		precedents across the globe and have compromised the reputation of those that follow. Given that this is still a nascent asset class and market, building confidence of landowners has been particularly challenging. Investor interest has been overwhelming and based on extremely solid expectations of scientific rigour and State support. However, given the highly fragmented nature of land ownership in Ireland, supporting communities and small farmers is a priority.	The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Energy generation • Environment & Climate • Mining • Tourism	• Water Framework Directive River Basin Management Plan

Madagascar – "Synergies between the UNESCO World Heritage Convention and CITES in protecting precious wood species (ebony and rosewood) of the World Heritage site "Rainforests of the Atsinanana" (Madagascar)" (2010- 2025)

The rainforests of the Atsinanana, inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List in 2007 for their exceptional biodiversity and critical ecological processes, are essential for the survival of Madagascar's unique flora and fauna, which evolved in isolation for over 60 million years, supporting numerous rare species. However, the rainforests and the species they support have faced a series of threats in recent years including illegal logging; trafficking of precious wood species, namely Malagasy ebonies (*Diospyros* spp.) and palisanders and rosewoods (*Dalbergia* spp.) which are listed in the CITES Appendices; and deforestation which is impacting the status of important key species such as lemurs. These threats led to the inclusion of the rainforests to the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2010.

Following the site's inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, Madagascar, with the support of UNESCO, IUCN, the CITES Secretariat, and the international community, developed and implemented an action plan aligned with global and regional commitments towards the removal of the site from the List. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee have helped to establish a Desired State of Conservation in consultation with the local and national authorities, and Corrective Measures were identified together with indicators for their achievement. Madagascar developed and implemented an action plan with the support of UNESCO and the international community. Under the World Heritage Convention, this is known as the programme of Corrective Measures and the Desired State of Conservation for the Removal of properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR).

UNESCO and IUCN conducted a joint Reactive Monitoring mission in March 2025 with the participation of the CITES Secretariat, highlighting the positive efforts made by Madagascar and its partners to improve the state of conservation of the property, the implementation of corrective measures from previous missions, and, in particular, the remarkable progress achieved. Through strengthened management measures, satellite surveillance, local patrols, and control of ebony and rosewood felling, significant progress has been achieved in halting illegal activities, restoring forest cover, and reducing poaching, thereby contributing to the implementation of biodiversity-related conventions at the national level. As of 2025, 63% of areas of forest cover loss had been restored, illegal logging and trafficking of precious wood were significantly reduced, and levels of lemur poaching reached their lowest level in 10 years.

The World Heritage Committee removed the property from the List in Danger in July 2025.

MEAs addressed in the case study: CITES, WHC					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**
The State Party has stepped up its efforts to combat the exploitation and trade in precious woods by adopting and implementing several new legal texts and strengthening legal enforcement, supported by monitoring (e.g. Decision 47 COM 7A.14 of the World Heritage Committee, State of Conservation report submitted to the World Heritage Committee, and 2025 joint UNESCO/IUCN/CITES Joint Reactive Monitoring mission report). The joint effort of international organisations and national authorities for the conservation of the rainforests has enabled the implementation of an integrated action plan which includes a programme of corrective measures. This process is defined under the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines towards meeting a desired state of conservation for the removal of properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Coordinated management plans and	The coordinated conservation efforts in the Atsinanana rainforests have strengthened synergistic implementation of biodiversity-related MEAs at the national level, resulting in improved species protection, forest restoration, and enhanced enforcement against illegal logging and trade. Sixty-three percent of forest cover has been restored, and illegal logging and lemur poaching are at their lowest levels in a decade. This example of cooperation in MEA implementation has supported efforts against the international trade of endangered species, ensuring their long-term sustainability and conservation within areas of outstanding universal value inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List.	Coordinated management plans were applied by Madagascar, UNESCO, IUCN and the CITES Secretariat, including tools for satellite-based forest monitoring, local patrol mechanisms, and the enforcement of protocols targeting illegal logging and trafficking of CITES-listed precious wood species.	Madagascar has not reported specific barriers encountered in implementing the case study.	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation include: • National Government • Local Authorities • Non-Governmental Organizations The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Environment & Climate • Customs & Trade	• SDG 11 • SDG 15 The case study supports the following regional and national-level strategies for MEA implementation: • Desired State of Conservation for the Removal of the Rainforests of Atsinanana World Heritage property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and programme of corrective measures (DSOCR) • Ongoing process for the preparation of management plans for all national park components of the serial World Heritage property, as well as the production of an integrated management plan

enforcement measures have required and facilitated cross-agency cooperation and synergies for the protection of endangered species and forest ecosystems.					

Mexico - "National Meeting: Synergies between Multilateral Environmental Agreements for the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework" (6 & 7th August 2024)

On August 6 and 7, 2024, the National Meeting: Synergies between multilateral environmental agreements for the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) was held at the headquarters of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, welcoming around 130 people from the federal government, state governments, the Legislative Branch and international cooperation agencies. The event aimed to identify challenges and opportunities to contribute to the efficient implementation of the GBF and various MEAs in Mexico. Globally, Mexico understands it was the first country to carry out an exercise of this type, inspired by the Bern Process, an initiative of Switzerland and the United Nations Environment Programme, created to promote synergies and collaboration between different MEAs. This leadership will allow the consolidation of Mexico's position in various international fora, favouring a transversal and synergistic approach in the fulfilment of the commitments derived from the MEAs.

The event focused on generating schemes for the various agencies and entities of the Government of Mexico to identify challenges and opportunities to collaborate in an agile manner, without duplicating efforts and while making resources more efficient in relation to the application of the GBF and the MEAs. The role of the Escazú Agreement as a cross-cutting axis to enable plural processes of participation and promote environmental and climate justice stood out. The importance of coordination between the national focal points of the MEAs was emphasized, both for reporting and for generation and exchange of information and data, as well as the implementation of aligned actions in the territory.

In addition, collaborative dynamics were developed to strengthen inter-institutional collaboration among MEAs through their focal points, addressing possible coordination mechanisms, legal and institutional arrangements, as well as alignment of efforts between different sectors and levels of government. Likewise, the importance of fostering an inter-institutional dialogue that allows for the development of additional recommendations to improve environmental cooperation was highlighted, recognizing the respective roles and mandates of all the actors involved.

MEAs addressed in the case study: CBD, Nagoya Protocol, Cartagena Protocol, Convention on Wetlands, Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention, Minamata Convention, UNFCCC, UNCCD, Escazú Agreement					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**
Mexico reports the importance of political and governmental will at all levels to advance a mechanism that encourages inter-institutional coherence and cooperation, as the National Meeting did. Good collaborative practices should	The National Meeting demonstrated the existence of a firm will to move forward in the creation of a mechanism that promotes coherence and cooperation between institutions. However, it is	This case study aims at developing indicators and tools for the periodic evaluation of progress (i.e. compliance traffic lights). It seeks to	While this National Meeting aimed at supporting the creation of synergies between mutually complementary multilateral	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation include: • Children & Youth	• SDG 5 • SDG 6 • SDG 13 • SDG 15 • SDG 16

strengthen international cooperation in order to access external resources. The case study used to the Inter-institutional Coordination Mechanism, headed by an office of the Presidency of the Republic, made up of two Co-Presidencies and composed of Working Groups linked to each of the four objectives of the KMGBF. As part of the synergy identification task, an exercise was presented during the webinars to outline the goals of the KMGBF and the provisions of various MEAs that could support each other in its implementation. For example, Target 7 of the KMGBF "Reduce pollution risks and the negative impact of pollution from all sources, to levels that are not harmful to biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services" could be supported by Articles 1 of the BRS Conventions and the Minamata Convention on Mercury. Likewise, possible synergies of the three rights of access (access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters) in the Escazú Agreement were found with the KMGBF and other MEAs.	crucial that this willingness is reflected at the highest level to provide effective guidance to people implementing MEAs. To achieve a long-term vision that provides continuity and historical memory, it is essential to retain specialized people and promote their training. This will consolidate progress and ensure the effective implementation of MEAs. This process has shown the importance of contributions to resource mobilization for MEA implementation at all levels. Duplication of tasks between government institutions could be avoided through capacity building and well-designed institutional frameworks. This initiative provides an opportunity to work jointly in homologating indicators and data presented in country reports for MEAs, providing a chance to develop projects along with cooperation agencies.	implement an instrument similar to the Data Reporting Tool for MEAs (DaRT), and uses a National Platform for Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation of Multilateral Environmental Agreements, which would produce reports on biodiversity based on existing platforms.	environmental agendas, it faced several barriers. These include the reduction of the public budget for various sectors, in particular the environmental sector. The lack or scarcity of budget prevents the full fulfilment of the mandate of governmental agencies, both internally and internationally, and increases competition among federal government agencies for financial resources from international organizations. Reduced staff are often subjected to an overload of work, thereby extending hours and temporary of fee-based hiring.	• Indigenous Peoples & local communities • Local Authorities • National Government • Women The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Environment & Climate • Health • Tourism • Waste management and sewerage	The case study supports the following regional and national-level strategies for MEA implementation: • the implementation of the ICCM's Global Framework on Chemicals • Mexico's National Biodiversity Strategy (ENBioMex) • State Strategies for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity (ECUSBE) • Roadmap towards the implementation of the Escazú Agreement in Mexico

Panama - “Panama’s Nature Pledge” (2025-ongoing)

Panama’s Nature Pledge initiative seeks to find alignment between the tools to implement the Rio conventions in order to act with synergy, making good use of resources and conducting realistic actions. The Panama Nature Pledge emerged as a strategic national response to the urgent need to protect biodiversity and enhance climate action, in alignment with the country's multilateral commitments. The pledge is supported by a solid foundation of national environmental policies, including the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) under the Paris Agreement, and sectoral plans such as the Ecosystem Restoration Plan, Integrated Water Resource Management Plan, and the National Adaptation Plan. The pledge is further strengthened by high-level political commitment and the engagement of local communities, Indigenous Peoples, the private sector, and international partners. It aims to create synergies between the biodiversity, climate change, environmental health, intergenerational justice, and

sustainable finance agendas. The pledge positions Panama as a regional leader in evidence-based conservation, nature-based solutions, and climate action grounded in equity. The Panama Nature Pledge represents a collective call to redefine the human–nature relationship through policy, territory, and shared responsibility.

MEAs addressed by the case study: CBD, Convention on Wetlands, Basel Convention, UNFCCC, Vienna Convention, Montreal Protocol, UNCCD, BWM, Escazú Agreement					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**
In the implementation of the Nature Pledge, Panama reported the use of working groups and data-sharing mechanisms to create space for dialogue and understanding across the different conventions. Collaboration across ministerial directions (Ministry of Environment) was essential as well as the request for human resources and technical support to develop the Pledge.	The Nature Pledge is a new initiative which must foster understanding from key stakeholders, starting with the focal points in Panama for each of the Rio Conventions. Understanding the differences in work methods and capacity for each of the focal points is essential to identify the differences and similarities in the implementation agenda for each convention, thereby fostering adaptability and respect from each stakeholder. Aligning goals stated in national strategies (NDC, NBSAP etc.) unlocks the potential for better allocation of resources and implementation efforts.	With the support of UNDP, the case study developed an artificial intelligent (AI)-enabled analysis of the targets from the different Conventions to identify synergies.	Extensive fragmentation of information, led to incoherence and lack of alignment among the different tools used to report for the three Rio Conventions (CBD, UNCCD, UNFCCC). Alignment in the wording across the conventions would clarify the scope for each and the responses needed.	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation include: • Local Authorities • National Government The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Energy generation • Environment & Climate • Health • Waste management and sewerage	• SDG 3 • SDG 5 • SDG 6 • SDG 7 • SDG 11 • SDG 13 • SDG 14 • SDG 15 • SDG 16 • SDG 17 Regional and national-level strategies for MEA implementation: • Mesoamerica Biodiversity Strategy (CCAD) • Central American Regional Climate Change Strategy (SICA, 2015-2025) • Escazú Agreement Action Framework • National Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) Targets • National Drought Plan • National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) • Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) • National Adaptation Plan (NAP) • National Climate Change Policy • Strategic Government Plan

					• National GHG Inventory • National Ecosystem Restoration Plan • National Action Plan on Plastic Pollution • Integrated Water Resources Management Plan (IWRM Plan 2022-2026) • National Action Plan for Marine and Coastal Conservation

Rwanda - "Terms of Reference of a steering committee for chemicals-based and Rio conventions, with a mandate to evaluate the synergetic implementation of these conventions" (2012-ongoing)

To address the limitations presented by fragmented implementation of several MEAs across institutions, Rwanda established in 2010 a specific Unit titled "Climate change and International Obligations under Rwanda Environment Management Authority" to coordinate the implementation of MEAs across the country. A first MEA coordination meeting was held in 2012 to promote synergy across implementation strategies for MEAs.

MEAs addressed by the case study: CBD, Nagoya Protocol, Cartagena Protocol, Convention on Wetlands, Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention, Minamata Convention, UNFCCC, Montreal Protocol, UNCCD					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**
Rwanda uses two National Coordination meetings per year: a first at the start of the year to serve as a joint planning platform and a second at the end of the year to evaluate planned activities related to MEAs. Financial support available under each MEA must be effectively used while strengthening any approaches supporting coordination in MEA implementation.	Rwanda has not reported specific mutual benefits of collaboration in the case study's approach to MEA implementation.	Since 2012, Rwanda produces an annual MEA implementation status report to reflect its work in meeting the requirements of each MEA.	Limited financial capacity as a main challenge faced by developing countries. Finding synergy across MEAs requires the support of all MEA secretariats.	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation include: • National Government • Private Sector & Industry • Scientific & Technological Community The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions	• SDG 3 • SDG 6 • SDG 7 • SDG 9 • SDG 11 • SDG 12 • SDG 13 • SDG 14 • SDG 15 • SDG 16 • SDG 17

Rwanda highlights the use of effective planning between National Focal Points to avoid duplication across MEAs.				in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Construction • Customs & Trade • Environment & Trade • Health • Manufacturing • Mining • Waste management and sewerage	The case study supports the following regional and national-level strategies for MEA implementation: • National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) • Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC)

Switzerland - "Linking Biodiversity science with policy – the Swiss Biodiversity Forum" (1999-ongoing)

The Swiss Biodiversity Forum is the scientific competence centre for biodiversity in Switzerland, leading research on biodiversity and maintaining dialogue between scientists and decision makers in administration, politics and society. It is part of the Science-Policy platform at the Swiss Academy of Sciences. The Biodiversity Forum was created 25 years ago with its own Coordination Office, Steering Committee and Plenary. The Plenary works like a think-tank on biodiversity science-policy and comprises around 40 scientific experts from various academic institutions, conservation practitioners, and government representatives from Switzerland. Through its scientific analyses, national coordination role for IPBES, and direct support to the Swiss government in CBD and other biodiversity-related processes, the Forum contributes concretely to the implementation of MEAs at the national level.

Its mission is based on three pillars:
(1) Promoting Foundations: The Swiss Biodiversity Forum strengthens the scientific network and promotes the scientific foundations necessary for understanding biodiversity.
(2) Knowledge Transfer: It brings the latest scientific findings and actionable options related to the conservation and promotion of biodiversity into political and public discussions in Switzerland in a useful and accessible way.
(3) Fostering Dialogue: As a scientific centre of excellence for biodiversity and its ecosystem services, it strengthens the dialogue between science, administration, conservation practice, business, politics, and the public.

MEAs addressed by the case study: CBD, CITES, CMS, Convention on Wetlands, ITPGRFA, IPPC, WHC					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**
To foster exchanges between stakeholders, the Swiss Biodiversity Forum organizes IPBES national meetings in Switzerland and in the	In close collaboration with the Federal Office for the Environment, the Forum provides a national	The Swiss Biodiversity Forum creates fact sheets on various issues:	Switzerland has not reported specific barriers encountered in	The stakeholders involved in synergistic	• SDG 3 • SDG 11 • SDG 14 • SDG 15

ECA region together with other national IPBES Platforms, informs the Swiss research community and public about IPBES on its website and mobilizes and nominates experts for IPBES task forces and assessment groups. It also supports the Swiss delegation and has provided scientific input and advice for IPBES Plenaries since its beginning.	platform for IPBES, for exchange and collaboration between the international IPBES process and the Swiss policy and science communities on biodiversity, and the public.	•It analysed harmful subsidies for biodiversity in Switzerland, which had a huge impact on policy. •It analysed IPBES policy options for different sectors in Switzerland. The Forum uses an information system for biodiversity, reporting on research, IPBES and other activities every month (e-Newsletter and online database), in German and French.	implementing the case study.	implementation include: • National Government • Private Sector & Industry • Scientific & Technological Community • Farmers • Non-Governmental Organizations • Local Authorities The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Construction • Health • Tourism • Environment & Climate	The Swiss Biodiversity Forum contributes to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework as well as other biodiversity-related MEAs and acts as an initiator and catalyst to anchor biodiversity in all sectors of policy and society. It has been commissioned by the government to provide scientific information for the CBD and Swiss National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan process and contributes to the Swiss CHM and CBD National Reporting. Thereby it further supports the implementation of biodiversity-related MEAs

South Africa - "National target setting for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework" (2023-2025)

Following the adoption of the Kunming-Montreal Biodiversity Framework, South Africa embarked on a series of meetings with representatives of national, provincial and local governments, research and academic institutions, women and youth with a view to source inputs for the development of national targets as an initial step towards the revision of South Africa's NBSAP. National focal points of all MEAs were requested to provide information on how their MEAs will contribute to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Biodiversity Framework. These forums meet regularly to prepare for various international meetings and receive feedback on meetings held for information and action as appropriate.

MEAs addressed in the case study: CBD, CITES, CMS, Convention on Wetlands, WHC, UNCCD					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA**

	the country's approach to MEA implementation				**implementation relevant to the case study**
South Africa has not reported specific examples of good collaborative practices from this case study.	South Africa reports that enhancing cooperation in the implementation of MEAs was key for achieving their goals and targets at the national level. In doing so, a sense of ownership of the national targets, which themselves support KMGBF targets, can be fostered by the engagement of different stakeholders.	South Africa created International Relations and MEAs Forums within the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE) to address issues of common interest and to have common positions on issues discussed by various MEAs.	A main challenge in this case study was a lack of proper coordination between stakeholders, heightening the risk of duplicated efforts.	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation include: • Indigenous Peoples & local communities • National Government • Children & Youth • Women • Scientific & Technological Community • Private Sector & Industry • Non-Governmental Organizations • Local Authorities The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Environment & Climate • Health • Waste Management and Sewerage • Customs & Trade	• SDG 5 • SDG 15 The case study supports the following regional and national-level strategies for MEA implementation: • South African Development Community (SADC) Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan • National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) • White Paper on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of South Africa's Biodiversity • National Biodiversity Economy Strategy

Uganda - "Strengthening synergies and cooperation among chemicals and biodiversity-related MEAs" (2019-2025)

Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining (ASGM) in Uganda is an important sector but one with negative impacts for people and biodiversity from the unsustainable use of mercury. According to the Uganda National Action Plan for ASGM (under the Minamata Convention), the sector directly engaged over 30,000 people, highlighting importance of the sector for local community development, as long as mercury is eliminated and more responsible practices can be sustained. The key impacts of AGSM and associated mercury use have been deforestation, land degradation, and pollution of air, soil, and water. National interventions taken to address the impacts of ASGM in an integrated manner included (a) the development of the National Environmental Act in 2019, which covered biodiversity offsets; (a) the development of the national action plan (NAP) on ASGM in 2019, which formalized the ASGM sector; and (c) the revision of Uganda's Mining and Minerals Act in 2022 establishing a favourable minerals licensing regime. These developments are

essential not only for livelihoods but also for biodiversity, given that approximately 11% of ASGM sites were located within key biodiversity areas (KBAs) and 7% in protected areas based on the inventory taken under the NAP[20].

Uganda developed a strategy to strengthen the management of mercury and biodiversity in the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining sector (ASGM) titled "The National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small Scale Mining (2019)", which aims to:
•Objective 1: To reduce the emissions, releases and risks of exposure to mercury by the ASGM sector by 70% by 2024
• Objective 2: To facilitate the formalization of the ASGM sector by 2024
• Objective 3: To strengthen stakeholder engagement in the implementation of the NAP

Uganda's NBSAP III (2025-2030) reports on strategies, activities, costs and monitoring indicators for chemicals and waste MEAs in line with the KMGBF.

MEAs addressed by the case study: CBD, Basel Convention, Stockholm Convention, Minamata Convention					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**
Uganda used central MEAs clearing house mechanisms, along with knowledge management practices to conduct their activities. Stakeholder engagement was central to the strategy. Uganda used National Coordination Mechanisms and Technical Working Groups with multisectoral and multidisciplinary participation to: (1) develop a national action plan to reduce/phase out the use of mercury in the ASGM sector; (2) update, review and align the NBSAP to the KMGBF; (3) develop the 7th National Report on implementing CBD obligations.	Uganda provided a platform to strengthen the linkage between pollution and biodiversity loss. This approach attracted development partners such as FAO, UNDP, CIFOR/ICRAF to complement UNEP/GEF and the Government of Uganda's efforts in aligning the NBSAP to the KMGBF Targets. The FAO has further complemented the Government and UNEP/GEF efforts to support local authorities to mainstream NBSAP III (2025-2030) in their Local	Strengthening of Technical Working Groups with multisectoral, multidisciplinary teams including the private sector, non-governmental organizations, cultural institutions, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, and development partners. A range of tools and approaches were used including capacity-building meetings, technical working group	Some challenges were generated by structure of certain legal frameworks, making resource mobilization and reporting on indicators less straightforward.	The rightsholders and stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation include: • Indigenous Peoples & local communities • Local Authorities • National Government • Non-Governmental Organizations • Private Sector & Industry • Women The sectors relevant to the MEA-related	• SDG 1 • SDG 2 • SDG 3 • SDG 5 • SDG 6 • SDG 8 • SDG 9 • SDG 10 • SDG 13 • SDG 14 • SDG 15 • SDG 16 • SDG 17 The case study supports the following regional and national-level strategies for MEA implementation: • Regional Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans

[20] UNEP. Infographic: ASGM in Key Biodiversity Areas and Protected Areas. Available at: https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/45632/Biodiversity-ASGM-Sites.pdf

Uganda is currently working with UNEP (joint work between Law Division and Chemicals and Health Branch) on further piloting available guidance on mainstreaming pollution into NBSAPs review and implementation (linking to the guidance from Minamata, BRS, GFC and CBD).	Authority Environment Action Plans. Among other results, this has served as an entry point to mainstream the objectives of chemicals & waste MEAs in Local Authority Action Plans. This strengthens inclusiveness in implementing and reporting on MEAs. The approach has also supported synergies in implementing and reporting on MEAs by providing a platform linking pollution and biodiversity loss. For example, national focal points for chemicals and waste MEAs are directly contributing to CBD reporting. Strategies for mercury management are being developed and implemented by different government sectors and NGOs. This promotes resource mobilization.	meetings, reporting tools, publication and dissemination of information, and baseline studies.		actions in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Customs & Trade • Environment & Climate • Health • Mining • Waste management & Sewerage • Energy generation • Construction	• African Union Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (ABSAP) (2023-2030) • East African Community Regional Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (2021-2031) • National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan III (NBSAPIII) (2025-2030) • actions under the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management and Global Framework on Chemicals • National Action Plan for Artisanal and Small Scale Mining (2019) • Local Governments (Buhweju District) (Environmental Protection and Natural Resources Management) Ordinance (2017) • Mining and Mineral Act (2022) • National Environment Act, 2019 and the National Environment (Waste Management) Regulations (2020) • National Environment (Management of Hazardous Chemicals and Products containing Hazardous Chemicals) Regulations (2024) • National Environment (Air Quality Standards) Regulations (2024) • Preparing City and District Environment Action Plans mainstreamed with NBSAPIII (2025-2030), covering management of hazardous waste including medical waste. Districts include Kabale, Sheema, Kibuku, Pallisa, Ntugamo, Namutumba, Kasese, Kisoro, Mbarara, Rukungiri, Rubirizi

					while Cities cover Arua, Fort Portal, Kampala, Hoima, Jinja, Mbarara, Soroti, Lira, Gulu and Masaka

United Arab Emirates - "UAE National Reporting on Conserving Biodiversity and Combating Desertification" (2015-ongoing)

The UAE's National Strategy to Combat Desertification (2022–2030) is a comprehensive national framework that aims to restore degraded lands, enhance ecosystem resilience, and promote sustainable land and water management in arid and semi-arid environments. In line with the UNCCD, the UAE has institutionalized an annual national reporting mechanism, endorsed by a Cabinet decision in 2023. Through local implementation by regional authorities, this mechanism compiles verified data from both federal and local entities to track measurable progress and ensure cross-sectoral coordination, transparency and accountability. The United Arab Emirates highlight the use of a multi-level institutional structure to facilitate coordination across land, agriculture, biodiversity, and climate sectors.

Between 2023 and 2024, achievements have included the rehabilitation of over 1,800 hectares of degraded land, the expansion of protected areas to cover 18.4% of UAE territory, and measurable gains in vegetation productivity and soil carbon levels. The UAE now hosts 49 nature reserves (33 terrestrial and 16 marine), safeguarding critical biodiversity areas and directly contributing to national targets. Indeed, beyond combating land degradation, the strategy is closely interlinked with several key national strategies. Notably, the National Biodiversity Strategy 2031 aims to conserve ecosystems, protect native species, and integrate biodiversity considerations into national development plans. The synergy between biodiversity conservation and land restoration ensures that restored landscapes also provide habitat connectivity and ecological services.

In addition, the strategy aligns with the UAE Food Security Strategy 2051, which emphasizes the importance of sustainable agriculture, efficient water use, and healthy soils all of which are directly influenced by land degradation and desertification. It also supports the UAE Climate Change Strategy 2050, where nature-based solutions such as reforestation and ecosystem-based adaptation play a critical role in building climate resilience. Furthermore, it contributes to the goals of the UAE Green Agenda 2030, promoting low-carbon and resource-efficient growth.

Collectively, this integrated policy framework helps the UAE to meet its obligations under multiple MEAs, including the CBD, the Convention on Wetlands, CITES, CMS, Nagoya Protocol, Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and the GCC Wildlife Agreement. It also contributes to the work of IPBES and reflects the UAE's active role as a member of IUCN in advancing global biodiversity conservation. This holistic approach ensures that desertification control efforts contribute not only to land productivity but also to biodiversity, food security, and climate mitigation at the national and global levels.

MEAs addressed by the case study: CBD, Nagoya Protocol, Cartagena Protocol, CITES, CMS, Convention on Wetlands, UNFCCC, UNCCD					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**
The National Strategy to Combat Desertification and annual report were developed under the supervision of the Ministry of Climate Change	UAE reports that formalizing a national reporting structure through the Ministry of Climate Change and Environment—endorsed by	UAE used a structured national progress reporting system on desertification, mandated by the UAE Council of Ministers, and	The case study addresses the challenge of enhancing cross-sectoral coordination and policy coherence to align national land restoration	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation include:	• SDG 1 • SDG 2 • SDG 13 • SDG 14 • SDG 15

and Environment, which serves as the national focal point for the UNCCD, the CBD, CITES, CMS, and the Convention on Wetlands. Coordination involved relevant local authorities, including Emirate-level municipalities and environmental agencies. International frameworks, such as the UNCCD, CBD, CITES, CMS, the Convention on Wetlands, and the GCC Agreement for Wildlife Conservation, were used as reference points for aligning the national strategy with global biodiversity goals and supporting the implementation of the KMGBF. The National Biodiversity Strategy 2031 was shaped through extensive national consultations involving a broad spectrum of stakeholders, including federal and local government entities, academic and research institutions, NGOs, private sector actors, and international organizations such as the United Nations Environment Programme. This inclusive process ensured that biodiversity conservation goals were fully embedded within wider	the UAE Council of Ministers—supports long-term governmental commitment and institutional clarity. This high-level mandate has embedded biodiversity and desertification monitoring into official government procedures, reducing duplication of efforts, ensuring timely and consistent reporting, and aligning local-level actions with national strategies and international obligations. Embedding MEA obligations into governance systems has supported the achievement of measurable results through institutional commitment, cross-sectoral coordination, and innovative environmental management. Mutual benefits for MEA implementation of this work: • Supports UNCCD and CBD cooperation through integrated land and ecosystem monitoring • Enables CBD Targets 1 (spatial planning), 2 (ecosystem restoration), Target 3 (protected areas expansion) (30x30 protection target), 4 (species recovery), 10 (ecosystem resilience to climate and human pressure) and 13 (access and benefit-sharing)	developed a centralized biodiversity database compiling species data, ecosystem assessments, and restoration progress from federal and local authorities. Multi-sectoral technical working groups were established to coordinate implementation of biodiversity-related MEA obligations. Advanced environmental monitoring tools, including AI-powered soil drones and satellite-based systems, were deployed to enhance ecosystem assessments. National seed banks house over 20,000 samples of native and endangered plant species, contributing to conservation and the preservation of genetic resources in line with the Nagoya Protocol.	efforts with biodiversity goals—particularly by integrating the UAE's National Strategy to Combat Desertification with the National Biodiversity Strategy 2031 and commitments under the CBD and UNCCD. Baseline data for some key performance indicators was limited. In particular, the National Biodiversity Strategy 2031 presents an important opportunity to strengthen baseline data indicators and enhance stakeholder-inclusive reporting tools ensuring more comprehensive monitoring of progress.	• Local Authorities • National Government • Scientific & Technological Community • Farmers • Women • Private Sector & Industry • Non-Governmental Organizations The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Environment & Climate • Waste management & Sewerage The National Strategy to Combat Desertification fosters coordination among the environment, agriculture, infrastructure, and municipal sectors.	The case study supports the following regional and national-level strategies for MEA implementation: • UAE National Strategy to Combat Desertification 2022–2030 • UAE Food Security Strategy 2051 • UAE Water Security Strategy 2036 • UAE Green Development Strategy • UAE Green Agenda 2030: Supports sustainable development through biodiversity-based nature solutions and ecosystem services. • UAE National Climate Change Plan 2017–2050: Integrates biodiversity into climate adaptation and land restoration strategies. • UAE Biodiversity Strategy Plan 2031: Targets include restoring 80% of degraded ecosystems, increasing protection for 20% of ecosystems, and improving the status of threatened native species by 10%.

national development policies across critical sectors—such as environment, agriculture, climate change, water, land use, tourism, and energy. To promote coherence and reinforce alignment with global commitments, biodiversity indicators were integrated into national climate action plans and land restoration strategies. The strategy also fosters operational synergies with on-the-ground efforts, including protected area expansion, native species recovery, and urban greening programs. For both strategies, implementation is anchored by a centralized monitoring and reporting framework, led by the Ministry of Climate Change and Environment. The reporting mechanisms connect ministries, local governments, and research institutions for mainstreaming, integrated planning and data sharing across levels of governance. Examples of good collaborative practices include: • The Annual Council of Ministers mandates a national progress report on	• Supports the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-Sharing and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety through conservation of genetic resources and safe biotechnological applications • Enhances national implementation of CITES by supporting sustainable management and monitoring of wild species • Advances wetland conservation under the Convention on Wetlands through improved habitat monitoring and protection • Promotes shared use of biodiversity and land restoration data between national reporting systems under multiple MEAs • Reporting to the Annual Council of Ministers ensures that implementation stays on track, while also creating a structured report to share progress and challenges.				• The UAE National Invasive Species Strategy and Action Plan (NISSAP) 2022-2026 • National Plan of Action for the Conservation & Management of Sharks the UAE • National Plan of Action for the Conservation of Marine Turtles in the UAE 2019 – 2021 • National Environment Policy: Focus on conserving biodiversity for food security, pollination, and ecosystem resilience. • National Framework on Education for Sustainable Development (ESD): Encourages biodiversity awareness and citizen engagement through schools and universities.

desertification strategy and requests annual updates on the achievements of both the desertification and biodiversity strategies. • Integration of UNCCD, CBD and its protocols, CMS and the Convention on Wetlands' indicators into national statistics. • Joint data-sharing and field monitoring with local environmental authorities. • Establishment of cross-sectoral working teams on rangeland and dryland restoration, ecosystem restoration, and biodiversity conservation, invasive species management, and ecological connectivity aligning local actions with global targets. • Active partnerships with international entities such as IUCN, UNEP, and the Global Biodiversity Information Facility to ensure scientific alignment and access to technical cooperation. • Integration of environmental indicators with UAE's national statistics system. • Local implementation through Emirate-level entities. • Strengthened data-sharing agreements between federal					

and local biodiversity-related agencies. • Use of platforms such as the Climate Change Majlis[21] and the Municipal Environmental Work Council to enhance coordination between federal and local entities, promote stakeholder engagement, and ensure alignment on biodiversity and land restoration priorities.					

United Kingdom - "Reviewing and adapting the UK Biodiversity Indicators to align with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGBF) Monitoring Framework" (2022-ongoing)

The Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) and the UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) have reviewed the UK Biodiversity Indicators, first published in 2007, in the light of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGBF) and associated Monitoring Framework. The review started in advance of CBD CoP15 by looking at potential improvements to existing indicators and dataflows, and by seeking views from stakeholders and data providers. The review concluded after the Indicators Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) had completed its work and decisions were reached at CBD CoP16.

The UK Biodiversity Indicators are official statistics, produced to high standards and published independently of Government, complying with the three pillars of the Code of Practice for Statistics: Trustworthiness, Quality and Value. The indicators have been used in the UK's MEA reporting since they became available, including in the UK's 4th, 5th and 6th CBD National Reports, and will be used in the 7th CBD National report.

The UK is now implementing the Headline and Binary indicators agreed in the monitoring framework: up to twelve new headline indicators are being developed from scratch and six of the existing UK indicators are being redeveloped to match the requirements of the KMGBF. These will all feed into the UK's 7th CBD National report and will provide statistics that can be used in other MEA reports, thereby enhancing synergies and streamlining between MEAs. It is anticipated that the development of the new indicators will need to continue after the 7th National Report has been produced, leading to improved indicators for the 8th National Report in 2029. The development of the indicators has involved new stakeholders and has been a 'learning while doing' process – the project plan for indicator development has had to adapt during the process.

MEAs addressed by the case study: CBD, CMS, Convention on Wetlands

[21] Emirati Majlis, meaning council or assembly, are 'sitting places' where people come together for social exchange, to discuss shared interests, and resolve problems.

Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation	Tools developed in the case study	Barriers encountered in implementing the case study	Sectors & stakeholders involved	SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study
The UK Biodiversity Indicators are a compendium which has been assessed to meet the status of 'accredited official statistics' – and as such they are the UK Government's own numbers on the state of the environment. They are compiled from diverse sources (around 100 organizations contribute data) and attract wide interest from across society. Revising the indicators to respond to the KMGBF has involved new stakeholders and collaboration with the custodian organizations listed in the indicator metadata to understand the data that can be mobilized. Development of the indicators has involved consultation with experts both within government and beyond on an indicator by indicator basis. MEA national focal points were not a specific focus of this engagement. In parallel with developing the new headline indicators, UK experience in indicator development has been shared with an intersessional working group under CMS which is developing indicators for the Samarkand Strategic Plan for Migratory Species, and in conversations underpinning the development of a new Strategic Plan for the Convention on Wetlands.	For the CBD, the work will result in new and revised indicators that can be used in the 7th and 8th National Reports (and beyond). For other MEAs, the mobilization of data facilitates the reporting of MEA specific targets, recognizing the linkages between the targets for those MEAs and the KMGBF. Essentially, it is the same biodiversity that is being reported on, so the indicators offer an opportunity to streamline the reporting undertaken and provide consistent data. Deconstructing complex KMGBF goals and targets into discrete 'components' and 'elements' helped to identify what needs to be assessed by indicators and what the current gaps are. Refocusing the indicators on the new global targets maintains their relevance; once the review is complete the indicators can be used across MEA reports.	The UK Biodiversity Indicators use reproducible analytical pipelines, which build in levels of automation, to facilitate their production and streamline the resources needed in each publication cycle. Development of the new indicators has required a series of stages: (1) Indicator scoping phase, (2) Indicator development phase, (3) Indication production phase, (4) project finalization phase. An iterative, stepwise approach has been used: • investigate the requirements, for example through metadata review and discussions with key stakeholders (this step is complete) • development of methods documents which lay out decisions on data sources to be used, how the indicator will be produced, and whether it will be an	The UK encountered challenges in: 1. developing a set of indicators which reconciles different points of view from users on the indicators of value to them. For example, the review took significant effort in parallel with the existing publication process as the same staff were involved in both processes, and publication of the existing indicators is already an intensive task. Extra resources were mobilized on a one-off basis for development of new headline indicators. 2. mobilizing data for new indicators. On further investigation of the indicators, data were unavailable for at least one of them and so not all of them can be produced at present. Data constraints mean that some of the indicators cannot be disaggregated to a smaller country-scale to directly measure the	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation include: • National Government • Non-Governmental Organizations • Private Sector and Industry • Scientific & Technological Community The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Customs & Trade • Environment & Climate	• SDG 14 • SDG 15 The case study supports the development and implementation of the UK National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan.

Engagement with stakeholders and data providers is essential to ensure indicators are fit for purpose; but publication should be independent. Publication should be regular, ideally annually, to build dataflows. The process followed the steps below: • Consultation with each of the UK's four country governments (England / Scotland / Wales / Northern Ireland) • Surveying the views of indicator users and of data providers on the ways in which the existing indicators could be improved • Deconstruction of the complex KMGBF Goals and Targets into discrete 'components' / 'elements' • Mapping of existing UK and country-level indicators to the deconstructed framework to identify gaps at a UK scale to identify needed changes to the existing set of indicators • Joint workshop for the four countries to discuss a shortlist of indicators and priorities for development and gap-filling • Considering the alignment of existing indicators, and what new indicators are needed as a result of the work by the CBD AHTEG on Indicators • Running a survey to gather user views on which of the existing UK biodiversity indicators should continue and which should be stopped • Continuation of the usual publication process for the existing indicators in parallel with seeking funding for a project to develop up to twelve new headline indicators from scratch and	Re-using the same indicators in different MEA reports encourages coherence in policy implementation. A number of the UK Biodiversity indicators have been used in recent reports to Convention on Migratory Species and the Convention on Wetlands.	official statistic or not (this step is largely complete) • development of reproducible analytical pipelines for statistical analyses and webpage production, and detailed desk instructions to allow the indicator to be produced again by another person, along with internal and external quality assurance steps (this step is ongoing) • recommendations and lessons learnt from the process (this step will be completed in January – March 2026 after the 7th National report is finalized and submitted)	success of devolved policies. In some cases, data may only be available for parts of the United Kingdom. 3. delivering rapidly to allow the indicators to be used for the CBD 7th National Report. For example, the complexity of the KMGBF targets makes it difficult to measure all components equally. The metadata provided by the AHTEG is very helpful, but flexibility is inevitably needed in implementation due to data availability, as well as the short timescale available to adjust existing indicators and develop new ones between CBD CoP16 and the deadline for submission of the 7th National Report.		

adapt/redevelop six of the existing indicators • Production of the UK's 7th National Report, including collection of data from Devolved Governments					

Uzbekistan - "Promoting Synergistic Accession and implementation of UNECE Conventions" (ongoing)

The case study focuses on Uzbekistan's synergistic accession and domestic preparedness for implementation of three MEAs under the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE): the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention) (1998) and its Protocol on Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (Protocol on PRTRs); the 1991 Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in a Transboundary Context (Espoo Convention) (1991) and its Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment (Protocol on SEA) and the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (Air Convention) (1979).

To assist with the accession process and the subsequent implementation of the three Conventions in a synergistic manner, UNEP, in collaboration with the UNECE, prepared a report at the request from the government of Uzbekistan, which also provided support with reviewing the implementation status of relevant recommendations stemming from the third Environmental Performance Review (EPR) of Uzbekistan.[22] This report was used as the basis for this case study on MEA synergies, showing how synergies can be advanced through the accession process and increasing domestic preparedness for implementation. Uzbekistan acceded to the Aarhus Convention in March 2025 and has also made progress with the accession to the Air Convention. Recent normative developments, including the adoption of the 2025 Law on Ecological Expertise, EIA and SEA, has also placed the country on track for future accession to the Espoo Convention and its Protocol on SEA

MEAs addressed by the case study: Air Convention, Espoo Convention, SEA Protocol, Aarhus Convention, PRTR Protocol					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**
The 2025 Law on Ecological Expertise, EIA and SEA is an example of collaborative practice that simultaneously advances obligations under all three UNECE MEAs. By embedding public	For Uzbekistan, enhancing synergies among the Aarhus, Espoo and Air Conventions delivers several concrete benefits. First, it saves resources and reduces duplication, since one legal reform	Digitalization and digital transformations have created significant enabling conditions for the establishment of a future comprehensive air quality management system in Uzbekistan and a publicly	Some barriers still constrain the effective implementation of synergies across the Aarhus, Espoo and Air Conventions and related Protocols in Uzbekistan.	The Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change (MEEPCC), in cooperation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, leads Uzbekistan's accession process to the MEAs and serves as the national authority	• SDG 3 • SDG 11 • SDG 12 • SDG 13 • SDG 15 • SDG 16 • SDG 17

[22] The third Environmental Performance Review of Uzbekistan is available here: https://unece.org/environment-policy/publications/3rd-environmental-performance-review-uzbekistan

participation requirements from the Aarhus Convention into EIA/SEA procedures, the Law links access rights directly with the Espoo Convention and its Protocol on SEA's strategic planning requirements. At the same time, its provisions on monitoring and reporting connect with the Air Convention objectives on pollution control and transparency and provide opportunity to introduce international best practice and tools in the setting of relevant emission standards; as well as build the capacities of relevant institutions (national and local) engaged in EIA and SEA processes. UNEP and UNECE's joint report highlighted these synergies, including the role of digitalization and digital transformations to foster these. Reforms in one area under the purview of one convention (e.g. improving digital access to EIA and SEA processes as well as information on pollution	(such as the 2025 Law on Ecological Expertise, EIA and SEA) or one digital platform managed by a public authority can meet the requirements of multiple conventions at once. Second, it improves institutional efficiency and coordination, as ministries and agencies work with shared systems for information, monitoring and stakeholders' access to information and participation in decision-making. Finally, it strengthens public engagement, trust and confidence in the accountability and integrity of public institutions, because the same platforms that ensure access to information under the Aarhus Convention also support public participation in EIA/SEA under the Espoo Convention and accountability in air quality management under the Air Convention.	accessible national PRTR. Furthermore, they have enabled greater access to public services and a more effective enjoyment of environmental rights in Uzbekistan. By improving data interoperability, broadening access to information, and enabling more consistent public participation in decision-making, these conditions have also strengthened interinstitutional cooperation. The many digital platforms run by various national entities, for instance, to foster open data sharing, engage the public in discussions on draft policy and legal frameworks and state ecological expertise, and collect information on air pollution directly reinforce MEA synergies. They can advance the provisions of the Aarhus Convention on transparency and participation; they can modernize EIA/SEA procedures in line with the Espoo Convention and its Protocol on SEA; they can prepare the ground for a national PRTR while also supporting Air Convention	Uzbekistan's policy landscape for digitalization and digital transformations has the potential to drive greater advancements in the consolidation and normative recognition of the right to access environmental information; as well as create the basis for the future establishment of a national PRTR. To support this, the expressed legal recognition of the many digital platforms managed by public authorities, which are relevant to the conventions part of the study, could support greater awareness and public use. On air quality, Uzbekistan's air quality policies and national legal framework could more closely integrate the public rights of access to information, participation in decision-making and access to justice to secure the synergetic implementation of the Air Convention and the Aarhus Convention and prepare for the accession	for Aarhus, Espoo, and Air Conventions. Some areas related to these Conventions are handled by subordinated institutions to the MEEPCC, including: the Center for State Environmental Expertise for overseeing EIA and SEA; the Center for Specialized Analytical Control for monitoring industrial pollution sources; and Uzhydromet for managing air quality and hydrometeorological data. The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Construction • Energy generation • Environment & climate change • Health • Manufacturing • Transport • Waste management & Sewage	The New Uzbekistan Development Strategy for 2022-2026, the "Uzbekistan-2030" Strategy, the Programme and Action Plan on Transition to "Green" Economy and Securing "Green Growth" in the Republic of Uzbekistan until 2030 include several provisions on environmental protection, the prevention of air pollution and promotion of rule of law, including in the context of a transition to green economy. Furthermore, the 2019 "Concept on Environmental Protection until 2030" strives for increased policy coherence in the environmental governance field and defines several measures which are all highly relevant to the Aarhus, Espoo and Air Conventions.

sources regulated under the Air Convention), for instance, can also strengthen compliance with other conventions (for instance creating the basis of the future establishment of a national PRTR). The result is a more integrated legal and policy framework that reduces duplication, streamlines procedures, advances policy coherence and builds institutional capacity to address overlapping MEA requirements in a coherent way.		requirements. Many of these platforms also bear significant potential to integrate environmental monitoring across institutions, thus creating conditions for greater coherence in reporting and compliance.	to the Protocol on PRTRs. EIA and SEA remain important policy tools to harmonize domestic policies and decisions and promote synergies in the implementation of MEAs. To support this, the 2025 Law on Ecological Expertise, EIA and SEA should encourage the revision of other existing relevant norms as well as the adoption of additional norms and regulations, such as on transboundary EIA, to ensure full alignment with the Espoo Convention and Protocol on SEA, the Aarhus Convention and its Protocol on PRTRs. Finally, advancing horizontal and vertical coordination and cooperation across ministerial departments and local authorities responsible for environmental issues remains an essential enabling condition to support synergetic MEAs implementation in Uzbekistan. This should be complemented by additional investment in		

			capacities and expertise of relevant stakeholders, including on EIA and SEA, environmental litigation and the governance of environmental rights.		

Vanuatu - "Advancing community-led nature-based climate action" (2021-ongoing)

Vanuatu's biodiversity is under increasing pressure from climate impacts, including rising temperatures, shifting rainfall patterns, sea-level rise, ocean acidification, and the increasing frequency of tropical cyclones. Vanuatu's greenhouse gas inventory indicates that while the country remains carbon negative due to forest carbon sinks, it remains highly vulnerable to climate-induced biodiversity loss. These vulnerabilities underscore the importance of integrating biodiversity conservation with climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies. Vanuatu's integration of biodiversity into its second NDC and climate transparency reports was the result of a cross-sectoral effort to align national climate and conservation goals. The development process was coordinated by the Ministry of Climate Change Adaptation, Meteorology and Geohazards, Environment, Energy, and Disaster Management (MOCC) in cooperation with National Advisory Board on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction (NAB), which jointly oversee the coordination of all government and non-government initiatives related to climate change. Stakeholder consultations were conducted through NAB mechanisms, including engagement with provincial governments, NGOs, traditional leaders, and local communities, to identify practical priorities such as mangrove restoration, afforestation, and the formal registration of 20 Community Conservation Areas. The integration was further supported by projects implemented in collaboration with the German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), which provided input on climate–ecosystem linkages, nature-based solutions and the design of ecosystem-based adaptation strategies.

The results emphasize prioritizing nature-based interventions, such as revegetation, over hard infrastructure, and aligning adaptation with the protection of carbon sinks, heritage sites, and traditional taboos. Targeted actions were outlined to reduce climate-related pressures on key marine ecosystems and species, particularly coral reefs, seagrasses and sea turtles.

Consequently, Vanuatu has integrated biodiversity considerations into its second NDC and recent climate reports submitted under the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement. Commitments include, inter alia, conserving mangroves and shoreline vegetation, promoting sustainable forest management, supporting afforestation, and restoring forest landscapes, including buffer zones around climate-sensitive ecosystems.

MEAs addressed by the case study: CBD, UNFCCC					
Enabling conditions and good collaborative practices in the case study	**Lessons learned and the benefits from synergies in the country's approach to MEA implementation**	**Tools developed in the case study**	**Barriers encountered in implementing the case study**	**Sectors & stakeholders involved**	**SDGs & national strategies for MEA implementation relevant to the case study**

Vanuatu has committed to hold regular meetings of REDD+ programmes with officials from across government departments, NGOs and private sector, including training and workshops to raise the capacity of relevant stakeholders.	Nature-based solutions offer an effective approach to climate adaptation by integrating ecological health and community well-being, with a preference for soft interventions like revegetation over hard infrastructure and alignment with local values and tools such as carbon sinks, heritage sites, and traditional taboos. Integrated action across the biodiversity and climate clusters, by linking adaptation and mitigation measures with biodiversity conservation priorities, maximized the effectiveness and resource efficiency of implementation. Climate benefits included strengthened carbon sequestration through forest landscape restoration, coastal protection from storm surges via mangrove rehabilitation, and improved adaptive capacity through nature-based solutions targeting vulnerable ecosystems such as coral reefs and seagrasses.	Vanuatu has established a National Forest Monitoring System, which serves as the Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) system for REDD+. Tools such as databases and training programs are being developed to document and integrate traditional knowledge into planning, education, and decision-making, while respecting cultural protocols and intellectual property rights.	Achieving an integrated approach to addressing biodiversity loss and climate change remains a challenge, requiring stronger cross-sectoral collaboration and coordination across policy frameworks. Community-based adaptation projects have faced challenges in terms of sustainability and local engagement. Many projects have been led by external experts with limited community participation, resulting in interventions that did not fully align with local needs or contexts. This underscores the importance of designing adaptation efforts that are community-led and incorporate local knowledge and socio-cultural systems. Other barriers to implementation include significant gaps in monitoring and social inclusion. For example, the lack of data on mangrove plantations hinders the ability to assess ecosystem health, plan restoration, and track NDC progress. Similarly, the absence of gender-disaggregated analysis in policy documents undermines the effectiveness of biodiversity	The stakeholders involved in synergistic implementation primarily include the National Government. However, this example from Vanuatu aims to engage all relevant sectors of society, including key stakeholder groups. Women are being actively included through an ongoing FAO project titled “Restoring and Protecting Biodiversity, Coastal Landscapes, and Climate Change Resilience through Nature-Based Solutions, Women and Youth Entrepreneurship in Vanuatu.” It supports community-led nature-based solutions to strengthen climate resilience, food security, and livelihoods, with a focus on women and youth, targeting 22,500 beneficiaries across 5,000 households. The sectors relevant to the MEA-related actions in the case study include: • Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing • Environment & Climate	• SDG 6 • SDG 13 • SDG 14 • SDG 15 This case study draws on Vanuatu’s second updated Nationally Determined Contribution (2022). The NDC-2 links climate action to conservation by referencing Aichi Target 11 and committing to conserve 17% of important biodiversity areas, 30% of natural forests, 10% of wetlands, and 10% of marine areas by 2030 through community and government management. Incorporating main biodiversity targets in climate policies supports SDG Target 15.9 that calls for intergrading ecosystems and biodiversity in government planning.

	Biodiversity benefits included enhanced protection of species and habitats through community conservation areas, improved ecological resilience via invasive species management, and expanded marine protected areas that align conservation objectives with climate adaptation goals.		and adaptation measures, as it overlooks women's differentiated vulnerabilities and central role in the subsistence economy.		

B. Appendix 2: Questionnaire Used to Collect National Case Information

Collection of case studies on good collaborative practice in MEA implementation

Share your experience in strengthening cooperation, collaboration, and synergies in the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements:

The United Nations Environment Programme and its UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre want to hear about your experience at the national level in implementing multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) collaboratively.

We would like to update your case study from its previous submission by gathering additional information and insights you may have. The aim is to integrate the case study into a UNEA-7 Information Document as an example of synergistic MEA implementation.

By 'case study,' we mean an example of an action or set of actions taken to address a specific cooperation, collaboration, or synergy challenge in the context of two or more MEAs, instruments or intergovernmental processes. The information you provide through this questionnaire will inform efforts to collect and share good practices, tools, lessons learned, and success stories for MEA implementation.

We kindly request your response by 14 July 2025.

If you have any questions or would like to receive an offline version of the form, please contact:

Should you need to complete the survey in French or Spanish, please contact us (if you are comfortable using the English questions, feel free to respond here in French or Spanish).

Si vous avez besoin de répondre au sondage en français, veuillez nous contacter.

Si necesita completar la encuesta en español, comuníquese con nosotros.

By taking part in this survey, you acknowledge that your participation is voluntary, and you have the right to withdraw at any time by closing the survey. If you agree to take part in this survey, please proceed below.

Section I: About yourself and contributors

1.**Please share with us your full name and email:** Answer required. Single-line text.

Example: First Name Middle Name Last Name, name@email.org. This is the email we will use to contact you for further information.

2.**Please share with us your job title and affiliation:** Answer required. Single-line text

Example: Full Job Title, Organization.

3.**Main case study contributor:** Answer required. Single-line text

Contributor who is or was responsible for leading the development and implementation of the case study. If there are multiple co-leads, please list the main contributor. The focus of this survey is on national level cases, so our understanding is that the main contributor is typically at national government.

4.**Other contributors, if any** Single-line text

Section II: Relevant multilateral environmental agreements and intergovernmental processes

In this section the focus lies on the multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) and intergovernmental processes your case study responses to. In the section following this one you will have the chance to elaborate

further on the contents of the case study. Note that the case study must include action(s) related to at least two multilateral environmental agreements, instruments and/or intergovernmental processes.

5.**Please select the main environmental topic(s) related to your case study:** Answer required. Multiple selection.

See *https://www.informea.org/en*. *Please select all that apply.*
Biological diversity
Chemicals and waste, including plastics
Climate and atmosphere
Desertification, drought and Land degradation
Environmental governance
Land and agriculture
Marine and freshwater resources

6.**Please list all the multilateral environmental agreements that your case study directly supports:** Answer required. Multiline text.

A comprehensive overview of MEAs and instruments at regional and global levels is available at https://www.informea.org/en.

7.**If applicable, please list all global and regional strategies, strategic plans, and/or frameworks adopted by governing bodies of multilateral environmental agreements or by intergovernmental processes that your case study directly supports, as well as relevant targets as appropriate.** Multiline text.

This may include, for example, the CBD's Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the ICCM's Global Framework on Chemicals.

8.**If applicable, please list all relevant national-level strategies, plans, and other instruments for MEA implementation that your case study directly supports.** Multiline text.

This may include, for example, national biodiversity strategies and action plans and nationally determined contributions. Where possible, please provide links to relevant strategies, plans, and other instruments.

9.**If applicable, please provide more information about any consultation or engagement of MEA national focal points undertaken or facilitated in the context of your case study.** Multiline text.

10.**Please select all the sustainable development goals (SDGs) directly relevant to your case study:** Answer required. Multiple selection.
SDG 1 (No poverty)
SDG 2 (Zero hunger)
SDG 3 (Good health and well-being)
SDG 4 (Quality education)
SDG 5 (Gender equality)
SDG 6 (Clean water and sanitation)
SDG 7 (Affordable and clean energy)
SDG 8 (Decent work and economic growth)
SDG 9 (Industry, innovation, and infrastructure)
SDG 10 (Reduced inequalities)
SDG 11 (Sustainable cities and communities)
SDG 12 (Responsible consumption and production)
SDG 13 (Climate action)
SDG 14 (Life below water)
SDG 15 (Life on land)
SDG 16 (Peace, justice, and strong institutions)
SDG 17 (Partnerships for the goals)

11.**In the context of the SDGs selected above, please share any corresponding national goals and targets that your case study supports.** Multiline text.

Section III: About the case study

In this section we ask you to elaborate on the content of the case study and its resulting impacts. By 'case study,' we mean an action or set of actions to address a specific cooperation, collaboration, or synergy challenge. Case studies should include action(s) related to at least two multilateral environmental agreements, instruments, intergovernmental processes, or regulatory regimes. Please submit one response for each cooperation, collaboration, or synergy challenge.

13.**Please indicate the title of your case study:** Answer required. Single-line text.

14.**Please indicate the current scope of your case study:** Answer required. Single selection.
International
Regional
National
Subnational
Local

15.**If you selected "regional" above, please specify:** Single selection.

For your reference, please see the United Nations regional groups of member states at https://www.un.org/dgacm/en/content/regional-groups.
African States
Asia-Pacific States
Eastern European States
Latin American and Caribbean States
Western European and other States

16.**If applicable, please specify the subregion** Single-line text.

17.**If you selected "national" as an answer to question 9, please specify:** Single-line text.

18.**Please indicate the status of your case study activity:** Answer required. Single selection.
Ongoing
Completed

19. **Please indicate the duration of your case study:** Answer required. Single-line text.

Please use the following format: Month Year – Month Year (e.g., January 2023 – December 2023). For case studies under implementation, replace the second date with "ongoing" (e.g., January 2023 – ongoing).

20.**Please select the category that best describes the practices and tools contained in your case study (please limit to three options):** Answer required. Multiple selection but limited to 3 options.
Legal frameworks for collaboration, cooperation, and synergies at all levels (e.g., national-level legislation)
Policy frameworks for collaboration, cooperation, and synergies at all levels (e.g., sectoral action plans and strategies)
Institutional frameworks for collaboration, cooperation, and synergies at all levels (e.g. working groups etc.)
Stakeholder engagement and whole-of-society approaches for collaboration, cooperation, and synergies at all levels
Cooperation and collaboration on **monitoring, reporting, and review** in the context of multiple multilateral environmental agreements
Capacity-building to implement objectives that fall under the scope of multilateral environmental agreements with a view of enhancing and strengthening collaboration, cooperation, and synergies at all levels
Information and knowledge management for MEA collaboration, cooperation, and synergies at all levels
Resource mobilization and finance for MEA collaboration, cooperation, and synergies at all levels.
Science-policy-society interfaces that promote coherent implementation of multilateral environmental agreements.
Others *(please elaborate)*

21.**Does your case study illustrate a sectoral or cross-sectoral approach to MEA implementation, as described below?** Answer required. Multiple selection.
Sectoral approach: A specific sectoral institution (e.g. agriculture, customs, health, environment) is responsible for or involved in implementing or coordinating multiple MEA-related actions.

Cross-sectoral approach: The implementation involves cooperation and collaboration across multiple sectors (potentially reflected in a national strategy or policy document)
Not applicable

22.**To help us better understand the sectoral or cross-sectoral approaches in your case study, please select all sectors that were relevant to the MEA-related actions or coordination strategies you are referring to:** Answer required. Multiple selection.
Agriculture, forestry and fishing
Construction
Customs & Trade
Energy generation
Environment & Climate
Health
Manufacturing
Mining
Tourism
Transport
Waste management & sewerage
Others (please list)
Sectoral Approach not applicable

23.**Please further elaborate on the sectoral or cross-sectoral approaches that were applied in the context of your case study** Answer required. Multiline text.

Please write "N/A" if not applicable.

24.**Please provide any relevant background information on your case study, including how it relates to the implementation of MEAs and other global or regional commitments at the national level:** Answer required. Multiline text.

This may include the region's or country's context and/or any other information you may find relevant to introduce your case study.

25.**Please describe in a single sentence the main cooperation, collaboration, or synergy challenge that your case study seeks to address:** Answer required. Single-line text.

26.**Please recount any major barriers you faced in the implementation of the case study, if any:** Multiline text.

27.**Please describe the tools and approaches used to overcome those barriers in order to facilitate the implementation of the case study, if any:** Multiline text

28.**Please use this space to share lessons you learned about the effectiveness of such tools and approaches, if any:** Multiline text.

29.**Please select the stakeholders involved in your case study:** Answer required. Multiple selection.

Please select any specific group(s) of stakeholders that your case study engages, supports, or benefits.
Children & Youth
Farmers
Indigenous Peoples & Local Communities
Local Authorities
National Government
Non-Governmental Organizations
Private Sector & Industry
Indigenous Peoples & Local Communities
Scientific & Technological Community

Women
Workers & Trade Unions

30.**Please provide a summary of your case study:** Answer required. Multiline text.

Please provide a summary of your case study highlighting why it was initiated that way and how it supports, strengthens, or fosters collaboration, cooperation, and synergies in the implementation of at least two multilateral environmental agreements, instruments, and/or intergovernmental processes. Minimum of 250 words (or 1,250 characters including spaces) and maximum of 900 words (or 5,400 characters including spaces).

31.**Please elaborate on the mutual benefits that resulted from the application of this case study for the implementation of each MEA involved.**

Indicate in what ways this case study supports the cooperation of MEAs from the same cluster and/or across clusters (e.g., biodiversity, climate, desertification, chemicals and waste) and what mutual benefits in their implementation result. Please note that the third section of the questionnaire will request a detailed overview of the MEAs to which this case study is relevant. At this stage, you only need to note the general mutual benefits.

32.**Please share any good collaborative practice or approach embedded in your case study:** Answer required. Multiline text.

By 'good collaborative practice,' we mean any concrete actions and/or activities embedded or resulting from your case study that enhance collaboration, cooperation, and synergies in the implementation of two or more multilateral environmental agreements, including through whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches. Please be as concise and as specific as possible (e.g., establishing an institutional framework for collaboration across government agencies; establishing data-sharing mechanisms; convening working groups).

33.**Please list any tools and approaches developed in the context of your case study, if any:** Multiline text.

By 'tools' we mean any tangible and practical instruments or mechanisms resulting from your case study that enhance collaboration, cooperation, and synergies in the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements (e.g., knowledge management systems, online capacity-development training courses, protocols and standards, legislative toolkits, compilation of best practices). Where possible, please also share relevant hyperlinks and web pages.

34.**As appropriate, please list any relevant donors and funding avenues that supported the implementation of the case study, if any:** Multiline text.

Section IV: Supporting documents

35.**Kindly submit any relevant supporting documents by sending them to tiffany.straza@unep-wcmc.org; lara.lebleu@unep-wcmc.org and yannik.friedli@un.org.** Answer required.

Section V: Privacy and data (disclaimer)

The information shared using this form will be used to inform the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in the implementation of resolution 6/4 and resolution 6/6 of the United Nations Environment Assembly, as well as the update of the "Sourcebook of Opportunities for Enhancing Cooperation among the Biodiversity-Related Conventions at National and Regional Levels" (https://dart.informea.org/node/26778). By submitting this form, you agree to have all the information provided -- with the exception of your name, job title, affiliation, and email -- used in the update of the sourcebook and other UNEP reporting, guidance, and knowledge-sharing materials. Names and email addresses collected using the form will be shared only with the UNEP and the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) teams to facilitate their communication with you. You can request a copy of the data provided, as well as request the deletion of such data from our databases anytime by emailing:

36.**If case studies are presented in any form (e.g., publications, presentations, or online platforms), would you be open to being acknowledged by name as a contributor?**

Yes, I would be open to being acknowledged by name.
No, I prefer to remain anonymous.

37.**Please select below the ways you want to hear from us:** Single selection.
Email
Do not contact me

C. Appendix 3: Approach to Selection and Analysis of National Case Studies

National case studies were selected with attention to regional and thematic balance, considering the set of environmental topics[23] as used in UNEP's InforMEA platform, available at **https://www.informea.org/en,** demonstrating the diversity of experiences and approaches in national MEA implementation taken over the years.

In preparation for UNEA-7 and in response to Resolutions 6/4 and 6/6, UNEP, including through UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), undertook a series of activities to compile and promote good practices, tools, success stories, and lessons learned to improve synergies, cooperation, and collaboration in the implementation of MEAs. This included a mapping exercise drawing from past project activities implemented by UNEP in collaboration with MEAs Secretariats between 2014 and 2024. Sources used in the selection included the *Sourcebook of Opportunities for Enhancing Cooperation among the Biodiversity Related Conventions at National and Regional Levels* (2015), the Bern III conference compilation of cases (updated in 2024), and the reports from regional MEA capacity-building workshops for MEA synergies. This exercise resulted in 133 examples that were further screened to identify those most relevant to the implementation of the two resolutions, considering a regional and thematic balance. To address any remaining gaps, additional case studies were sought to expand the geographical coverage and secure a more balanced representation across MEA thematic clusters and cooperation models.

In addition to contacting countries directly, the request for inputs was shared with MEA Secretariats, with UNEP regional offices, and with additional partners in the case of specific geographic or thematic gaps.

A total of 35 countries were invited to provide inputs; 20 countries participated. Respondents were asked to describe actions that addressed collaboration challenges across two or more MEAs or intergovernmental processes. The analysis in sections 3, 4, and 5 draws on survey questions on collaborative practices (Q32), tools (Q27, Q33), and mutual benefits (Q31) (see Appendix 1). The focus of the analysis was on collaboration processes rather than on implementation outcomes. Quantitative methods were not applied to avoid implying comprehensive or representative coverage. The national examples included here illustrate the diversity of practices and tools but are not exhaustive. Further research with a systematic sampling design would be required to identify priorities or to estimate the proportion of countries using a given approach.

Survey responses varied in length and detail. Where countries provided overlapping information across multiple questions, the content was consolidated under the most relevant aspect. Content was validated with the contributors prior to publication.

[23] Namely, biological diversity, chemicals and waste, climate and atmosphere, environmental governance, land and agriculture, and marine and freshwater.