



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BRC/WS/2016/1/2
15 April 2016

ENGLISH ONLY

WORKSHOP ON SYNERGIES AMONG THE
BIODIVERSITY-RELATED CONVENTIONS
Geneva, Switzerland, 8-11 February 2016

REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP ON SYNERGIES AMONG THE BIODIVERSITY-RELATED CONVENTIONS

INTRODUCTION

1. The workshop on synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions was convened under the auspices of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) pursuant to and in accordance with decision XII/6 of the Conference of the Parties.¹ Its task was to prepare options which could include elements for a possible road map for Parties to the various biodiversity-related conventions to enhance synergies and improve efficiency among them, without prejudice to the specific objectives of the conventions and recognizing their respective mandates, and subject to the availability of resources, with a view to enhancing their implementation at all levels. Its report would be transmitted to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation for consideration at its first meeting and subsequently to the Conference of the Parties for consideration at its thirteenth meeting.

2. The workshop was prepared by a regionally balanced informal advisory group, composed of two members per region, selected by the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP Bureau) on the basis of nominations by Parties,² in consultation with the Secretariat of the CBD and the Liaison Group of the Biodiversity-related Conventions (Biodiversity Liaison Group). Its participants³ included representatives of the Parties to the seven conventions represented in the Biodiversity Liaison Group,⁴ regionally balanced and nominated through the bureau, standing committee or equivalent body of the convention concerned; the secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions, international organizations, including those which host the secretariats to the conventions;⁵ and non-governmental organizations, including those which represent indigenous peoples and local communities. It was held at the Palais des Nations, United Nations Office at Geneva, from 8 to 11 February 2016.

¹ Decision XII/6, <https://www.cbd.int/decision/cop/default.shtml?id=13369>.

² Notification 2015-056, 19 May 2015, Membership of the informal advisory group concerning cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions, <https://www.cbd.int/doc/notifications/2015/ntf-2015-056-cooperation-en.pdf>.

³ The list of participants is published as document UNEP/CBD/BRC/WS/2016/1/INF/3 on the web page of the workshop, <https://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=BRCWS-2016-01>.

⁴ The Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, the International Plant Protection Convention, the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands especially as Waterfowl Habitat, and the World Heritage Convention.

⁵ The United Nations Environment Programme, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the International Union for Conservation of Nature.

I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

Item 1. Opening of the workshop

3. The workshop was opened by Mr. Braulio Dias, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, who introduced the two co-chairs, Ministerial Adviser Ms. Marina von Weissenberg of the Ministry of the Environment, Finland, and Dr. Vinod Mathur, Director of the Wildlife Institute of India, who were members of the informal advisory group that had planned the workshop. Mr. Dias thanked the Governments of Finland and Switzerland for their financial support for the workshop. The workshop was unique in that it brought together representatives of Parties to the seven global biodiversity-related conventions, the convention secretariats and their host organizations, and other experts. It would present an opportunity for Parties to the conventions to list actions that they considered priorities.

4. Mr. Dias said that the workshop had been organized in response to a request by the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the CBD at its twelfth meeting. Pursuant to decision XII/6, the workshop's preparation had involved an informal advisory group whose members had been selected by the COP Bureau on the basis of nominations by CBD Parties, the secretariats of all seven biodiversity-related conventions and others. The CBD Secretariat had provided the background material for the workshop and had organized two webinars to present the substantial work that had already been done on synergies, led by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).⁶ The outcome of the workshop would be transmitted to the first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, in May 2016, which would provide recommendations for consideration by COP at its thirteenth meeting, in December 2016. Mr. Dias introduced His Excellency Mr. Franz Perrez, Swiss Ambassador for the Environment.

5. Mr. Perrez said that the complexity of biodiversity, which was crucial to the future of the planet, had led to fragmentation of activities. Biodiversity should be integral to the achievement of all the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); therefore, the right indicators for progress towards those goals had to be found, guided by strong, complementary collaboration among the biodiversity-related conventions. Reporting on progress was essential both nationally and internationally; however, an aggregated view could be achieved only by a synergized reporting system. Synergy could also strengthen the institutional framework of the secretariats of the various conventions. The workshop offered an opportunity for Parties to the seven global biodiversity-related conventions to interact and exchange experiences and for the biodiversity-related conventions to better understand their Parties' priorities.

6. Dr. Mathur emphasized that the aim of the workshop was to identify enhanced synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions and not to reduce the power or effect of any individual convention. He introduced the ten members of the informal advisory group. Ms. von Weissenberg said that after Rio+20, synergies between the biodiversity-related conventions had evolved and the common framework through the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets gave us the opportunity to collaborate and make use of a common platform for halting biodiversity loss by 2020.

Item 2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

7. The co-chairs introduced the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/BRC/WS/2016/1/1) and annotations (UNEP/CBD/BRC/WS/2016/1/1/Add.1/Rev.1) and presented a professional facilitator, Mr. Simon Koolwijk, who described the arrangements for the workshop (UNEP/CBD/BRC/WS/2016/1/1/Add.1/Rev.1, pp. 12–37).

Item 3. Workshop background, scope and expected outcomes

8. The co-chairs drew the participants' attention to the background material and annotated agenda. They said that the workshop was expected to prepare options that could include elements of a possible road map for increasing synergy and improving the efficiency of the biodiversity-related conventions in fulfilling their mandates. Background information was available on each proposed topic from the reports

⁶ UNEP project on “improving the effectiveness of and cooperation among biodiversity-related conventions and exploring opportunities for further synergies”, supported by the European Union and the Government of Switzerland.

of the UNEP project on synergies⁷ and from case studies provided by some Parties to the conventions (document UNEP/CBD/BRC/WS/2016/1/INF/2). Eight thematic areas had been selected in which synergy and cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions could be enhanced:

- (a) The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and national biodiversity strategies and action plans;
- (b) Institutional arrangements and coordination mechanisms;
- (c) Information and knowledge management;
- (d) National reporting, monitoring and indicators;
- (e) Communication and awareness-raising;
- (f) The science–policy interface;
- (g) Capacity-building;
- (h) Resource mobilization and utilization.

9. Representatives of Parties to the seven biodiversity-related conventions could introduce other themes that they considered important. They would also have an opportunity to contribute further to the recommendations of the workshop when its report was considered by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation of the CBD before being forwarded to the Conference of the Parties.

10. The co-chairs noted that biodiversity involved many sectors and actors at both the national and international levels and therefore required mutually supportive actions and a system-wide approach in order to attract high-level political attention. Realistic approaches to synergy would also build political will and maximize the available resources at local, national and international levels. Synergy would also ensure efficient use of resources for capacity-building, for example. The workshop should help the different biodiversity-related conventions to exchange views on which options and actions each considered to be relevant to overcoming barriers to coordination among focal points and increasing the role of indigenous peoples and local communities including women in implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions.

11. One participant expressed dissatisfaction with the informal manner in which the workshop was to be conducted and the decision not to attribute comments of discussion to individual participants in the report.

Item 4. Background and dialogue on efforts related to enhancing synergies and improving efficiency among the various biodiversity-related conventions⁸

12. The Head of Biodiversity, Land and Governance Programme, Division of Environmental Law and Conventions, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), gave the background to work on synergies and cooperation among the biodiversity biodiversity-related conventions. He outlined the various reasons for cooperation and work towards synergies, emphasizing that the aim was not to centralize power or mandates nor was it to reduce influence or compromise the impact of the conventions. He further described the role of UNEP in the process and summarized the content of the background paper that had been provided to the workshop participants, “Elaboration of options for enhancing synergies among biodiversity-related conventions”.

13. The heads of the secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions, who comprise the members of the Liaison Group of the Biodiversity-related Conventions (Biodiversity Liaison Group), briefed the

⁷ Sourcebook of opportunities for enhancing cooperation among the Biodiversity-related Conventions at national and regional levels (UNEP, 2015) and Elaboration of options for enhancing synergies among biodiversity-related conventions (UNEP, 2015). These and other background documents are available on the web page for the workshop: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=BRCWS-2016-01>.

⁸ All the presentations made during this session are available in full on the CBD website at the web page for the workshop: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=BRCWS-2016-01>.

meeting. The Executive Secretary of the CBD described work undertaken under the CBD with regard to increasing collaboration with the other biodiversity-related conventions, including between their secretariats. That included the establishment of the Biodiversity Liaison Group and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, which had been adopted as a plan not only for the CBD but for the international community; other conventions had aligned their strategic plans and work programmes with that of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, which had facilitated cooperation. Likewise, all the conventions would benefit from using national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) as the principal national policy instrument. National focal points had been informed by the CBD Secretariat about tools in other conventions that might be useful in their work. Alignment of the targets of other conventions with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets would create further opportunities for synergies. Through a recent decision of the Conference of the Parties, CBD had also taken a step to facilitate the access of other conventions to funding through the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for actions that would contribute to achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, by inviting them to present priorities that the Conference of the Parties of the CBD could take into account in formulating its guidance to the financial mechanism. Joint notifications had been issued, including with other United Nations organizations.

14. The Secretary-General of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) described Party-led progress in ensuring national synergy in implementation of CITES across different sectors. Specific resolutions and decisions had been adopted, including on real issues concerning particular species and/or in specific countries. Cooperation with other conventions and with international organizations was vital, including outside of the biodiversity family, and common threads should be sought, such as through what was happening with CITES and the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), the United Nations Convention against Corruption, and the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

15. The Secretary of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) said this Convention was the newest member of the Biodiversity Liaison Group but the oldest of the conventions in the Group, and included nine regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) and 182 national plant protection organizations (NPPOs). Noting the current International Year of Pulses in 2016, he informed participants of an initiative of the IPPC for 2020 to be designated the International Year of Plant Health.

16. The Director of the World Heritage Centre⁹ presented the coverage of the World Heritage Convention and listed the internationally designated areas that were also partly the responsibility of other conventions (e.g. Ramsar), including cultural ones. A number of decisions of the World Heritage Committee¹⁰ supported cooperation with other biodiversity-related conventions through the Biodiversity Liaison Group. National reporting by member states had been adopted in 1972. She looked forward to a discussion on synergies of national and site reporting and reporting to the general public. The State of Conservation Information System, which contained 40 years of data on indicators of and threats to biodiversity, was linked to InforMEA.¹¹ A meeting of the Biodiversity Liaison Group could be organized at the margins of the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee in July 2016, to help foster better understanding among the conventions of the World Heritage Convention and how the Committee worked.

17. The Executive Secretary of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) described four “lessons” regarding synergies among conventions that could be learned from experiences under CMS and the CMS Family Instruments. Those included non-interference in the management and organization of secretariats, consideration of the initial requirement for additional

⁹ The UNESCO World Heritage Centre serves as the secretariat of the World Heritage Convention.

¹⁰ The World Heritage Committee is responsible to the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention. The Committee is responsible for implementation of the Convention, defines use of the World Heritage Fund and allocates financial assistance upon requests from States Parties. It has the final say on whether a property is inscribed on the World Heritage List. It examines reports on the state of conservation of inscribed properties and asks States Parties to take action when properties are not being properly managed. It also decides on the inscription or deletion of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

¹¹ See below, under “Information and knowledge management”, for information on InforMEA.

resources, ensuring synergies at the national level, and a need for Parties to be consistent across related departments and processes.

18. The Acting Secretary General of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands described the reach and functioning of the convention and the global situation of wetlands, and presented the fourth strategic plan, for 2016–2024. Noting the inclusion of biodiversity targets in the Sustainable Development Goals, she thanked CBD for working together with Ramsar to define an indicator for monitoring the extent of water-related ecosystems, including wetlands. Regarding synergies among the conventions at national level, some countries already had mechanisms for sharing information with the focal points of other biodiversity-related conventions, and reported this to the Ramsar COP. Regarding synergies at site level, a project was under way including Ramsar, WHC and two other conventions regarding sites with multiple international designations, to identify opportunities for cooperation.

19. The Secretary of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) described examples of areas in which synergies could be enhanced, which included sharing data on samples of genetic material, online reporting systems, resource mobilization, and sharing the output of its scientific advisory committee with other information systems. The Treaty had received endorsement for the workshop from its Contracting Parties.

20. The co-chair commented that the UNEP paper on “Elaboration of options for enhancing synergies among biodiversity-related conventions” provided 28 options, under which 88 actions had been identified for various actors including Governments, secretariats, UNEP and other United Nations bodies. Of the 88 actions, 21 made reference to actions that would substantially involve the Biodiversity Liaison Group; which meant that any proposal in this regard at the workshop would be welcomed.

21. One participant proposed that certain synergies could be ensured by national laws.

22. The Principal Officer for Mainstreaming, Partnerships and Outreach of the CBD Secretariat noted that the CBD Secretariat had been requested by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention to continue to contribute to the SDG process taking place under the United Nations General Assembly. She noted that there had been considerable effort to alert the various convention secretariats about issues of relevance to their conventions, and to work together to ensure that biodiversity was explicitly or implicitly recognized in the SDGs.

23. The Head of Biodiversity, Land and Governance Programme, Division of Environmental Law and Conventions, UNEP, discussed the contribution of biodiversity-related conventions to realization of the SDGs, emphasizing the importance of the United Nations Statistical Commission for interpreting data for the indicators. It would be important, therefore, to ensure that statistically relevant tools were used to report to national statistical offices. Certain SDG indicators were inappropriate for measuring progress on achieving targets and should be revised. There were clear links between the indicators for the SDGs and those for biodiversity although there was still not a complete set of indicators, and there was a lack of indicators that addressed the integrated approach in the SDGs. Biodiversity-related conventions should therefore synthesize their strategic plans, targets and indicators, link SDG and biodiversity indicators, and build the capacity of national statistical officers and biodiversity focal points. UNEP was currently mapping the SDG targets and indicators with the targets and indicators available within the biodiversity conventions and would prepare briefs on the linkages and gaps before the second session of the United Nations Environment Assembly of UNEP.

24. In the ensuing discussion, some participants said the report of the workshop should show how synergy would contribute to realization of the SDGs. It was also noted that the report would be issued as an information document to the first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation of the CBD; it should therefore be structured to distinguish the short-, medium- and long-term actions proposed as elements of a road map. One participant said that more work was required on responsibilities and timelines, what work should be assigned to experts and what further analysis was required.

25. Presentations were made on each thematic area.

The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and national biodiversity strategies and action plans

26. The co-chair made a presentation on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and NBSAPs as frameworks to facilitate synergies among the conventions. The co-chair noted that Parties to the biodiversity-related conventions had flexibility in incorporating the Aichi Biodiversity Targets that they considered relevant and important to their own situation in revising or updating their NBSAPs. Mapping the Aichi Biodiversity Targets would indicate how each convention was aligned with regard to each Target, which could serve as a guide for resource requirements and where cooperation was appropriate. She identified weaknesses in use of NBSAPs as policy instruments, review of experiences, coverage of cross-cutting issues, resource mobilization strategies, links to the SDGs, coverage of synergies in NBSAPs, institutional synergies and capacity-building and awareness. Future needs were capacity-building for NBSAPs, and stronger links to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and SDGs in order to attract funding and clearer guidance for implementation of the conventions through NBSAPs.

Institutional arrangements and coordination mechanisms

27. The Deputy Executive Secretary of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions¹² said that those three chemical conventions had been working towards synergy for 10 years. The process had been strictly Party-driven, including for the preparation of documents, and the secretariats acted only as a resource. In order to ensure synergy, the COP of each convention had had to take the same decisions on certain topics. COP meetings were held back to back or simultaneously for topics of common interest. Nevertheless, the autonomy and sovereignty of each convention were respected. They had one budget covering about 20 cross-cutting issues, with joint technical assistance, and one website with a joint meeting calendar. The three secretariats had now been merged, with one executive secretary, to work through a matrix of scientific and technical support, operations and administration. It would be important to determine how such synergy was reflected at national level, and how best to channel funding for institutional strengthening at the national level. Harmonization of reporting was an outstanding issue.

28. In answer to questions from workshop participants, the Deputy Executive Secretary said that the benefits to the Parties of synergy among the three conventions were still being reviewed, although most appeared to be seen at the regional and international levels. The three secretariats were still learning to work together, providing different perspectives on each issue; that was facilitated by their location in the same building. Any cost savings that were made would be channelled into implementation of the conventions, including capacity-building. The delegations to COPs were learning to time discussions and to communicate better, ensuring that all three conventions had equal weight.

29. Another participant commented that the three chemical conventions had more affinities than the seven biodiversity-related conventions, including the fact that they were all under the aegis of UNEP,¹³ the secretariats were located in the same building in Geneva, and they often had the same national focal points.

Information and knowledge management

30. The UNEP representative of the Multilateral Environmental Agreement Information and Knowledge Management Initiative (MEA IKM) presented *InforMEA – the United Nations Information Portal on MEAs*, an online system for information and knowledge management among the biodiversity-

¹² Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants.

¹³ The secretariats of the Basel and Stockholm conventions are administered by UNEP and are located in Geneva, Switzerland. The Secretariat of the Rotterdam Convention is jointly served by UNEP and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). It is based in Geneva, Switzerland, and in Rome, Italy. In 2012, the Secretariats of the Basel and Stockholm conventions, as well as the UNEP part of the Rotterdam Convention Secretariat, moved from three separate secretariats with a programmatic structure to a single secretariat with a matrix structure serving the three conventions.

related conventions and other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs)¹⁴ She described how the database, which drew directly from the databases managed by each of the participating conventions, contained information on thousands of governing body decisions and treaty texts, thousands of national reports and hundreds of national plans. It also contained information on national ratification status and focal points, a joint MEA calendar and 21 e-learning courses, including eight on biodiversity-related conventions, regarding which encouraging feedback had been received from learners, especially on the introductory course on CBD. Through a glossary section on law and environment ontology – LEO – this data set could further be related to over a million national laws, as well as to cases and regional environmental treaties. LEO also provided semantic standards and allowed retrieval across categories of information, such as all legislation on access and benefit-sharing. She explained that InforMEA is being developed collaboratively among UNEP and the participating MEAs through the MEA IKM Initiative spanning several United Nations entities (FAO, UNESCO, UNECE and UNFCCC) and IUCN.

Capacity-building

31. A representative of the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre presented the main findings of a study on capacity-building and awareness-raising needs for cooperation among biodiversity-related conventions at national level. The study had been prepared in accordance with decision XII/6 of the CBD and made available as a background document for the workshop (UNEP/CBD/BRC/WS/2016/1/INF/1). The study drew on a survey undertaken by the CBD Secretariat at the end of 2015. It analysed the capacity-building needs and awareness-raising needs regarding cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions at the national level, existing learning opportunities, tools and mechanism to address those needs, and explores future opportunities to better address those needs in the future. One of the main findings was that there was no critical need to come up with new tools or mechanisms, but that the existing tools and mechanisms ought to be strengthened, including raising awareness on their existence. These included cooperation mechanisms for national focal points and potentially other stakeholders involved in the implementation of the conventions; and meetings or workshops on issues related to one or multiple biodiversity-related conventions. It was also found that it would be important to take advantage of ongoing or planned capacity-building activities at the different levels of governance that would benefit from enhanced cooperation in the implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions.

Communication and awareness-raising

32. The Principal Officer for Mainstreaming, Partnerships and Outreach of the CBD Secretariat made a presentation on strategic and specific possibilities for synergy in communication by the seven conventions. In general, better communication was required about biodiversity and ecosystem services. Aspects to be considered were the type of messaging to be used, the target audience and the different partners that could be used. International days dedicated to biodiversity topics raised awareness and could be exploited further collaboratively. She also noted that the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity provided a platform for action by many different United Nations bodies and conventions, and could be used in a more effective manner.

33. A member of the Biodiversity Liaison Group recalled that the midpoint of the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity had been reached.

Science-policy interface

34. A member of the secretariat of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) described potential synergies in the science-policy interface. Having described the structure of IPBES, he said that its first work programme had indicated possible synergies in assessment, in policy support, in knowledge generation, in capacity-building and in information and knowledge management. The Platform would be seeking input for its next work programme before the completion of the current work programme in 2018. In answer to a question, he said that a measure of the

¹⁴ United Nations Information Portal on Multilateral Environmental Agreements, online: <http://www.informea.org/>.

effectiveness of the first programme was that many of the current deliverables were responding to requests made by conventions.

National reporting, monitoring and indicators

35. A presentation on harmonization of national reporting was made by video from the CBD Secretariat in Montreal. Discussions on synergy, streamlining and harmonization of national reporting to the different conventions had been held since 2000, with a number of pilot projects carried out, and these discussions had continued in the Biodiversity Liaison Group and the Joint Liaison Group of the Rio Conventions. The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership had been formed in 2007 in response to CBD needs, but now also integrated indicators for other biodiversity-related conventions and provided services to them. The experience from these initiatives was reflected in the five options in the background paper.¹⁵ Both the CBD and Ramsar Convention were developing guidelines and formats for the next reporting cycle. Discussions had been held and were not yet concluded, to see if there could be joint elements in reporting as well as indicators used by both instruments. A number of elements necessary for alignment and synergy among the biodiversity-related conventions with regard to monitoring and reporting already existed. The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 provided a framework, which was already used by several biodiversity-related conventions, and a number of elements of the Strategic Plan had been incorporated into the SDGs. A partnership had been formed on biodiversity indicators, with a process to enhance observation for monitoring biodiversity and emerging commonality through the Essential Biodiversity Variables. NBSAPs increasingly provided the framework at national level for implementing several conventions, with support through the NBSAP Forum¹⁶ and GEF and its implementing agencies. And the increasing use of online tools for reporting provided the possibility of linkage among them. What was now needed was a stepwise plan for achieving better integration. Options for alignment should be available in the form of a joint strategy for consideration by the governing bodies of each biodiversity-related convention.

Resource mobilization and utilization

36. A presentation on resource mobilization for biodiversity was made by video from the CBD Secretariat in Montreal by the Secretariat's Principal Officer of Technical Support for Implementation. The Conference of the Parties to the CBD at its twelfth meeting (COP 12) had adopted the financial targets and a mandate for financial reporting framework (decision XII/3). Voluntary guidance on financial reporting for CBD Parties had been provided, and a number of regional workshops and webinars held to sensitize Parties to using the framework. The Addis Ababa Action Agenda provided a comprehensive, integrated framework for financing sustainable development and achieving the SDGs, including domestic resource mobilization and international development assistance. The CBD COP had also invited the governing bodies of other biodiversity-related conventions to provide advice on national priorities under those conventions that would contribute to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (decision XII/30). The COP would take the information received into account in its guidance to the GEF to be adopted at its next meeting (COP 13).¹⁷ A questionnaire survey was also being carried out among CBD Parties to contribute to this work. Some 20 per cent of potential projects provided in the responses that had been received so far contained elements related to other biodiversity-related conventions. The Subsidiary Body on Implementation would consider this matter at its first meeting in May 2016.

37. One participant commented on the importance of using existing opportunities for the convention secretariats and GEF to facilitate liaison between national focal points for joint implementation and resource mobilization. There had been minimal participation by national focal points of the other conventions at the GEF extended constituency workshops. It was proposed that GEF should provide

¹⁵ UNEP/CBD/BRC/WS/2016/1/1/Add.1/Rev.1, pp. 44–45; and Elaboration of options for enhancing synergies among biodiversity-related conventions, pp. 19–22.

¹⁶ NBSAP Forum, a collaborative initiative of CBD Secretariat, UNDP and UNEP: <http://nbsapforum.net>.

¹⁷ Further information is available on a web page established to promote the sharing of funding information on the biodiversity-related conventions, <https://www.cbd.int/financial/blg.shtml>.

funding to enable national focal points of the biodiversity-related conventions to attend its extended constituency workshops.

38. One participant commented that communication also played a role in assessment. She also proposed that potential synergies in monitoring and reporting be discussed during the workshop. With respect to resource mobilization, national and collective actions and the role of the private sector should also be discussed.

39. Participants commented that the next periodic report on biological diversity, the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, should not only draw on the sixth national reports, but also on IPBES assessments, on the work of the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, and on relevant work of the other biodiversity-related conventions. One participant said that the World Heritage Convention received strong media attention and that the IPBES assessments would also have a big impact in the press and so should be supported by all the biodiversity-related conventions.

40. One participant commented that conventions differed widely with respect to national financing; as well as in national reporting and monitoring, some being generic and others events-driven; others conducted regular risk assessments so the interface with science was already there. One participant commented that it was important to account for expenditure on biodiversity in different sectors, including agriculture, forestry, fisheries and health. Relevant focal points worked in various sectoral agencies, including finance, science, technology, health, agriculture and the environment, which made it difficult to make contacts to that end.

II. THEMATIC AREAS FOR ENHANCED SYNERGIES

Item 5. Discussions of thematic areas for enhanced synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions at national, regional and global levels, as appropriate

41. The arrangements for the workshop are presented in detail in document UNEP/CBD/BRC/WS/2016/1/1/Add.1/Rev.1, pp. 12–37. In brief, after the introductory presentations and discussion on the first four thematic areas, participants divided into four groups that worked in parallel, with one group for each area, to conduct a “mind-mapping” exercise to find options for enhancing synergies among the conventions. A similar exercise was conducted after presentation of the other four areas.

42. On the basis of input from the mind-mapping exercise and the background documents on “options for enhancing synergy among biodiversity-related conventions” and the “sourcebook of opportunities for enhancing cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions” summarized in UNEP/CBD/BRC/WS/2016/1/1/Add.1/Rev.1, annex III, participants worked in small groups convened on the second and third days of the workshop, to propose options for enhancing synergy among the biodiversity-related conventions at national, regional and global levels. Each option was entered into a template. Four thematic areas were taken up on the second day by four groups that worked in parallel, and the other four areas were taken up in a similar manner on the third day. Each group contained about eight party representatives, a moderator and a rapporteur, who were members of the informal advisory group, and technical resource people, who included representatives of convention secretariats and other organizations.

43. The templates were presented in plenary for discussion and, on the basis of the feedback, were revised by the groups.

III. PREPARING OPTIONS

Item 6. Discussion and preparation of options and elements for a possible road map

44. The revised versions of the templates prepared by the small groups were presented for further discussion in plenary.

45. Although it had been envisaged that the options would be classified according to whether they should be implemented in the short term (0–2 years), medium term (2–5 years) or long term (5–10 years), that was not done throughout all groups, owing to shortage of time.¹⁸

46. During the discussion, participants commented that each option was not necessarily applicable to all conventions or in all situations, but also that none were objectionable to or problematic for any of the conventions; and it was also recognized that a range of the actions were already under way, at least in part. The group emphasized that the aim of the workshop had been to elicit concrete options for action, benefiting from the participation of parties and representatives of the secretariats of all seven biodiversity-related conventions, the host institutions of the secretariats and other relevant organizations.

47. The newly revised templates were discussed in plenary on the fourth day of the workshop and further revised. They are reproduced below, by thematic area, in narrative form, including revisions based on the comments made, in Box 1. Time did not permit further synthesis of the options or elimination of duplication. The completed templates are presented in an annex to the present report. Issues that emerged under several thematic areas are described in Box 2.

Box 1: Outcomes of discussions under thematic areas

Outcomes of discussions under thematic areas

I. THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011–2020, THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS AND NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS

Issues/areas addressed, including challenges, barriers and/or opportunities identified

1. National biodiversity strategies and action plans as a possible entry point for synergies
2. Involvement of key stakeholders, and of indigenous peoples and local communities
3. National coordination for implementing biodiversity-related conventions
4. National focal points
5. Awareness of national focal points of other relevant biodiversity-related conventions
6. Biodiversity-related conventions
7. Tools for accessing funding

Short-term options (0 – 2 years)

1. National biodiversity strategies and action plans as a possible entry point for synergies

National options for action

Reflect all the commitments of biodiversity-related conventions that are linked to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 in national biodiversity strategies and action plans in line with the commitments agreed to under relevant conventions.

Conduct mapping and gap analysis of relevant implementation actions, including those related to contributions under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development that include the Sustainable Development Goals.

Identify potential needs from the gap analysis.

Assess whether the actions on synergies in national implementation plans are in line with the priorities, commitments and opportunities.

According to national need, review existing action plans for implementation to include implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions.

¹⁸ It was done in two cases, partially done in another two cases and in four cases it was not done.

Regional options for action

Share best practices and experience from the national biodiversity strategies and action plan process and from other relevant regional strategies with regard to ongoing and planned actions on synergies between the biodiversity-related conventions.

Global options for action

Seek guidance from relevant international organizations/ institutions, to be used, as appropriate, at national level by national focal points and practitioners, on synergies for finalizing and implementing national biodiversity strategies and action plans for the CBD and similar strategies and action plans for other conventions.

2. Involvement of key stakeholders, and of indigenous peoples and local communities**National options for action**

Ensure appropriate participation of relevant stakeholders and of indigenous peoples and local communities in finalization of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and relevant national programmes, explicitly for better articulation and planning to achieve synergies.

Regional options for action

Involve key stakeholders and indigenous peoples and local communities

Global options for action

Involve key stakeholders and indigenous peoples and local communities

3. National coordination for implementing biodiversity-related conventions**National options for action**

In revising or updating national biodiversity strategies and action plans and related strategies and action plans, make use of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and prepare target-driven work plans for all biodiversity-related conventions.

In view of the relevance and need for furthering cooperation and coordination among the biodiversity-related conventions, explore options for establishing and/or strengthening a national coordination mechanism to potentially oversee national priority-setting, including funding options, for action on synergies.

4. National focal points**National options for action**

Strengthen awareness-raising and information-sharing for the national focal points of the various biodiversity-related conventions, with the participation of relevant stakeholders and scientists as well as indigenous peoples and local communities, to support related actions.

Global options for action

The Conference of the Parties of the CBD may consider calling on the biodiversity-related conventions specifically to coordinate relevant actions to translate the options for enhancing synergies into actions. A similar call could be made with respect to the financing mechanism.

5. Awareness of national focal points of other relevant biodiversity-related conventions**National options for action**

Make use of mechanisms or national steering committees to strengthen cooperation among the national focal points of the biodiversity-related conventions.

Global options for action

The relevant governing bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions could call for enhancement of joint efforts on synergies at various levels, ensure that future cooperation is based on a common understanding of issues and options and undertake joint efforts to maximize the effectiveness of mandates and agendas delivered at various levels.

Prepare guidance for national focal points, as appropriate, on incorporating all relevant biodiversity commitments into a system-wide approach.

6. Biodiversity-related conventions**National options for action**

Make use of indicators in other relevant conventions in implementing the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and, as appropriate, prepare relevant national indicators for other biodiversity-related conventions to track effective implementation and monitoring of actions and to feed into national actions related to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals.

Regional options for action

Ensure that the discussions and options for enhancing effective implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions extend to all relevant regional agreements and conventions, as prioritized by those agreements and conventions, in order to enhance cooperation and implementation.

Medium-term options (2–5 years)**National options for action** (relevant to points 1 to 7)

Link national biodiversity strategies and action plans to the national clearing-house mechanism and/or other information-sharing hubs.

7. Tools for accessing funding**National options for action**

National focal points of the biodiversity-related conventions should exchange information on priorities so that there is a common understanding.

Consider conducting pilot projects for promoting synergies on thematic areas, such as plant and animal health to support food security, food safety and environmental protection, including designing innovative projects for funding by the Global Environment Facility to contribute to synergistic action.

Regional options for action

Make use of regional achievements and promote success stories of implementation of biodiversity-related conventions for obtaining funds from all relevant funding sources and mechanisms.

Streamline funding to maximize implementation.

Identify specific thematic areas for promoting synergies at regional level.

Global options for action

Provide informed guidance in discussions and priority-setting for the next replenishment of the Global Environment Facility to ensure that the issue of synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions receives attention as a theme that is important for biodiversity.

Identify thematic areas for promoting synergies, and share success stories of the implementation of biodiversity-related conventions, to inform, as appropriate, the various governing bodies and the Global Environment Facility.

II. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND COORDINATION MECHANISMS

Issues/areas addressed, including challenges, barriers and/or opportunities identified

1. Lack of coordination at national level
2. Lack of coordination at international level
3. Fragmented responsibilities and efforts among biodiversity-related conventions

1. Lack of coordination at national level

National options for action

Establish formal coordination mechanism for efficient coordination among national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions and relevant host organizations

Party action required:

Establish a national committee comprising the national focal points of all seven biodiversity-related conventions and national representatives or focal points of host organizations as well as other necessary representatives.

Improve mutual understanding of the specific objectives of each convention.

Enhance political will and administrative responsibilities, and raise awareness of policymakers about improving cooperation and synergy.

Take into account mutual supportiveness of biodiversity-related conventions in developing national policies.

Assess national needs for coordination and synergy.

Develop a strategic plan for coordinated, synergistic implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.

Enhance technical knowledge on synergy and coordination.

Regional options for action

Take advantage of relevant existing institutions to work on specific common issues under biodiversity-related conventions at national, regional and international levels.

Global options for action

Invite relevant international organizations, such as FAO, IUCN, UNEP and UNESCO, to look for coordinated actions to create and implement synergies among biodiversity-related conventions (and national biodiversity strategies and action plans and other strategic plans).

Invite the biodiversity-related conventions to integrate priorities and synergies into their programmes of work, within their respective mandates.

Invite all biodiversity-related conventions to prepare a sample guide based on best practices, showing synergy among the conventions, and share it with the national focal points of the conventions.

2. Lack of coordination at international level

Global options for action

Encourage mutually supportive decisions and possibly common decisions by the governing bodies of biodiversity-related conventions for achieving coherence at all levels, including further development and strengthening of joint work programmes and memoranda of understanding.

Invite the secretariats of all the biodiversity-related conventions to attend meetings of the governing bodies of the other biodiversity-related conventions to facilitate synergies among them, using such opportunities for meetings between members of the Biodiversity Liaison Group or their designees.

Taking note of the valuable role of the Biodiversity Liaison Group in fostering synergies, invite the biodiversity-related conventions to consider recognizing the Biodiversity Liaison Group through their respective governing bodies and elaborating terms of reference.

Request members of the Biodiversity Liaison Group to designate members of their staff to participate in informal groups on synergies in communication, resource mobilization, capacity-building, Internet technology and other areas, as appropriate.

3. Fragmented responsibilities and efforts among biodiversity-related conventions

National options for action

Assess the capacity-building needs and institutional arrangements for coordinated and synergistic efforts or approaches for effective implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.

III. INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

Issues/areas addressed, including challenges, barriers and/or opportunities identified

Issues of focus:

1. Improve access to information necessary for implementation, as data and information are scattered
2. Access to knowledge necessary for implementation – linkage of networks

Challenges/barriers/opportunities:

- Scattered information, limited access and little willingness to share.
- Focal points of the different conventions are not part of the discussion on information management at country level.
- Databases design, metadata.
- Relation with indicators – gaps.
- Define core knowledge.
- Build national task forces.
- Identify what the parties need to provide the necessary information.
- Identify what is needed for national implementation.
- Create a directory of experts.

1. Improve access to information necessary for implementation, as data and information are scattered.

National options for action

Review existing tools and approaches for information and knowledge management to assess their efficacy, and develop new tools and approaches, if required.

Develop thematic national databases (or strengthen existing databases) that are open, interoperable and have adequate safeguards in the context of data/ information management.

Provide information to build capacity for planning and implementation.

Promote networking for information and knowledge management using web-based tools.

Invite national focal points to establish linkages with the agency designated for reporting on achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (national statistical agency in many countries) to harmonize information on the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and Indicators.

Regional options for action

Strengthen the role of regional entities and institutions, including use of virtual tools.

Supportive actions for parties

Identify the information needed for each convention, as Switzerland has done in a recent study that will be made available shortly.

Provide guidance on national databases, data access and use, and share experience in sharing national database development and use; the guidance provided by the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) could be used for ready reference.

2. Access to knowledge necessary for implementation – linkage of networks

National options for action

Attempt linkage of the databases of member countries of biodiversity-related conventions to the national statistical database.

Conduct joint information and awareness campaigns, including in the context of the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity 2011–2020.

Conduct broad stakeholder consultations or workshops at subregional level on information and knowledge management, including traditional knowledge in local communities.

Global options for action

Invite biodiversity-related convention secretariats to form links with relevant global knowledge products (e.g. the IUCN Red List).

Party action required

Identify two countries per region for pilot studies on database planning and management, and monitor outcomes after 2 years.

Supportive actions for Parties

UNEP, UNEP-WCMC, UNDP and others may provide advice, tools and technology to parties for database development, and promote the sharing of experience among parties, as appropriate.

Parties to various biodiversity-related conventions could promote use of UNEP “Live”, InforMEA and other similar web-based tools.

IV. NATIONAL REPORTING, MONITORING AND INDICATORS

Issues/areas addressed, including challenges, barriers and/or opportunities identified

1. Common reporting
2. Institutions for reporting
3. Monitoring
4. Indicators: cross-cutting synergies
5. Awareness-raising and communication
6. Exchanging information and lessons learned among conventions

Short-term and medium-term options

1. Common reporting

National options for action

Encourage parties of biodiversity-related conventions to exchange information on tools, mechanisms and best practices for data collection and reporting.

Parties should undertake an inventory of their datasets to better understand the availability of information and approaches.

Regional options for action

Provide training on database systems.

Build capacity to international standards.

Global options for action

Build on the work of the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre and others to determine common and different reporting elements for each biodiversity-related convention.

Ensure that the secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions provide information in a form that is accessible to InforMEA

1.1 Data:

Challenge: Biodiversity-related conventions have common and different data requirements and sources; no two are the same.

Opportunity: Deal with overlapping data requirements of biodiversity-related conventions.

National options for action

Identify which set of data is needed and the commonalities of the data in all or some of the biodiversity-related conventions.

1.2 Quality of data:

Challenges: 1) Interoperability requires a common language between systems. 2) Interpretation relies on the accuracy of data and its meaning (which may differ between conventions)

1.3 Reporting burden:

Challenges: 1) Reporting must be tailored to different institutions and instruments. 2) Completing reports on time and in full requires a heavy workload.

Opportunity: The burden could be reduced by accessing relevant data from other sources.

National options for action

Update clearing-house mechanisms to streamline reporting among different biodiversity-related conventions.

Global options for action

Provide guidance to assist national efforts; build on work of InforMEA and the mapping exercises identified in the Sourcebook. The Biodiversity Liaison Group should help in managing that process.

Develop a possible framework for reporting information covering all seven biodiversity-related conventions through a bottom-up approach, the framework being based on the common reporting information collected by the biodiversity-related conventions according to their mandates.

Exchange information on reporting experiences and lessons learned from different biodiversity-related conventions to improve the reporting system.

2. Institutions for reporting

National options for action

Establish or strengthen a multi-biodiversity-related convention national coordination process to, *inter alia*:

- Harmonize data collection and reporting.
- Link focal points and institutions to meet reporting requirements.
- Supervise quality control, consistency of reporting and respect for reporting deadlines.
- Ensure proper standards for databases.

Ensure that reporting under each biodiversity-related convention benefits from the input of other biodiversity-related conventions.

Global options for action

Make an inventory of areas of overlap between biodiversity-related conventions

Prepare guidance on reporting to assist in effective national reporting.

Make use of case studies, such as:

- the European Union mapping exercise on the data required to meet obligations
- the Brazilian information management system, described in the Sourcebook

3. Monitoring

Opportunities: The different biodiversity-related conventions must learn lessons:

- by tracking the effectiveness and utility of what is reported and
- determining reporting needs.

National options for action

Plan monitoring as a requirement for effective reporting.

Global options for action

Monitor the process of reporting to:

- improve implementation,
- identify emerging issues, and provide early warnings that require action.

4. Indicators

Challenge: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals process will be preparing indicators and driving the agenda. There will be implications for biodiversity-related conventions, e.g. they may be required to reformat their reporting structures.

Opportunity: Biodiversity-related conventions could influence development of indicators (however, indicators are being discussed currently, and there is limited time to engage).

National options for action

Member countries of each biodiversity-related convention should ensure that they influence the discussions on indicators for the Sustainable Development Goals and the discussion regarding biodiversity-related indicators under each of the conventions.

Global options for action

Biodiversity-related convention secretariats should ensure that they contribute to the discussions on indicators for the Sustainable Development Goals and to the discussion of biodiversity-related indicators under each of the other conventions.

5. Awareness-raising and communication**Challenges:**

Need to create reports that are useful documents for public communication and stakeholder consultation.

Some biodiversity-related conventions have “narrative” reporting requirements, while others require quantified data.

National reports are required in one of the six United Nations languages: this creates translation issues for people whose language is not one of the six official languages.

National options for action

Encourage member countries to use information from all the biodiversity-related conventions and not work in silos.

Ensure that summaries of the national report are also available in their national language(s).

6. Cross-cutting synergies:**Awareness-raising and communication****National options for action**

Collaborate on world events (international days, years, decade) with member countries of other biodiversity-related conventions.

Global options for action

The secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions should share information widely on world events (days, years, decade), championed by other biodiversity-related conventions.

Exchanging information and lessons learned among conventions**National options for action**

At meetings of the governing bodies and other relevant bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions, focal points from different conventions should practise synergies through informal discussions.

The host country should make arrangements for such informal meetings among representatives of biodiversity-related conventions.

V. COMMUNICATION AND AWARENESS-RAISING

Issues/areas addressed, including challenges, barriers and/or opportunities identified

Inadequate or inefficient communications and awareness among the biodiversity-related conventions

National options for action

Prepare a national biodiversity-related communication and awareness strategy, mindful of synergies and mutual benefit, that would:¹⁹

- Ensure target audience-specific communication;
- Develop target-specific communication channels;
- Use various approaches (e.g. emotional, economic, cultural, well-being) to establish better understanding of the connection between biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and human well-being;
- Provide scientific advisory information to policymakers;
- Use modern and traditional tools creatively (e.g. social media, folk media, search engines, cell phones, radio, sports events).

The national focal points, or equivalent authorities, of biodiversity-related conventions should collaborate with other sectors, as appropriate (e.g. climate change, inter-ministerial dialogue).

Entities responsible for the various biodiversity-related conventions should collaborate on international observances to increase awareness.

Develop internet screening tools to inform users about potential wildlife crimes and illegal trade and its role in endangering species' populations.

Integrate and coordinate message(s) for biodiversity-related conventions.

Send interactive message-linking information from biodiversity-related conventions, incorporating a feedback option (e.g. sharing success stories).

Create a single entry point to channel users to the information sought and other related or relevant information.

Link biodiversity conventions to others, such as on climate change.

Engage the private sector in developing “low-cost” but “high-impact” awareness-raising programmes.

Regional options for action

Involve regional networks and organizations relevant to the biodiversity-related conventions in communications and awareness activities.

Collaborate on international observances to increase awareness.

Global options for action

Biodiversity-related conventions should collaborate with other sectors, as appropriate.

Collaborate on and contribute to international observances to increase awareness.

Collaborate in providing scientific advisory information to policymakers.

Establish events, such as a pavilion for biodiversity-related conventions at international conventions and congresses.

¹⁹ Bullet points under the national strategy are also options for the regional and global levels.

Introduce an interactive option for countries to share successes and/or problems.

Create a single world wide web entry point to channel users to the information sought and other related or relevant information.

Use modern tools such as “google-doodle” and others to improve communication.

Link biodiversity conventions to others, such as on climate change.

Party action required

The national biodiversity coordination committee should develop a strategy for communication and awareness.

Supportive actions for Parties

Secretariats of biodiversity-related conventions and partners should provide member countries with communication material.

Develop guidance material for effective communication with various audiences.

Collaborate on international observances (e.g. the International Year of Plant Health in 2020).

Biodiversity-related conventions should provide strong support to the development of internet screening tools to inform users about potential wildlife crimes and illegal trade and its role in endangering species’ populations.

Relevant organizations should provide member countries of the biodiversity-related conventions with joint tools for successful approaches.

Biodiversity-related conventions should provide guidance material.

VI. SCIENCE–POLICY INTERFACE

Issues/areas addressed, including challenges, barriers and/or opportunities identified

Science in decision-making
Scientific bodies
Knowledge gaps
Science-policy functions
Communication

Short-term options (0–2 years)

National options for action

Science in decision-making

Ensure collaboration and involvement of the scientists engaged in the processes of the biodiversity-related conventions in the science–policy interface, e.g. through IPBES.

Establish and make use of a roster of experts across all biodiversity-related conventions.

Link biodiversity-related conventions to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets through NBSAPs.

Strengthen cooperation among relevant institutions for decision-making.

Ensure that all biodiversity-related conventions contribute jointly to the development of scenarios and models, catalysed by IPBES.

Scientific bodies

Establish a science–policy platform or coordination mechanism at national level, involving all relevant institutions, to:

- ensure use of the best available knowledge;
- interact with IPBES in a timely, coherent manner;
- strengthen implementation.

Knowledge gaps

Assess the needs of the seven biodiversity-related conventions to provide input to the IPBES work programme from 2019 onwards.

Identify science-policy centres in different countries that may address knowledge gaps and needs.

Regional options for action**Science in decision-making**

Ensure that all biodiversity-related contribute jointly to the development of scenarios and models, catalysed by IPBES.

Ensure collaboration and involvement of the scientists and rosters of experts of the biodiversity-related conventions.

Knowledge gaps

Assess the needs of the seven biodiversity-related conventions to provide input to the IPBES work programme from 2019 onwards.

Global options for action**Science in decision-making**

Contribute jointly to the development of scenarios and models, catalysed by IPBES.

Scientific bodies

Encourage the governing bodies and/or subsidiary bodies of biodiversity-related conventions to interact with IPBES in a timely, coherent manner.

Review the functions and products of the different biodiversity-related conventions in order to improve implementation.

Ensure that the chairs of the scientific advisory bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions continue to facilitate dialogue between the conventions and the provision of input to e.g. IPBES.

Medium-term options (2–5 years)**National options for action****Science-policy functions**

Establish institutional arrangements, relating to scientists and policymakers, for improving implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.

Improve incentives for scientists to take part in the knowledge-based decision-making process.

Communication

Make use of deliveries and assessments, and communicate findings.

Use information-sharing mechanisms (Internet, clearing-house mechanism, social media).

Regional options for action

Communication

Make use of IPBES deliverables and regional assessments, and communicate findings.

Use information-sharing mechanisms (Internet, clearing-house mechanism, social media).

Global options for action

Science policy functions

Establish memoranda of understanding (MoU) between the different biodiversity-related conventions and IPBES.

Communication

Make use of IPBES deliverables and assessments, and communicate findings.

Use information-sharing mechanisms (Internet, clearing-house mechanism, social media).

VII. CAPACITY-BUILDING

Issues/areas addressed, including challenges, barriers and/or opportunities identified

1. Insufficient knowledge and skills
2. Lack of coordinated capacity-building and awareness-raising efforts
3. Insufficient human and financial resources
4. Lack of sustainability of capacity-building

1. Insufficient knowledge and skills

National options for action

Train national focal points on other biodiversity-related conventions so that synergies and succession and pool of resources are maintained.

Build capacity and understanding of national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions on the role of indigenous and local knowledge for coordinated integration in the implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.

Prioritize skills and capacities of human resources, including national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions, and assign or delegate roles and responsibilities appropriately.

Clarify the roles and responsibilities of national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions.

Conduct joint workshops on common areas of responsibility, such as reporting and resource mobilization.

Conduct a needs assessment for targeted capacity-building.

Regional options for action

Take advantage of existing networking opportunities for capacity-building to help synergistic implementation of biodiversity-related conventions (national, regional and global levels).

Global options for action

Mobilize financial resources to provide training on biodiversity-related conventions in prestigious educational institutions.

2. Lack of coordinated capacity-building and awareness-raising efforts**National options for action**

Conduct coordinated capacity-building for implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.

Strengthen coordination mechanisms by making them inclusive of other stakeholders, including women, young people and indigenous and local people.

Build the capacity of national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions to raise awareness about the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services with their respective high-level policy decision makers.

Hold national preparatory meetings before or for the meetings of the governing bodies of biodiversity-related conventions.

Regional options for action

Identify common areas of capacity-building (needs) through a synergistic approach (national, regional and global levels).

Global options for action

Improve and identify specific capacity-building programmes, projects, opportunities and initiatives (and lists of experts) through a global database to avoid duplication and to maximize utilization.

Promote ways to strengthen coherent system-wide action on capacity-building to facilitate cooperation and collaboration in implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions (UNEP/CBD/BRC/WS/2016/1/1/Add.1/Rev.1, annex III 7.3).

3. Insufficient human and financial resources**National options for action**

Increase staff and leverage appropriate financial support for effective implementation of biodiversity-related conventions through advocacy and by demonstrating benefits (will require promotion of high-level support).

Global options for action

Build the capacity of national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions through the Global Environment Facility.

Advocate with international financial institutions to channel additional financial resources for strengthening synergy and efficient implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.

Advocate the value and need for investment in adequate human resources for synergistic and effective implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.

4. Lack of sustainability of capacity-building**National options for action**

Train trainers for the biodiversity-related conventions including scientists and policymakers.

Create, update and/or improve databases and platforms for information-sharing to ensure institutional memory and consolidation of human resources available for implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.

Develop a curriculum for the biodiversity-related conventions and advocate its inclusion in relevant university faculties and departments to support and ensure sustainability in capacity-building and synergistic implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.

Conduct targeted community capacity-building for effective assimilation and coordinated implementation of biodiversity-related conventions at site and national level.

VIII. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION AND UTILIZATION

Issues/areas addressed, including challenges, barriers and/or opportunities identified

1. Sources of funding: Joint GEF funding, innovative financial mechanisms and other instruments for resource mobilization
2. Information-sharing needs
3. Cross-cutting synergies

Contextual Note:

The CBD is the only biodiversity-related convention for which the Global Environment Facility (GEF) serves as the financial mechanism. Within the biodiversity focal area of the sixth replenishment of GEF, however, actions that support the objectives of other biodiversity-related conventions are eligible for GEF funding, as long as their proposals support their national biodiversity strategy and action plan and Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

Short- and medium-term options

1. Sources of funding: Joint GEF funding, innovative financial mechanisms and other instruments for resource mobilization

National options for action

Improve and ensure collaboration between the national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions and the operational focal points of GEF, with the goal of making proposals for biodiversity-related projects.

Encourage the national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions to coordinate their funding efforts for synergies among the conventions by engaging with the donor countries' representatives in their countries.

Conduct needs assessments for joint actions for implementation of biodiversity-related conventions within the framework of national biodiversity strategy and action plans.

Develop a joint resource mobilization strategy, taking into account the strategic plans of individual biodiversity-related conventions. This strategy could include mainstreaming of biodiversity into different sectors.

Regional options for action

Explore regional opportunities for fund-raising (e.g. regional development banks) to foster synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions.

Assess the need for joint actions for implementation of biodiversity-related conventions in the framework of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

Global options for action

Provide “How-to” guidelines for the national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions to work with national GEF operational focal points to access funding.

Prepare guidance for the biodiversity-related conventions for seizing emerging opportunities, consistent with option 6.2 of the UNEP paper on options, in a coordinated approach to securing funding from GEF and the Green Climate Fund, and make the guidance available to parties of the conventions.

2. Information-sharing needs**National options for action**

Encourage parties to exchange experiences (positive, negative and prospective) with the private sector on resource mobilization.

Encourage parties to exchange experiences with the use of economic instruments, such as subsidies, incentives and taxes.

Encourage the GEF operational focal points to share information with the national focal points of the biodiversity-related conventions on accessing funds through the GEF biodiversity focal area.

Engage with the national focal points of other biodiversity-related conventions to prepare for discussions on further enhancing synergies at the upcoming Conference of the Parties of CBD and the seventh GEF replenishment.

Seek sufficient GEF funding for joint implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans

Fully consult with the national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions in discussions on GEF biodiversity funding allocation.

Regional options for action

Encourage parties at regional and subregional levels to share best practices and lessons learned from successful access to the GEF biodiversity focal area.

Global options for action

Encourage GEF and others to promote public–private partnerships for cooperative efforts to implement the biodiversity-related conventions.

Invite GEF to conduct webinars, regional workshops and other activities for the national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions on accessing funds in the GEF biodiversity focal area.

Recommend that the seventh GEF replenishment recognizes the importance of further enhancing synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions and with the convention on climate change.

3. Cross-cutting synergies**Global options for action**

The website of each biodiversity-related convention should have a dedicated “synergies” page that provides information on synergies, such as the Sourcebook, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, common issues for biodiversity-related conventions and sources of funding for biodiversity.

Long-term options

1. Sources of funding: Joint GEF funding, innovative financial mechanisms and other instruments for resource mobilization

Global options for action

Consider a new financial mechanism that covers biodiversity-related conventions.

Box 2: Cross-cutting issues among the thematic areas

Cross-cutting issues among the thematic areas

Issues that featured in the options for action identified in discussions held under multiple thematic areas, at the national, regional and global levels, included the following.

At the national level, they included identification of: **NBSAPs** as a framework for establishing synergies; **national coordination mechanisms** being important to strengthen synergies in a number of areas; the **SDGs** as an important framework to which the biodiversity-related conventions relate; **needs assessments** as a necessary first step in determining actions to enhance synergies; the importance of involving **stakeholders, indigenous peoples and local communities** in order to strengthen synergies in a number of areas; the importance of coordinated or **joint communications**; and the interrelationship of the planning frameworks, building capacity and **resource mobilization**.

At the regional level, they included: **sharing experience** and best practice; utilizing and building upon existing **regional organizations and initiatives**; and **needs assessment**.

At the global level, they included: the role of the **Biodiversity Liaison Group** and common action by the convention secretariats; decision-making by the **governing bodies**; consideration of synergies in **CBD COP guidance to the GEF**; and coordinated or **joint communications**, including web-based communication on synergies.

These areas of commonality and their occurrence across thematic areas are further elaborated below. It should be borne in mind that these are not necessarily exclusive of others, and that further analysis of the outcomes of the workshop may identify additional commonalities.

Notation (Roman numerals) is used as follows:

I. The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and national biodiversity strategies and action plans

II. Institutional arrangements and coordination mechanisms

III. Information and knowledge management

IV. National reporting, monitoring and indicators

V. Communication and awareness-raising

VI. Science–policy interface

VII. Capacity-building

VIII. Resource mobilization and utilization

NATIONAL LEVEL

Seven prominent cross-cutting issues were identified among options for action at national level, as follow.

National biodiversity strategies and action plans

National biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) were addressed under a dedicated thematic area but were also reflected in the outcomes of discussion on several other thematic areas as follow: Areas I, VI and VIII.

National coordination mechanisms

National coordination mechanisms were addressed under a dedicated thematic area but were also reflected in the outcomes of discussion on several other thematic areas as follow: Areas I, II, IV, V, VI, VII²⁰ and VIII. Note that although national coordination mechanisms were not explicitly included among the options for action identified under area III, information and knowledge management, they may also be beneficial to enhancing synergies in this area.

SDGs (and other broader planning frameworks)

The importance of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as a framework to which the biodiversity-related conventions relate was identified in the outcome of the discussion on several thematic areas as follow: Areas I, III and IV.

Needs assessment / gap analysis

The importance of needs-assessment and/or gap analysis was reflected in the outcomes of discussion on several thematic areas as follow: Areas I, II, III, VI, VII and VIII.

Involvement of stakeholders and indigenous peoples and local communities

The importance of the involvement of stakeholders and indigenous peoples and local communities was reflected in the outcome of the discussion on several thematic areas as follow: Areas I, III and VII.

Joint and coordinated communications

Communications and awareness-raising were addressed under a dedicated thematic area but were also reflected in the outcomes of discussion on several thematic areas as follow: Areas III, IV and V.

Resource mobilization

Resource mobilization and utilization were addressed as a dedicated thematic area. In addition, the importance of coordination among conventions and consideration of tools for accessing funding were included in discussion related to the Strategic Plan, Aichi Targets and NBSAPS (Area I); and strengthening and sustaining financial, human and institutional capacity was addressed in discussion on capacity-building (Area VII). The issue was therefore reflected in the outcomes of thematic areas as follow: Areas I, VII and VIII.

Table 1. Issues that cut across areas, national level:

	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.	VIII.
NBSAPs	•					•		•
Coordination mechanisms	•	•		•	•	•	•	•
SDGs	•		•	•				
Needs assessment	•	•	•			•	•	•
Stakeholder engagement	•		•				•	
Communications			•	•	•			
Resource mobilization	•						•	•

²⁰ Reflected in language such as, “strengthen coordination mechanisms...” and in recommendations for coordination, for example coordinated capacity-building and joint workshops.

REGIONAL LEVEL

The following cross-cutting issues were identified among options for action at the regional level.

Sharing experience and best practice

The importance of the sharing of experience and best practice among countries at a regional level was reflected in the outcome of the discussion on several thematic areas as follow: Areas I, III and VIII. This included sharing experience and best practices related to mobilization and utilization of financial resources.

Utilizing existing regional organizations and initiatives

The important role of regional organizations and utilizing and building upon existing regional initiatives and mechanisms was reflected in the outcome of the discussion on several thematic areas as follow: Areas II, III, V and VII.

Needs assessment

The importance of needs-assessment was reflected in the outcomes of discussion on two thematic areas as follow: Areas VI and VII.

Table 2. Issues that cut across areas, regional level:

	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.	VIII.
Sharing experience	•		•					•
Regional organizations		•	•		•		•	
Needs assessment						•	•	

GLOBAL LEVEL

Actions at the global level under each of the thematic areas would involve action by existing relevant international organizations and global institutions, including the convention secretariats. Four prominent cross-cutting issues were identified among options for action at global level, as follows.

Biodiversity Liaison Group and common action by convention secretariats

The importance of action by the Biodiversity Liaison Group (BLG) and/or coordinated action by the convention secretariats was reflected in the outcome of the discussion on several thematic areas as follow: Areas I, II, III, VI, V and VIII. Note also that while actions for the Biodiversity Liaison Group and the convention secretariats were not explicitly identified under area VI, Science–policy interface and area VII, Capacity-building, clearly these are areas towards which the Group and the secretariats can and do contribute.

Joint and coordinated communications

Communications and awareness-raising were addressed under a dedicated thematic area but were reflected in the outcomes of discussion on three thematic areas as follow: Areas IV, V and VIII. This included communication on synergies on the convention websites.

Decision-making by the governing bodies

The importance of common requests and decisions by the governing bodies of each of the biodiversity-related conventions was reflected in the outcome of the discussion on two thematic areas as follow: Areas I and II. Although not explicitly identified in the discussion on other thematic areas, the governing bodies of each of the biodiversity-related conventions would have an important role in providing guidance on synergies under each of the thematic areas. An example has been the response by several of the governing bodies to decision XII/6 (cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions) and XII/29 (guidance to the financial mechanism) of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

CBD COP guidance to the GEF replenishment

The importance of (1) providing informed guidance in discussions and priority-setting for the next replenishment of the Global Environment Facility to ensure that the issue of synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions receives attention as a theme that is important for biodiversity, and (2) that recommendation is made that the seventh GEF replenishment recognizes the importance of further enhancing synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions and with the convention on climate change, were identified, respectively, in the following thematic areas: Areas I and VIII.

Table 3. Issues that cut across areas, global level:

	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.	VIII.
BLG	•	•	•	•	•			•
Communications				•	•			•
Decision-making	•	•						
CBD guidance to GEF	•							•

48. The Secretariat informed the group that the report would be submitted as an information document to the first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation of the CBD; the results of the workshop would also be used in preparing a working document for that meeting. The governing bodies of other conventions could make use of the report in their respective organizations. It was proposed that the lists of options be discussed during a side event at the meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

IV. CLOSING

A. Evaluation of the workshop

49. Participants were given the opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the workshop in achieving its aims and various components. A commonly held opinion was that the agenda of the workshop covered relevant issue areas but in too little time. Some participants noted that the discussions could have been more focused, for example on opportunities to enhance synergies among some of the conventions and not only on issues relevant to all seven conventions. A number of participants noted that the mechanism used to convene representation from among the seven biodiversity-related conventions and five regions was valuable and that the workshop methodology provided good opportunities for all representatives to learn and exchange about other conventions and to contribute to the workshop's outcomes.

Item 7. Other matters

50. There were no other matters.

Item 8. Adoption of the report

51. A draft report was presented to the workshop, which did not contain the finalized narrative texts or the templates of options in each thematic area, which were being discussed until just before closure. The participants agreed that the report of the meeting would be reviewed by the co-chairs and the CBD Secretariat and distributed to all participants for their review prior to completion.

Item 9. Closure of the meeting

52. After the usual exchange of courtesies, the workshop was closed at 5.25 p.m. on 11 February 2016.

Annex

OUTCOMES OF THE DISCUSSIONS UNDER EACH OF THE THEMATIC AREAS FOR ENHANCED SYNERGIES AMONG THE BIODIVERSITY-RELATED CONVENTIONS AT NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND GLOBAL LEVELS

Templates of the eight breakout groups

Workshop on synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions, 8-11 February 2016 Outcomes of the discussions on:					
I. The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and national biodiversity strategies and action plans					
Short-term options (0 – 2 years)					
What are the issues to focus on?	National options for action	Regional options for action	Global options for action	Party action required What concrete actions in a defined time space are required by the Party (or by Parties)?	What supportive actions do the Parties need and by whom?
1. National biodiversity strategies and action plans as a possible entry point for synergies	<p>Reflect all the commitments of biodiversity-related conventions that are linked to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 in national biodiversity strategies and action plans in line with the commitments agreed to under relevant conventions.</p> <p>Conduct mapping and gap analysis of relevant implementation actions, including those related to contributions under the 2030 Agenda for</p>	Share best practices and experience from the national biodiversity strategies and action plan process and from other relevant regional strategies with regard to ongoing and planned actions on synergies between the biodiversity-related conventions.	Seek guidance from international organizations/ institutions to be used at national level by national focal points and practitioners, on synergies for implementing national biodiversity strategies and action plans for the CBD and similar strategies and action plans for other conventions and multilateral environmental agreements.		

	<p>Sustainable Development that include the Sustainable Development Goals.</p> <p>Identify potential needs from the gap analysis.</p> <p>Assess whether the actions on synergies in national implementation plans are in line with the priorities, commitments and opportunities.</p> <p>According to national need, review existing action plans for implementation to include implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions.</p>				
2. Involvement of key stakeholders, and of indigenous peoples and local communities	<p>Ensure appropriate participation of relevant stakeholders and of indigenous peoples and local communities in finalization of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and relevant national programmes, explicitly for better articulation and planning to achieve synergies.</p>	<p>Involve key stakeholders and indigenous peoples and local communities</p>	<p>Involve key stakeholders and of indigenous peoples and local communities</p>		

3. National coordination for implementing biodiversity-related conventions	<p>In revising or updating national biodiversity strategies and action plans and related strategies and action plans, make use of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and prepare target-driven work plans for all biodiversity-related conventions.</p> <p>In view of the relevance and need for furthering cooperation and coordination among the biodiversity-related conventions, explore options for establishing and/or strengthening a national coordination mechanism to potentially oversee national priority-setting, including funding options, for action on synergies.</p>				
4. National focal points	<p>Strengthen awareness-raising and information-sharing for the national focal points of the various biodiversity-related conventions, with the participation of relevant stakeholders and scientists and of indigenous peoples and local communities, to support related actions.</p>		<p>The Conference of the Parties of the CBD may consider calling on the biodiversity-related conventions specifically to coordinate relevant actions to translate the options for enhancing synergies into actions. A similar call could be made with respect to the financing mechanism.</p>		
5. Awareness of national focal points of	<p>Make use of mechanisms or national steering</p>		<p>The relevant governing bodies of the</p>		

other relevant biodiversity-related conventions	committees to strengthen cooperation among the national focal points of the biodiversity-related conventions.		<p>biodiversity-related conventions could call for enhancement of joint efforts on synergies at various levels, ensure that future cooperation is based on a common understanding of issues and options and undertake joint efforts to maximize the effectiveness of mandates and agendas delivered at various levels.</p> <p>Prepare guidance for national focal points, as appropriate, on incorporating all relevant biodiversity commitments into a system-wide approach.</p>		
6. Biodiversity-related conventions	Make use of indicators in other relevant conventions in implementing the Biodiversity Targets, and, as appropriate, prepare relevant national indicators for other biodiversity-related conventions to track effective implementation and monitoring of actions and to feed into national actions related to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals.	Ensure that the discussions and options for enhancing effective implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions extend to all relevant regional agreements and conventions, as prioritized by those agreements and conventions, in order to enhance cooperation and implementation.			

Medium-term options (2 – 5 years)					
7. Tools for accessing funding	Link national biodiversity strategies and action plans to the national clearing-house mechanism or other information-sharing hubs.	Make use of regional achievements and promote success stories of implementation of biodiversity-related conventions for obtaining funds from all relevant funding sources and mechanisms.	Provide informed guidance in discussions and priority-setting for the next replenishment of the Global Environment Facility to ensure that the issue of synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions receives attention as a theme that is important for biodiversity.		
	National focal points of the biodiversity-related conventions should exchange information on priorities so that there is a common understanding.	Streamline funding to maximize implementation.			
	Consider conducting pilot projects for promoting synergies on thematic areas, such as plant and animal health to support food security, food safety and environmental protection, including designing innovative projects for funding by the Global Environment Facility to contribute to synergistic action.	Identify specific thematic areas for promoting synergies at regional level.	Identify thematic areas for promoting synergies, and share success stories of the implementation of biodiversity-related conventions, to inform, as appropriate, the various governing bodies and the Global Environment Facility.		

Workshop on synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions, 8-11 February 2016 Outcomes of the discussions on:					
II. Institutional arrangements and coordination mechanism					
Short-term options (0 – 2 years)					
What are the issues to focus on?	National options for action	Regional options for action	Global options for action	Party action required What concrete actions in a defined time space are required by the Party (or by Parties)?	What supportive actions do the Parties need and by whom?
1. Lack of coordination at national level	<p>Establish formal coordination mechanism for efficient coordination among national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions and relevant host organizations</p> <p>Improve mutual understanding of the specific objectives of each convention.</p> <p>Enhance political will and administrative responsibilities, and raise awareness of policymakers about improving cooperation and synergy.</p> <p>Take into account mutual supportiveness of biodiversity-related conventions in developing national</p>	Take advantage of relevant existing institutions to work on specific common issues under biodiversity-related conventions at national, regional and international levels.	<p>Invite relevant international organizations, such as FAO, IUCN, UNEP and UNESCO, to look for coordinated actions to create and implement synergies among biodiversity-related conventions (and national biodiversity strategies and action plans and other strategic plans).</p> <p>Invite the biodiversity-related conventions to integrate priorities and synergies into their programmes of work, within their respective mandates.</p> <p>Invite all biodiversity-related conventions to prepare a sample guide based on best practices, showing synergy among the conventions, and share it with the national focal</p>	Establish a national committee comprising the national focal points of all seven biodiversity-related conventions and national representatives or focal points of host organizations as well as other necessary representatives.	

	<p>policies.</p> <p>Assess national needs for coordination and synergy. Develop a strategic plan for coordinated, synergistic implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.</p> <p>Enhance technical knowledge on synergy and coordination.</p>		<p>points of the conventions.</p>		
<p>2. Lack of coordination at international level</p>			<p>Encourage mutually supportive decisions and possibly common decisions by the governing bodies of biodiversity-related conventions for achieving coherence at all levels, including further development and strengthening of joint work programmes and memoranda of understanding.</p> <p>Invite the secretariats of all the biodiversity-related conventions to attend meetings of the governing bodies of the other biodiversity-related conventions to facilitate synergies among them, using such opportunities for meetings between members of the</p>		

			<p>Biodiversity Liaison Group or their designees.</p> <p>Taking note of the valuable role of the Biodiversity Liaison Group in fostering synergies, invite the biodiversity-related conventions to consider recognizing the Biodiversity Liaison Group through their respective governing bodies and elaborating terms of reference.</p> <p>Request members of the Biodiversity Liaison Group to designate members of their staff to participate in informal groups on synergies in communication, resource mobilization, capacity-building, Internet technology and other areas, as appropriate.</p>		
3. Fragmented responsibilities and efforts among biodiversity-related conventions	Assess the capacity-building needs and institutional arrangements for coordinated and synergistic efforts or approaches for effective implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.				

Workshop on synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions, 8-11 February 2016 Outcomes of the discussions on:					
III. Information and knowledge management					
Challenges, barriers and opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scattered information, limited access and little willingness to share • Focal points of the different conventions are not part of the discussion on information management at country level • Data bases design, metadata • Relation with indicators – gaps • Define core knowledge • Build national task forces • Identify what the parties need to provide the necessary information • Identify what is needed for national implementation • Create a directory of experts 					
Short-term options (0 – 2 years)					
What are the issues to focus on?	National options for action	Regional options for action	Global options for action	Party action required What concrete actions in a defined time space are required by the Party (or by Parties)?	What supportive actions do the Parties need and by whom?
1. Improve access to information necessary for implementation, as data and information are scattered.	<p>Review existing tools and approaches for information and knowledge management to assess their efficacy, and develop new tools and approaches, if required.</p> <p>Develop thematic national databases (or strengthen existing databases) that are open, interoperable and have adequate safeguards in the context of data/information management.</p> <p>Provide information to build</p>	<p>Strengthen the role of regional entities and institutions, including use of virtual tools.</p>			<p>Identify the information needed for each convention, as Switzerland has done in a recent study that will be made available shortly.</p> <p>Provide guidance on national databases, data access and use, and share experience in sharing national database development and use; the guidance provided by the</p>

	<p>capacity for planning and implementation. Promote networking for information and knowledge management using web-based tools.</p> <p>Invite national focal points to establish linkages with the agency designated for reporting on achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (national statistical agency in many countries) to harmonize information on the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and Indicators.</p>				Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) could be used for ready reference.
2. Access to knowledge necessary for implementation – linkage of networks	<p>Attempt linkage of the databases of member countries of biodiversity-related conventions to the national statistical database. Conduct joint information and awareness campaigns, including in the context of the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity (2011–2020).</p> <p>Conduct broad stakeholder consultations or workshops at subregional level on information and knowledge management, including traditional knowledge in local communities.</p>		Invite biodiversity-related convention secretariats to form links with relevant global knowledge products (e.g. the IUCN Red List).	Identify two countries per region for pilot studies on database planning and management, and monitor outcomes after 2 years.	<p>UNEP, UNEP-WCMC, UNDP and others may provide advice, tools and technology to parties for database development, and promote the sharing of experience among parties.</p> <p>Parties to various biodiversity-related conventions could promote use of UNEP “Live”, InforMEA and other similar web-based tools.</p>

<p>Workshop on synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions, 8-11 February 2016</p> <p>Outcomes of the discussions on:</p> <p>IV. National reporting, monitoring and indicators</p>					
<p>Challenges, barriers and opportunities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Common reporting 2. Institutions for reporting 3. Monitoring 4. Indicators: cross-cutting synergies: 5. Awareness-raising and communication 6. Exchanging information and lessons learned among conventions 					
<p>Short-term and medium-term options</p>					
What are the issues to focus on?	National options for action	Regional options for action	Global options for action	Party action required What concrete actions in a defined time space are required by the Party (or by Parties)?	What supportive actions do the Parties need and by whom?
<p>1. Common reporting</p>	<p>Encourage parties of biodiversity-related conventions to exchange information on tools, mechanisms and best practices for data collection and reporting.</p> <p>Parties should undertake an inventory of their datasets to better understand the availability of information and approaches.</p>	<p>Provide training on database systems.</p> <p>Build capacity to international standards.</p>	<p>Build on the work of the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre and others to determine common and different reporting elements for each biodiversity-related convention.</p> <p>Ensure that the secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions provide information in a form that is accessible to InforMEA.</p>		

<p>1.1 Data:</p> <p><i>Challenge:</i> Biodiversity-related conventions have common and different data requirements and sources; no two are the same.</p> <p><i>Opportunity:</i> Deal with overlapping data requirements of biodiversity-related conventions.</p>	<p>Identify which set of data is needed and the commonalities of the data in all or some of the biodiversity-related conventions.</p>				
<p>1.2 Quality of data:</p> <p><i>Challenges:</i> 1) Interoperability requires a common language between systems. 2) Interpretation relies on the accuracy of data and its meaning (which may differ between conventions)</p>					
<p>1.3 Reporting burden:</p> <p><i>Challenges:</i> 1) Reporting must be tailored to different institutions and instruments. 2) Completing reports on time and in full requires a heavy workload.</p>	<p>Update clearing-house mechanisms to streamline reporting among different biodiversity-related conventions.</p>		<p>Provide guidance to assist national efforts; build on work of InforMEA and the mapping exercises identified in the Sourcebook. The Biodiversity Liaison Group should help in managing that</p>		

<p><i>Opportunity:</i> The burden could be reduced by accessing relevant data from other sources.</p>			<p>process.</p> <p>Develop a possible framework for reporting information covering all seven biodiversity-related conventions through a bottom-up approach, the framework being based on the common reporting information collected by the biodiversity-related conventions according to their mandates.</p> <p>Exchange information on reporting experiences and lessons learned from different biodiversity-related conventions to improve the reporting system.</p>		
<p>2. Institutions for reporting</p>	<p>Establish or strengthen a multi-biodiversity-related convention national coordination process to, <i>inter alia</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Harmonize data collection and reporting. ○ Link focal points and institutions to meet reporting requirements. ○ Supervise quality control, 		<p>Make an inventory of areas of overlap between biodiversity-related conventions</p> <p>Prepare guidance on reporting to assist in effective national reporting.</p>		

	<p>consistency of reporting and respect for reporting deadlines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ensure proper standards for databases. <p>Ensure that reporting under each biodiversity-related convention benefits from the input of other biodiversity-related conventions.</p>		<p>Make use of case studies, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the European Union mapping exercise on the data required to meet obligations and ○ the Brazilian information management system, described in the Source book 		
<p>3. Monitoring</p> <p><i>Opportunities:</i> The different biodiversity-related conventions must learn lessons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ by tracking the effectiveness and utility of what is reported and ○ determining reporting needs. 	<p>Plan monitoring as a requirement for effective reporting.</p>		<p>Monitor the process of reporting to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ improve implementation, ○ identify emerging issues, and provide early warnings that require action. 		
<p>4. Indicators</p> <p><i>Challenge:</i> The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals process will be preparing indicators and driving the</p>	<p>Member countries of each biodiversity-related convention should ensure that they influence the discussions on indicators for the Sustainable Development Goals and the discussion regarding biodiversity-related indicators under each of the conventions.</p>		<p>Biodiversity-related convention secretariats should ensure that they contribute to the discussions on indicators for the Sustainable Development Goals and to the discussion of biodiversity-</p>		

<p>agenda. There will be implications for biodiversity-related conventions, e.g. they may be required to reformat their reporting structures.</p> <p><i>Opportunity:</i> Biodiversity-related conventions could influence development of indicators (however, indicators are being discussed currently, and there is limited time to engage).</p>			<p>related indicators under each of the other conventions.</p>		
<p>5. Awareness-raising and communication</p> <p>Challenges:</p> <p>Need to create reports that are useful documents for public communication and stakeholder consultation.</p> <p>Some biodiversity-related conventions have “narrative” reporting requirements, while others require quantified data.</p> <p>National reports are</p>	<p>Encourage member countries to use information from all the biodiversity-related conventions and not work in silos.</p> <p>Ensure that summaries of the national report are also available in their national language(s).</p>				

required in one of the six United Nations languages: this creates translation issues for people whose language is not one of the six official languages.					
6. Cross-cutting synergies: Awareness-raising and communication Exchanging information and lessons learned among conventions	Collaborate on world events (international days, years, decade) with member countries of other biodiversity-related conventions.		The secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions should share information widely on world events (days, years, decade), championed by other biodiversity-related conventions.		
	At meetings of the governing bodies and other relevant bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions, focal points from different conventions should practise synergies through informal discussions.		The host country should make arrangements for such informal meetings among representatives of biodiversity-related conventions.		

<p>Workshop on synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions, 8-11 February 2016</p> <p>Outcomes of the discussions on:</p> <p>V. Communication and awareness-raising</p>					
Short-term options (0 – 2 years)					
Challenges/ Barriers/ Opportunities	National options for action	Regional options for action	Global options for action	Party action required What concrete actions in a defined time space are required by the Party (or by Parties)?	What supportive actions do the Parties need and by whom?
<p>Inadequate or inefficient communications and awareness among the biodiversity-related conventions</p>	<p>Prepare a national biodiversity-related communication and awareness strategy, mindful of synergies and mutual benefit, that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Ensure target audience-specific communication. •Develop target-specific communication channels. •Use various approaches (e.g. emotional, economic, cultural, well-being) to establish better understanding of the connection between biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and human well-being. •Provide scientific advisory information to policymakers. •Use modern and traditional tools creatively (e.g. social media, folk media, search engines, cell phones, radio, sports events) <p>The national focal points, or equivalent authorities, of biodiversity-related conventions should collaborate with other sectors, as appropriate (e.g. climate</p>	<p>Involve regional networks and organizations relevant to the biodiversity-related conventions in communications and awareness activities.</p> <p>Collaborate on international observances to increase awareness.</p>	<p>Biodiversity-related conventions should collaborate with other sectors, as appropriate.</p> <p>Collaborate on and contribute to international observances to increase awareness.</p> <p>Collaborate in providing scientific advisory information to policymakers.</p> <p>Establish events, such as a pavilion for biodiversity-related conventions at international conventions and congresses.</p> <p>Introduce an interactive option for countries to share successes and/or problems.</p> <p>Create a single world</p>	<p>The national biodiversity coordination committee should develop a strategy for communication and awareness.</p>	<p>Secretariats of biodiversity-related conventions and partners should provide member countries with communication material.</p> <p>Develop guidance material for effective communication with various audiences.</p> <p>Collaborate on international observances (e.g. the International Year of Plant Health in 2020).</p> <p>Biodiversity-related conventions should provide strong support to the development of Internet screening tools to inform users about potential wildlife crimes and</p>

	<p>change, inter-ministerial dialogue).</p> <p>Entities responsible for the various biodiversity-related conventions should collaborate on international observances to increase awareness.</p> <p>Develop Internet screening tools to inform users about potential wildlife crimes and illegal trade and its role in endangering species' populations.</p> <p>Integrate and coordinate message(s) for biodiversity-related conventions.</p> <p>Send interactive message-linking information from biodiversity-related conventions, incorporating a feedback option (e.g. sharing success stories).</p> <p>Create a single entry point to channel users to the information sought and other related or relevant information.</p> <p>Link biodiversity conventions to others, such as on climate change.</p> <p>Engage the private sector in developing "low-cost" but "high-impact" awareness-raising programmes.</p>		<p>wide web entry point to channel users to the information sought and other related or relevant information.</p> <p>Use modern tools such as "google-doodle" and others to improve communication.</p> <p>Link biodiversity conventions to others, such as on climate change.</p>		<p>illegal trade and its role in endangering species' populations.</p> <p>Relevant organizations should provide member countries of the biodiversity-related conventions with joint tools for successful approaches.</p> <p>Biodiversity-related conventions should provide guidance material.</p>
--	---	--	---	--	--

<p>Workshop on synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions, 8-11 February 2016</p> <p>Outcomes of the discussions on:</p> <p>VI. Science-policy interface</p>					
Short-term options (0 – 2 years)					
What are the issues to focus on?	National options for action	Regional options for action	Global options for action	Party action required What concrete actions in a defined time space are required by the Party (or by Parties)?	What supportive actions do the Parties need and by whom?
Science in decision- making	<p>Ensure collaboration and involvement of the scientists engaged in the processes of the biodiversity-related conventions in the science–policy interface, e.g. through IPBES.</p> <p>Establish and make use of a roster of experts across all biodiversity-related conventions.</p> <p>Link biodiversity-related conventions to the Biodiversity Targets through NBSAPs.</p> <p>Strengthen cooperation among relevant institutions for decision-making.</p> <p>Ensure that all biodiversity-related conventions contribute jointly to the</p>	<p>Ensure that all biodiversity-related contribute jointly to the development of scenarios and models, catalysed by IPBES.</p> <p>Ensure collaboration and involvement of the scientists and rosters of experts of the biodiversity-related conventions.</p>	<p>Contribute jointly to the development of scenarios and models, catalysed by IPBES.</p>		

	development of scenarios and models, catalysed by IPBES.				
Scientific bodies	<p>Establish a science–policy platform or coordination mechanism at national level, involving all relevant institutions, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure use of the best available knowledge, • interact with IPBES in a timely, coherent manner and • o strengthen implementation. 		<p>Encourage the governing bodies and/or subsidiary bodies of biodiversity-related conventions to interact with IPBES in a timely, coherent manner.</p> <p>Review the functions and products of the different biodiversity-related conventions in order to improve implementation.</p> <p>Ensure that the chairs of the scientific advisory bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions continue to facilitate dialogue between the conventions and the provision of input to e.g. IPBES</p>		
Knowledge gap	<p>Assess the needs of the seven biodiversity-related conventions to provide input to the IPBES work plan from 2019 onwards.</p> <p>Identify science-policy centres in different countries that may address knowledge gaps and needs.</p>	Assess the needs of the seven biodiversity-related conventions to provide input to the IPBES work plan from 2019 onwards.			

Medium-term options (2 – 5 years)					
	National options for action	Regional options for action	Global options for action	Party action required What concrete actions in a defined time space are required by the Party (or by Parties)?	What supportive actions do the Parties need and by whom?
Science-policy functions	<p>Establish institutional arrangements relating to scientists and policymakers, for improving implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.</p> <p>Improve incentives for scientists to take part in the knowledge-based decision-making process.</p>		Establish memoranda of understanding (MoU) between the different biodiversity-related conventions and IPBES.		
Communication	<p>Make use of deliveries and assessments, and communicate findings.</p> <p>Use information-sharing mechanisms (Internet, clearing-house mechanism, social media)</p>	<p>Make use of IPBES deliverables and regional assessments, and communicate findings.</p> <p>Use information-sharing mechanisms (Internet, clearing-house mechanism, social media)</p>	<p>Make use of IPBES deliverables and assessments, and communicate findings.</p> <p>Use information-sharing mechanisms (Internet, clearing-house mechanism, social media)</p>		

Workshop on synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions, 8-11 February 2016 Outcomes of the discussions on:					
VII. Capacity-building					
Short-term options (0 – 2 years)					
Challenges/ Barriers/ Opportunities	National options for action	Regional options for action	Global options for action	Party action required What concrete actions in a defined time space are required by the Party (or by Parties)?	What supportive actions do the Parties need and by whom?
1. Insufficient knowledge and skills	<p>Train national focal points on other biodiversity-related conventions so that synergies and succession and pool of resources are maintained.</p> <p>Build capacity and understanding of national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions on the role of indigenous and local knowledge for coordinated integration in the implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.</p> <p>Prioritize skills and capacities of human resources, including</p>	Take advantage of existing networking opportunities for capacity-building to help synergistic implementation of biodiversity-related conventions (national, regional and global levels).	Mobilize financial resources to provide training on biodiversity-related conventions in prestigious educational institutions.		

	<p>national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions, and assign or delegate roles and responsibilities appropriately.</p> <p>Clarify the roles and responsibilities of national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions.</p> <p>Conduct joint workshops on common areas of responsibility, such as reporting and resource mobilization.</p> <p>Conduct a needs assessment for targeted capacity-building.</p>				
2. Lack of coordinated capacity-building and awareness-raising efforts	<p>Conduct coordinated capacity-building for implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.</p> <p>Strengthen coordination mechanisms by making them inclusive of other stakeholders, including women, young people and indigenous and local people.</p> <p>Build the capacity of national focal points of biodiversity-related</p>	<p>Identify common areas of capacity-building (needs) through a synergistic approach (national, regional and global levels).</p>	<p>Improve and identify specific capacity-building programmes, projects, opportunities and initiatives (and lists of experts) through a global database to avoid duplication and to maximize utilization.</p> <p>Promote ways to strengthen coherent system-wide action on capacity-building to facilitate cooperation and collaboration in implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions (UNEP/CBD/BRC/WS/2016/1/1/Add.1/Rev.1, annex III 7.3).</p>		

	<p>conventions to raise awareness about the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services with their respective high-level policy decision makers.</p> <p>Hold national preparatory meetings before or for the meetings of the governing bodies of biodiversity-related conventions.</p>				
3. Insufficient human and financial resources	<p>Increase staff and leverage appropriate financial support for effective implementation of biodiversity-related conventions through advocacy and by demonstrating benefits (will require promotion of high-level support).</p>		<p>Build the capacity of national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions through the Global Environment Facility.</p> <p>Advocate with international financial institutions to channel additional financial resources for strengthening synergy and efficient implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.</p> <p>Advocate the value and need for investment in adequate human resources for synergistic and effective implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.</p>		
4. Lack of sustainability of capacity-building	<p>Train trainers for the biodiversity-related conventions including scientists and policymakers.</p> <p>Create, update and/or improve databases and</p>				

	<p>platforms for information-sharing to ensure institutional memory and consolidation of human resources available for implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.</p> <p>Develop a curriculum for the biodiversity-related conventions and advocate its inclusion in relevant university faculties and departments to support and ensure sustainability in capacity-building and synergistic implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.</p> <p>Conduct targeted community capacity-building for effective assimilation and coordinated implementation of biodiversity-related conventions at site and national level.</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--

Workshop on synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions, 8-11 February 2016
Outcomes of the discussions on:

VIII. Resource mobilization and utilization

Context: The CBD is the only biodiversity-related convention for which the Global Environment Facility (GEF) serves as the financial mechanism. Within the biodiversity focal area of the sixth replenishment of GEF, however, actions that support the objectives of other biodiversity-related conventions are eligible for GEF funding, as long as their proposals support their national biodiversity strategy and action plan and Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

Short- and medium-term options

What are the issues to focus on?	National options for action	Regional options for action	Global options for action	Party action required What concrete actions in a defined time space are required by the Party (or by Parties)?	What supportive actions do the Parties need and by whom?
1. Sources of funding: Joint GEF funding, innovative financial mechanisms and other instruments for resource mobilization	<p>Improve and ensure collaboration between the national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions and the operational focal points of GEF, with the goal of making proposals for biodiversity-related projects.</p> <p>Encourage the national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions to coordinate their funding efforts for synergies among the conventions by engaging with the donor countries' representatives in their countries.</p> <p>Conduct needs assessments</p>	<p>Explore regional opportunities for fund-raising (e.g. regional development banks) to foster synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions.</p> <p>Assess the need for joint actions for implementation of biodiversity-related conventions in the framework of national biodiversity strategies and action plans..</p>	<p>Provide "How-to" guidelines for the national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions to work with national GEF operational focal points to access funding.</p> <p>Prepare guidance for the biodiversity-related conventions for seizing emerging opportunities, consistent with option 6.2 of the UNEP paper on options, in a coordinated approach to securing funding from GEF and the Green Climate Fund, and make the guidance available to parties of the conventions.</p>		

	<p>for joint actions for implementation of biodiversity-related conventions within the framework of national biodiversity strategy and action plans.</p> <p>Develop a joint resource mobilization strategy, taking into account the strategic plans of individual biodiversity-related conventions. This strategy could include mainstreaming of biodiversity into different sectors.</p>				
2. Information-sharing needs	<p>Encourage parties to exchange experiences (positive, negative and prospective) with the private sector on resource mobilization.</p> <p>Encourage parties to exchange experiences with the use of economic instruments, such as subsidies, incentives and taxes.</p> <p>Encourage the GEF operational focal points to share information with the national focal points of the biodiversity-related conventions on accessing funds through the GEF</p>	<p>Encourage parties at regional and subregional levels to share best practices and lessons learned from successful access to the GEF biodiversity focal area.</p>	<p>Encourage GEF and others to promote public–private partnerships for cooperative efforts to implement the biodiversity-related conventions.</p> <p>Invite GEF to conduct webinars, regional workshops and other activities for the national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions on accessing funds in the GEF biodiversity focal area.</p> <p>Recommend that the seventh GEF replenishment recognizes the importance of further enhancing synergies among the</p>	<p>Consider a new financial mechanism that covers biodiversity-related conventions.</p>	

	<p>biodiversity focal area.</p> <p>Engage with the national focal points of other biodiversity-related conventions to prepare for discussions on further enhancing synergies at the upcoming Conference of the Parties of CBD and the seventh GEF replenishment.</p> <p>Seek sufficient GEF funding for joint implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans</p> <p>Fully consult with the national focal points of biodiversity-related conventions in discussions on GEF biodiversity funding allocation.</p>		<p>biodiversity-related conventions and with the convention on climate change.</p>		
3. Cross-cutting synergies			<p>The website of each biodiversity-related convention should have a dedicated “synergies” page that provides information on synergies, such as the Sourcebook, the Biodiversity Targets, common issues for biodiversity-related conventions and sources of funding for biodiversity.</p>		