



## CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/1/7/Add.3  
27 July 2005

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

### AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

First meeting

Montreal, 5-9 September 2005

Item 5 of the provisional agenda\*

### COOPERATION WITH OTHER CONVENTIONS, ORGANIZATIONS AND INITIATIVES, AND ENGAGEMENT OF STAKEHOLDERS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

#### *Addendum*

### OPTIONS FOR A GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR BIODIVERSITY

#### INTRODUCTION

1. The present addendum to the note by the Executive Secretary on cooperation with other conventions, organizations and initiatives, and engagement of stakeholders in the implementation of the Convention discusses in greater detail options for a Global Partnership for Biodiversity, as a means to enhance cooperation among the Convention and other organizations, initiatives, processes and stakeholders. The document presents the rationale and existing models for a global partnership, and considers issues and options relating to the partnership's scope, structure and membership. Proposed terms of reference and working modalities are presented in the annex to the main note by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/1/7).

#### **A. Rationale**

2. Achieving the 2010 target, and monitoring progress towards it, will require improved coordination, synergy and partnership among various actors and programmes. Better coordination and partnerships are also needed in order to ensure effective mainstreaming of biodiversity and the 2010 target into relevant international programmes, projects, processes and initiatives. In addition, fulfilment of the leadership role mandated by the Strategic Plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity (Goal 1) for halting biodiversity loss will require greater cooperation among relevant international instruments and processes, and also the active support of such instruments and processes to the objectives of the Convention and the 2010 target.

---

\* UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/1/1.

/...

3. In view of the above imperatives, the Conference of the Parties of the Convention of Biological Diversity, in decision VII/26, requested the Executive Secretary, in close collaboration with relevant conventions, organizations and bodies, to examine options for a flexible framework between all relevant actors, such as a global partnership on biodiversity, in order to enhance implementation through improved cooperation. The recommendation for a global partnership on biodiversity was first put forward by the Open-ended Inter-Sessional Meeting on the Multi-Year Programme of Work of the Conference of the Parties up to 2010 in March 2003.

4. The work of the partnership should seek to complement rather than displace existing activities and initiatives, providing a common focus around the 2010 target and—as these are developed—around longer-term goals for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Accordingly, the global partnership for biodiversity should build on current cooperative arrangements between the Convention and its partners, and those already existing between organizations and networks that would be invited to join the partnership. While advancing the work of the Convention, the partnership will also support the objectives of its members, and serve as a means to *inter alia* exchange information and experience, make better use of limited resources, and raise the profile of biodiversity issues.

#### **B. Existing models and building blocks**

5. The mandate, structure and membership of a global partnership for biodiversity can draw on a range of available models or possible building blocks, with several examples discussed here.

6. The Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) was established in 2001 following the recommendations of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. The CPF has as its two primary objectives: (i) to support the work of the United Nations Forum on Forests and its member countries; and (ii) to enhance cooperation and coordination on forest issues. The CPF supports the implementation of the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests/Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IPF/IFF) proposals for action. The partnership comprises 14 member organizations that have a significant role in forest management—without necessarily having forests as their central interest—including United Nations bodies, convention secretariats, and international governmental and non-governmental organizations. The CPF supports the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action through: providing information and technical assistance to countries; facilitating regional and international initiatives; identifying and mobilizing financial resources; and strengthening political support for sustainable forest management. Formal membership in the CPF is limited, but complemented by a broader, more informal “CPF network” of forest stakeholders.

7. Type II partnerships are an important outcome of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), and are meant to complement the primary outcome of government commitments to sustainable development. Partnerships should contribute to the implementation of inter-governmental commitments in Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, and should be new (e.g., not merely reflect existing initiatives). Partnerships are voluntary multi-stakeholder initiatives that range in formality and composition. The inclusion of different types of actors is encouraged (e.g., inter-governmental, national and non-governmental organizations, the private sector). The Mountain Partnership—an alliance dedicated to improving the lives of mountain people and protecting mountain environments around the world—is an example of a Type II Partnership, launched at the WSSD and presently consisting of 45 countries, 14 intergovernmental organizations and 56 major groups and NGOs.

8. The Convention on Biological Diversity has a wide range of existing cooperation arrangements with other conventions and organizations on which a global partnership could be built:

(a) Joint work programmes established with bilateral partners, including the Ramsar Convention, the Convention on Migratory Species and the Convention to Combat Desertification. Joint work programmes are usually endorsed by the respective Conferences of the Parties;

(b) Liaison groups of the biodiversity-related conventions and of the Rio conventions provide a formal arrangement comprising the executive secretaries of these respective bodies;

(c) A number of voluntary initiatives have been developed to support the implementation of the Convention, or more broadly its objectives of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. These were referred to above in paragraph 25, and include:

- (i) The Collaborative Partnership on Protected Areas;
- (ii) The Global Partnership for Plant Conservation;
- (iii) The Global Invasive Species Programme;
- (iv) The International Initiative for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Pollinators;
- (v) The River Basin Initiative;
- (vi) Countdown 2010.

9. These initiatives are largely self-organized, and do not have a policy-making role, existing only to promote implementation of agreed programmes of work, strategies and targets related to the Convention.

**C. Issues for consideration**

10. A number of questions arise regarding the possible mandate and structural nature of a global partnership for biodiversity:

(a) Should the partnership aim to promote implementation of agreed goals—achievement of the 2010 target (e.g. Strategic objective 1.3 of the Convention on Biological Diversity)—or should it also have a role in promoting policy coherence among conventions, organizations and initiatives (Strategic objective 1.2)?

(b) How large should the partnership be? (see table 1) Is the contemplated partnership to be limited to biodiversity-related conventions or could it involve other relevant multilateral environmental agreements and international organizations? Is it to be limited to inter-governmental organizations or will it also engage other stakeholders including non-governmental organizations and business (Strategic objective 4.4 of the Convention on Biological Diversity)?

**Table 1. Examples of potential partners in a limited and broad global partnership for biodiversity, organized by type of member body**

Type of Body	Type of Partnership	
	Limited membership	Broad participation
<b>Conventions</b>	<b>Biodiversity-related Conventions (CMS, CITES, Ramsar, WHC)</b>	<b>All relevant conventions and processes (e.g., UNFCCC, UNCCD, UNFF, IPPC, Regional Seas Convention, Bern Convention)</b>
<b>Intergovernmental Organizations</b>	<b>UNEP, FAO</b>	<b>World Bank, UNDP, IFAD, etc.</b>
<b>Civil Society organizations</b>	<b>Conservation NGOs (e.g., IUCN, WWF, ....)</b>	<b>Indigenous organizations, development NGOs, academics</b>
<b>Private sector</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Financial sector, extractive industries, supply chain industries</b>

(c) Would the partnership be a formal organization or would it have a flexible, informal structure? The structure would be directly related to the initiative’s scope, size and membership

composition. A partnership focused on promoting policy coherence for instance, would by necessity have to be restricted to bodies with policy-setting capacity, and follow a formal structure. On the other hand, actions to enhance implementation of biodiversity policy, if undertaken by a broad-based partnership, might require a more flexible model.

11. These three inter-related issues were discussed by the Biodiversity Liaison Group at its third meeting in May 2005 (see report UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/1/INF/7). The participants considered that the Liaison Group itself is a suitable mechanism for promoting policy coherence among the five biodiversity related conventions, but that a wider partnership could serve to facilitate implementation and progress towards biodiversity goals. The Liaison Group discussed developing a global partnership consisting of an inner core-group of international, biodiversity-related conventions and organizations, supported by one or more issue-based networks.

12. In the views on the issue of cooperation submitted by Parties for consideration by the Working Group on Review of Implementation, some envisioned the global partnership as an extension of the Biodiversity Liaison Group, and suggested that the partnership would be a flexible framework charged with ensuring effective coordination of all biodiversity-related institutions. One Party noted that while the partnership may not solve the problems of national implementation, it would contribute to streamlining biodiversity-related commitments, particularly with regard to programmes of work and national reporting. Some Parties proposed first strengthening the Biodiversity Liaison Group and then expanding it to include additional biodiversity-related organizations.

13. Other Parties viewed the global partnership as an all-inclusive multi-stakeholder partnership. One Party, in supporting this idea, noted that in order to engage business and other relevant stakeholders in the partnership, the Convention on Biological Diversity would have to make greater efforts to demonstrate its relevancy, as well as its ability to deliver on its commitments.

#### *D. Options for a global partnership*

14. The issues of the global partnership's mandate, structure and membership—informed by the views of Parties and of the Biodiversity Liaison Group presented above—are examined further in this section, and proposals for a Global Partnership for Biodiversity are made.

15. To achieve, and monitor progress towards, the 2010 target, cooperation will need to occur at both the international policy-setting level and at the level of national implementation, in line with objectives 1.2 and 1.3 of the Convention's Strategic Plan. A single global partnership for biodiversity could seek to promote both policy coherence and implementation, or separate mechanisms could be developed to address each subsidiary goal. There may be advantages to developing a global partnership focused on the achievement of the 2010 target through the implementation of agreed policies (e.g., in the framework of the Convention on Biological Diversity, focusing on objective 1.3). The 2010 target is widely agreed, having been endorsed by the World Summit on Sustainable Development, and thus has a broad appeal. Focusing on implementation activities, especially at the national level, would contribute more directly to achieving observable outcomes of conservation and sustainable use, and would reflect the move away from policy setting and towards implementation already underway within many of the biodiversity-related conventions.

16. Furthermore, a partnership focused primarily on implementation could attract a wider range of organizations and networks than if addressing only policy issues, helping to mainstream biodiversity considerations into more fora and sectors (with eventual indirect effects on policy development). Potential specific drawbacks to a partnership with a policy role are that the partnership may be more controversial, require negotiations within and among a number of governing bodies and take longer to establish. It is therefore proposed that the Partnership will have no policy-setting role, although it will facilitate policy coherence through implementation of agreed objectives and targets, and information sharing. It would complement existing mechanisms that have already proven successful at the international level, including Liaison Groups among convention bodies.

17. Drawing on existing models of partnerships, such as the Collaborative Partnership on Forests, the Global Partnership for Biodiversity could usefully be structured as a core group within a larger body of organizations and networks (see UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/1/7, annex). Membership in the core group would be limited to a small number of partners, chosen for their shared focus on biodiversity conservation and sustainable development issues, and to representatives of associated issue-based networks. The wider partnership would be open to a much broader range of organizations and members of existing networks, potentially including civil society and private sector organizations.

18. In addition to international conventions, United Nations agencies and programmes, and international non-governmental organizations, the core-group of the proposed partnership would include international science and research organizations, and international organizations representing indigenous and local communities. Participation of science and research organizations will facilitate the focused provision of scientific knowledge to support the implementation activities of the partnership. Similarly, participation of indigenous and local communities will offer a means to integrate traditional knowledge and practices into implementation activities and ensure that these activities respect indigenous rights, while also providing an additional mechanism for increasing the participation of this stakeholder group in the Convention.

19. The Partnership would thus combine the advantages of a formal organization (the core group) with those of a loose alliance of existing organizations and networks working towards a common objective. While the core group would have a common understanding of the challenges to be addressed, be familiar with existing processes and initiatives to meet these, and have a similar commitment to achieving the objectives of the Partnership, the broader partnership would facilitate the involvement of a range of partners with varying levels of experience (and perhaps commitment) to biodiversity objectives. Broad participation would allow for the mainstreaming of biodiversity concerns into economic sectors (e.g., trade, finance and industry, agriculture, fisheries, mining) that have a major impact on biodiversity but may not yet be fully engaged in supporting the work of the Convention. In addition, this “two-tier” approach would help reduce the time needed to establish a partnership, as the core group of members could move forward on work as new partners continue to be recruited and/or register themselves.

20. Given the large potential for increased cooperation within the Global Partnership for Biodiversity, and the finite resources of the Convention, it may be useful to consider how organizations can be encouraged to engage with the Convention in a largely self-motivated, self-organized manner. Although admittance to the Partnership would take place only upon invitation by the core group (and following recommendation by the Executive Secretary), <sup>1/</sup> a mechanism that would allow organizations and networks to self-identify themselves as candidates would reduce the partnership’s workload, in addition to limiting the likelihood of overlooking potential partners. This would be particularly useful in the longer term, as the Partnership is expanded to include organizations and networks at the regional and national levels, and from a broader range of sectors. Suggestions from within the Partnership regarding potential new partners would also be considered.

-----

---

<sup>1/</sup> See the annex to the note by the Executive Secretary on cooperation with other conventions (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/1/7).