*"Outcomes of the first multi-stakeholder expert meeting on elaboration of options for synergies among biodiversity-related Multilateral Environmental Agreements"*

*Interlaken, Switzerland, 26-28 August 2014*

**Background**

Over the past decades a number of biodiversity-related MEAs have been adopted, which can be difficult, at times, for States to implement in a coherent manner at national and international levels. As a result, there have been calls by MEA governing bodies as well as the UNEP Governing Council to explore possible synergies between such MEAs, with the specific aim of making their implementation more coherent, efficient and effective. This call was also reiterated by the Rio + 20 Conference in its outcome document “The Future We Want”... *“We recognize the significant contributions to sustainable development made by the multilateral environmental agreements. We acknowledge the work already undertaken to enhance synergies among the three Conventions in the chemicals and waste cluster [the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions]. We encourage parties to multilateral environmental agreements to consider further measures, in these and other clusters, as appropriate, to promote policy coherence at all relevant levels, improve efficiency, reduce unnecessary overlap and duplication, and enhance coordination and cooperation among MEAs, including the three Rio conventions, as well as with the United Nations system in the field”.*

Prior to Rio+20, the Governing Council of UNEP, in paragraphs 2 to 3 of Decision SS.XII/3 on International Environmental Governance (February 2012), instructed the UNEP Secretariat to undertake *“activities to improve the effectiveness of and cooperation among multilateral environmental agreements, taking into account the autonomous decision-making authority of the conferences of the parties”* and *“explore the opportunities for further synergies in the administrative functions of the multilateral environmental agreement secretariats administered by the United Nations Environment Programme and to provide advice on such opportunities to the governing bodies of those multilateral environmental agreements”.*

**Outcomes of the expert meeting and way forward on the UNEP synergies project**

The options for enhanced collaboration and coordination at the global level across the biodiversity-related conventions presented in this paper emerged from an expert meeting in Interlaken (26-28 August 2014). The meeting was carried out in an open brainstorming mode, under the Chatham House Rule. The objective of the expert meeting was to review current experience and views relating to existing and possible future synergies among biodiversity-related conventions; and to identify and explore further some of the most appropriate options for building additional synergies. This meeting was attended by representatives of States-Parties from several geographic regions, the secretariats of biodiversity-related conventions, international and regional organisations, and retired convention or UNEP secretariat officials and other individuals identified by UNEP for their expertise in MEAs, MEA synergies and aspects of MEA implementation.

The meeting and its outcomes represent an initial stage in the UNEP project "*Improving the effectiveness of and cooperation among biodiversity-related conventions and exploring opportunities for further synergies”* that aims to address the mandate from the UNEP Governing Council, and to help inform decisions on related issues by the Conferences of the Parties (COPs) of the biodiversity-related conventions. This project explores options for further synergies at all levels of the six major biodiversity-related conventions[[1]](#footnote-1), with a view to achieving improvements in efficiency and effectiveness through enhanced collaboration[[2]](#footnote-2)and cooperation[[3]](#footnote-3). It thus looks into the potential for synergies in the widest sense and includes consideration of all activities that aim at enhanced cooperation and collaboration with respect to the strengthening implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions.

More co-ordinated implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions will also be achieved through better mainstreaming of biodiversity objectives into other policies and sectors (such as e.g. development, trade, finance and agriculture). Similar mainstreaming is also underway in the post 2015 Sustainable Development Framework and the SDGs, as well as in national planning processes such as the UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs). Such policy integration is vital to the implementation of MEAs and requires the involvement of actors other than MEA focal points in ensuring synergies. This would also allow countries to optimize processes, with potentially significant savings of resources.

**Peer review and next steps**

In addition, the outcomes of the meeting will be circulated for review and comment to National Focal Points and authorities of biodiversity-related conventions and the Convention Secretariats. In parallel UNEP will undertake a "stocktaking exercise" of existing instruments for coordination and collaboration between the biodiversity-related conventions; and identification of best practice. Information from the global level questionnaire sent by UNEP to National Focal Points and authorities and the Convention Secretariats in April 2014 will also be used as appropriate in the development of the draft options paper. The work on a draft options paper will culminate in a second expert meeting, to be held in the first half of 2015. Consequently, the final options paper and other results of the project will inform the second session of the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA-2).

Ultimately, the output of the UNEP project is envisaged as a set of recommendations for the UNEP Executive Director to present to UNEA-2 in 2016. Meanwhile the material produced for the expert meetings, and especially the options paper in its various development stages, can also be used by Parties to the relevant Conventions to inform discussions at meetings of the Conferences of Parties (COPs) or other governing bodies - recognising that progress on enhancing coordination and synergies across biodiversity-related conventions will require **a Convention Party-driven process** consistent with mutually supportive decisions across the COPs.

**INITIAL OPTIONS FOR FURTHER ENHANCING COLLABORATION AND COOPERATION**

While presenting the initial options below, it is recognised that there are many Party and Secretariat-led efforts already underway to enhance coordination and synergy across the biodiversity-related conventions, but that these could be strengthened and built upon in some areas. During the course of developing the options paper, the aim is also to capture the ideas from work in various other fora.

It is also recognised that these initial options are not all 'new ideas' - proposals for enhancing synergies across biodiversity conventions have been developed through other means and processes, but many have not come to fruition for a multiple of reasons. Therefore, it will be important to ensure that in future these challenges and barriers can be addressed as options are further developed and taken forward in the relevant fora. It should also be recognised that, though the options have been clustered under six themes, there are many interlinkages between options. Of particular note are the various CoP decisions and increasing efforts to align around the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets; and to acknowledge, promote and develop National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) as a framework for coherent implementation of all biodiversity-related Conventions relevant to a particular State. The NBSAP is the national implementation mechanism for the CBD. Unlike CBD (Article 6), other biodiversity related conventions have not previously provided for such a national mechanism for implementation. The NBSAP therefore is a huge opportunity for coordination and cooperation among these MEAs. A driving force for this is now the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, and the Aichi Targets that provide a common framework across all the biodiversity-related conventions..

Accordingly, **advancing the development of comprehensive and coherent NBSAPs, that take into account and promote synergies across the biodiversity-related conventions, is a pre-requisite for enhancing coordination and synergy as well as for effective implementation; and is central to many of the options proposed in this paper**. The initial options are outlined below:

**1. NBSAPs and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and Aichi Targets**

All the biodiversity-related conventions have taken steps to align their strategies with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets, and this represents a significant advancement in achieving synergies at a programmatic level and it has already provided impetus for collaborative action at global and national level. The process for revising and updating NBSAPs has led to COP decisions across conventions, with CITES and CMS COPs, and the WHC Committee (for example) encouraging their Parties’ national focal points and authorities to engage with the NBSAPs development, revision and implementing process. This impetus needs to be built upon to achieve concrete outcomes. **Revised and updated NBSAPs should be designed to become a framework for national-level implementation of all the biodiversity-related conventions as appropriate [noting there is no common membership by all States in all conventions],** including for the design of a shared set of national level targets and indicators. They would, as such be a powerful tool for mainstreaming across sectors (and into the post-2015 SDGs and UNDAFs), a tool to facilitate and encourage harmonization of reporting and an incentive to develop a more coherent approach to resource mobilisation at global, regional and national levels.

**i) Develop streamlined guidelines and tools for facilitating development, revision and implementation of NBSAPs**, **and for NBSAP related activities** (e.g. development of national indicators; resource mobilisation)**.** The work should be carried out in collaboration with the Parties, Convention Secretariats, UNEP, FAO, UNESCO, UNDP and other relevant UN- and non UN bodies (such as ITTO). Some conventions, such as CITES and CMS have already developed convention-specific guidelines for their National Focal Points to engage in the revision and updating of NBSAPs. Although some convention-specific guidance might be necessary, there remains scope for more coherent approaches and activities and to further facilitate coherent policy implementation at all levels.

**ii) Further develop the NBSAP forum** to meet the relevant needs of Parties and to provide tools and guidance to Parties for the coherent implementation of biodiversity-related conventions.

**iii) Support Parties in accessing GEF funding for development, revision and implementation of NBSAPs, through synergies and cooperation among the biodiversity conventions.** The Convention Secretariats and UNEP regional focal points for biodiversity-related conventions and UNDP should provide information and encourage Parties to take advantage of GEF funding for development and implementation of NBSAPs that serve as frameworks for the synergistic implementation of all biodiversity conventions.

**iv) Enable voluntary 'peer review' of NBSAPs** (as proposed by the CBD Ad-hoc Open Ended Working Group for Review of Implementation of the Convention [WGRI] at its fifth meeting[[4]](#footnote-4)),with a view to further supporting NBSAPs as a framework for the coherent implementation of all biodiversity-related conventions, and to review how well synergies are being taken into account.

**v) Develop complementary regional strategies and action plans** to address transboundary issues with support of the UNEP Regional focal points for biodiversity-related conventions and with contribution from UNDP and other resource networks.

**vi) UNEP, MEA Secretariats and others should seek to further elaborate on the role of each Convention in contributing to the achievement of the Aichi Targets** and synergistic actions that might be taken in that respect, building on existing work by the EMG and others, as a basis for coordinated and coherent action at global, regional and national levels.

**2. Reporting, monitoring and indicators**

The monitoring of and reporting on implementation activities are key obligations for Parties to the biodiversity-related conventions, but may currently place a significant burden on Parties. Whilst it is recognised that each Convention has its own reporting framework, and mandatory reporting requirements, and that some of these will remain distinct, there is still further scope for streamlining the reporting process, accompanied by complementary capacity development efforts, to decrease the burden on Parties and to increase the utility of reports (noting the work already underway through UNEP-WCMC). This has been a long-recognised issue, and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Targets, along with the development of indicators to monitor progress, at global and national levels, provide a new opportunity for streamlining national reporting. Ultimately it is the Parties who adopt their reporting frameworks through COP or other governing body decisions for each convention. Thus, action is needed to ensure that decisions are mutually supportive and implemented in a coordinated manner.

**i) Develop a shared modular reporting approach** across the biodiversity conventions on the implementation and achievement of the Biodiversity Strategic Plan and the Aichi Targets. This would include the alignment of convention reporting with the global Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. This effort would be linked to preparing integrated guidelines for the development and implementation of NBSAPs, as the NBSAPs should reflect all of the biodiversity-related conventions to which States are party.

**ii) Consider timelines for reporting** given the different cycles of the conventions. Attempts need to be made to harmonise the reporting cycle, to enable effective contribution to future assessments e.g. the Global Biodiversity Outlook, IPBES etc. This needs urgent attention to be useful for reporting on achievement of the current Biodiversity Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets.

**iii) Enhance coherence through indicator development and monitoring**. A coherent set of national and global level indicators, taking into account needs related to all the biodiversity-related conventions, would be a powerful tool for mainstreaming into wider sectors, including the development of SDG indicators. Revising, updating and complementing indicators for Aichi Targets should be done through the Biodiversity Indicator Partnership (BIP) and linked to the SDGs indicators process.

**iv) Further develop online reporting and information management systems** to support easier and more coherent reporting to the conventions

**v) Continue support to reporting processes and compliance mechanisms through joint capacity-building activities**, building on the existing good practices and experience from conventions e.g. from the WHC on ways to support reporting through experience exchange, capacity building and feedback mechanisms. These activities should be developed by the Convention Secretariats (e.g. through the BLG), regional bodies including UNEP regional offices and other relevant UN-bodies such as FAO, UNESCO and UNDP. Organizing regional workshops should be encouraged. The approach provides a way to enhance synergies between the various conventions and thus facilitates GEF-funding.

**vi) Report on enhanced synergies.** Parties to conventions should provide information through their national reports on how they have enhanced synergies and facilitated coherent implementation of the MEAs to which they are Party (e.g. as done under CITES biennial reports); and such reporting should become or remain a regular agenda item for the governing bodies of biodiversity related conventions. This would also enable lessons learnt and experiences to be shared on an ongoing basis. Guidance to Parties on how to proceed in this regard is needed. Convention Secretariats should also report on their activities in this regard for example through continued intersessional reports of the BLG[[5]](#footnote-5). Others, for example, civil society organizations, should also be encouraged to report on their contribution or perspectives.

**3. IPBES and strengthening the Science-Policy Interface**

The newly established and quickly developing Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) will play a key role for biodiversity-related conventions. The conventions should continue to build upon the current momentum and position themselves in the emerging new architecture on the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services, through actions by individual Parties, decisions of convention governing bodies, efforts of the Chairs of the Scientific Advisory Bodies (CSAB), and activities of the convention secretariats. Many opportunities related to IPBES have already been explored (e.g. through convention governing body or scientific advisory body discussions and decisions as well as participation in meetings of the IPBES Bureau, Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Plenary).

**i) Conventions should initiate an open dialogue with IPBES on timely communication of key scientific findings coherently across the COPs and scientific advisory bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions,** in order to support their coherent implementation and to build on work to date by the BLG and CSAB.

**ii) The CSAB** **and BLG should be strengthened in order for the biodiversity-related conventions to ensure that their scientific bodies and secretariats interact with IPBES in a coherent and timely manner.** This would include identifying emerging issues to be addressed by IPBES, making joint requests to IPBES through the governing bodies of conventions and making direct requests to IPBES, rather than only through COPs (also taking into account regional aspects) [though this is not envisaged by the IPBES structure it might be possible if authorized by the relevant governing body]. CSAB should receive a clearer mandate from participating conventions and meet on a regular basis. Coordination through CSAB and the BLG should help ensure that scientific body chairs as well as Convention Secretariats participate regularly as observers to IPBES (including through identifying a 'lead’ scientific chair or Secretariat where resources are limited).

**4. Information management and awareness raising**

Taking into account ongoing work under the MEA IKM Initiative and the BLG, more coordination on information management and awareness raising could contribute to more effective efforts to raise awareness across all sectors of society, of the values and importance of biodiversity and support mainstreaming efforts. At present, the information on international conventions and activities on biodiversity is still rather fragmented and there is an insufficiently coherent approach to outreach, which is being further addressed through InforMEA. The Aichi Biodiversity Target Task Force has now been revitalized, however, and there is increased emphasis on using the UN Decade for Biodiversity to expand and better link outreach efforts.

**i) Develop shared approaches to use more effectively global information management tools relevant to the biodiversity related conventions such as InforMEA, UNEP-live and the various types of Clearing House Mechanisms, including in the development of indicator frameworks.** A coherent capacity building approach should be developed for the use of the global information management tools to enable coherent implementation of the conventions, taking into account IT infrastructure needs of the Parties.

**ii) Deliver joint information and awareness campaigns**, in particular in the context of the UN Decade of Biodiversity. This would require co-operation across Secretariats and with other partners (including States, UN bodies, regional bodies, the private sector, civil society and the Media) and tailoring joint awareness raising activities for different target audiences. There could also be co-ordinated/joint activity on 'days of...' (E.g. international biodiversity day, wetlands day, world wildlife day and other environmental days) and 'years of', noting that some are official UN days and others are not. This would also include more coordination on requests for information from, and announcements to, national focal points and authorities.

**iii) Strengthen the collaboration between communications officers** across the biodiversity-related convention Secretariats. This should continue to be facilitated by the BLG on an ongoing basis in support of the above efforts.

**5. Capacity building**

The ‘*Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome’ from the 2010 meeting of the* second Consultative Group of Ministers or High-Level Representatives on International Environmental Governance recommended a **UN system-wide capacity building framework** for the environment, taking into account the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building. UNDP is the lead entity in the UN for capacity building and it hosts the resident coordinator at country level and leads in the coordination of the UNDAF.

A more coordinated and coherent approach to capacity building among the biodiversity conventions in selected areas could help to reduce duplication, increase effectiveness of capacity building efforts and build capacity for coherent implementation of the conventions at the national level. In this context, synergies should be built in an inclusive way by involving all resources networks and actors including: other UN Bodies especially the UNDP and UNODC; the World Bank and other Development Cooperation agencies; and other organisations such as ITTO, INTERPOL, WCO, IUCN and regional and subregional institutions, local governments/communities, academia and private sector as well as civil society organisations. This should link to the capacity building efforts of IPBES and its current work to review capacity building needs. Opportunities for advancing synergies through the NBSAP Forum should also be considered.

At the same time, it is of utmost importance that adequate funding for UNEP Regional MEA focal points in the regions is ensured, since they provide essential support for supporting the implementation of the conventions at the regional level, working closely with Parties and the relevant Secretariats.

**i) Strengthen the support provided by UNEP regional focal points for biodiversity-related conventions and secure funding for this,** on the basis of a coherent strategy (to be developed) that allows them to support the NBSAPs process, the coherent implementation of MEAs, and their work with UN country teams to contribute to UNDAFs.

**ii) Identify immediate opportunities for collaboration.** Enhanced collaboration could be achieved through Convention Secretariats when they are considering capacity development requests from Parties. It is important also to consider whether the activity could be designed to benefit implementation of more than one convention, or the coherent implementation of MEAs, in order to benefit from GEF funding.

**iii) Create a centralised service to receive and review capacity development requests** from the Parties, determine which could be carried out jointly and propose options to address them based on the available programme resources under all of the conventions.

**iv) Involve UNEP, FAO, UNESCO, UNODC and UNDP and others in the development of a joint initiative to bring together capacity building related to the biodiversity-related Conventions** and to help identify joint activities. This should be done in close collaboration with MEA Secretariats. Further development of the UNDAF and the Bali Strategic Plan may provide a useful input to such work, recognizing that environment is only one strand of sustainable development.

**6. Funding and resource efficiency**

Collaboration across biodiversity-related conventions towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and the Aichi Targets can support more coherent efforts and increase options for resource mobilisation. In addition there needs to be increased incentives for submission and funding of projects specifically aiming to increase cooperation and enhance synergy among the biodiversity conventions.

Because of the recent GEF6-replenishment, Biodiversity is the largest focal area (1.2 billion USD) of the GEF. The Biodiversity portfolio of the GEF is built on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and the Aichi Targets, according to the guidance of the CBD COP. As stipulated in the GEF6 Project document “*Due to the inclusive and comprehensive nature of the GEF biodiversity strategy, ample opportunity exists for the inclusion of pertinent GEF-eligible activities, as prioritized in the country’s revised National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs), to exploit this synergy amongst the conventions and advance shared objectives.”*

Adequate, timely, predictable, and efficient use of GEF resources is key to promotion and enhancement of synergies in respect of the six biodiversity-related conventions.

**i) Collaborate on new initiatives for obtaining additional financial resources**, e.g. the UNDP adaptation programme. The MEA Secretariats could work together to review new opportunities and make joint approaches to relevant institutions as well as to review how the Parties could benefit from these new programmes and access funds to support integrated approaches for implementing the various biodiversity-related conventions.

**ii) Co-ordinate on GEF funding.**The Convention Secretariats and UNEP regional offices and UNDP should provide information and encourage countries to take advantage of the opportunity of **GEF funding for development and implementation of NBSAPs** that are frameworks for implementation of all of the biodiversity conventions, and for integrated approaches to implementing the various biodiversity conventions. This also enables and enhances co-operation among the Rio Conventions (the CBD, UNFCCC and UN CCD).

Following a meeting between the BLG and GEF Secretariat, as well as decisions taken by relevant CBD bodies efforts are underway to enhance synergies on financing through **supportive decisions from the conventions’ COPs**, including (for example) potentially coordinated guidance to the GEF. This joint effort of the BLG and GEF should continue. The Secretariats and the implementing agencies could further support this, for example by facilitating the liaison among the national focal points and authorities of different conventions to work on joint proposals that would cover biodiversity related issues extended to conventions that are not independently able to access GEF funding; and working to build the capacity of the GEF to support more projects advancing the coherent implementation of the MEAs at national level.

**iii) Encourage donors, particularly those concerned with development assistance policies, to contribute to the creation of enhanced opportunities for, and to incentivize, co-ordination and synergies** across biodiversity-related MEAs, in collaboration with Convention and NBSAPs national focal points.

**iv) Coordinate and share information on the development of/work on innovative finance mechanisms**

Several conventions have been discussing guidance on 'new' and 'innovative' finance mechanisms for biodiversity, such as environmental fiscal reform; payment for ecosystem services (PES); biodiversity offsets and markets for green products. More coordination of future efforts could eliminate duplication and help to identify and implement new mechanisms that support the coherent implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions; and their mainstreaming into wider sectors.

**7. Institutional Collaboration**

Institutional cooperation is essential to support enhanced implementation of MEAs at national, regional and global levels. Many institutional entities, instruments and bodies already exist, some of which need further development and strengthening. With regard to the biodiversity-related conventions, the global instruments include the Biodiversity Liaison Group, consisting of the secretariats of the CBD, CITES, CMS, ITPGRFA, Ramsar, World Heritage and International Plant Protection conventions, the EMG, as well as UNEP regional focal points for biodiversity-related conventions. Additionally, numerous partnerships with UN bodies and other actors play a key role when strengthening institutional collaboration for promoting synergies, such as International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime on coordinated support on combating illegal wildlife trade. For effective implementation, the involvement of UN country teams through UNDAFs is crucial. In the future, enhanced collaboration should be considered with additional relevant Conventions, UNESCO, FAO, non-UN bodies like ITTO and IUCN and with the Regional or subregional bodies such as ACTO, ASEAN, CCAD, SADC and SPC, Regional Ministerial Environment Forums and Development banks; which with their regional presence, outreach and convening powers, are well suited to promote MEA implementation in a coherent manner.

Given that the biodiversity-related conventions are legally separate and autonomous in their decision-making it is essential that Parties collaborate and cooperate at all levels to ensure that the decisions making bodies of the conventions act in a coherent manner and that their decisions are mutually supportive.

**i) Integrate NBSAPs and Aichi Targets into the UNDAFs** through support by the UNEP regional focal points for biodiversity-related MEAs and collaboration with UNDP. This builds on the work initiated by the EMG and the upcoming report to the CBD COP12 on mainstreaming biodiversity into UNDAFs. There should be a strong link between these efforts and efforts to integrate biodiversity into the post 2015 sustainable development framework and the SDGs.

**ii) Strengthen and open the BLG**. The BLG has an important role in reviewing and advancing options for enhancing collaboration and coordination on a practical level and has already achieved success in increasing the programmatic cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions. The BLGs role and impact could be strengthened through efforts to:

* **Invite participation from or collaboration with Parties** in the work of the BLG to strengthen synergies through a country driven process. This could include: consultations with Parties on the work programme for the BLG; continued intersessional communication of its activities to the Parties; an opportunity for Parties to give more (coordinated) mandates and direction to the BLG; and some means of including Parties (e.g. regional representatives, the COP bureaus) in BLG meetings.
* **Scale up efficiencies by replicating the 'lead Secretariat' model**. This would build on existing examples such as the CBD representing coordinated input of all the Secretariats in the UN SDG process, Ramsar for UN-water activities and CITES for trade issues (including liaising with WTO); and could potentially be extended to a range of functions: for example, the identification of "lead Secretariats" for approaches to funding institutions; for development of communication and awareness raising programmes; and for development of on-line reporting etc.

**iii)** Based on its existing mandate, **strengthen the role of UNEP in supporting enhanced collaboration and cooperation across the biodiversity-related conventions.** . UNEP could strengthen its support for synergies across the biodiversity-related conventions in various areas falling under its existing mandate for example by supporting and facilitating cross-cutting activities for implementation of the conventions.

**iv) Encourage mutually supportive decisions across Conferences of the Parties of the biodiversity related conventions** through developing tools for supporting coherence at all levels.

1. The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES); the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS); the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA); the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands; and the World Heritage Convention (WHC). It was announced during the Interlaken meeting that another convention, the International Plant Protection Convention, had recently been added as a member of the Biodiversity Liaison Group which comprises the other conventions mentioned above. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. defined, for this project as "working together to produce a shared discrete output" [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. defined, for this project as " working together towards a common aim or objective" [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. In its 5th meeting WGRI recommended (Recommendation 5/2) that the COP at its 12th meeting *" Decides to enable a voluntary peer review process for the national biodiversity strategies and action plans on a pilot basis by interested Parties making best use of mechanisms such as the NBSAP forum and requested the Executive Secretary to report on progress and challenges to its implementation at its thirteenth meeting". Subsequently COP 12 requested* the Executive Secretary "subject to the availability of resources, to develop a methodology for a voluntary peer-review process and to report to the subsidiary body on implementation, for its consideration" (UNEP/CBD/COP/12/L.31). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See the option vii) under section 7 Institutional Collaboration [↑](#footnote-ref-5)