**Convention on  
Biological Diversity**

---

Distr.: General  
3 May 2024

English only

---

**Subsidiary Body on Implementation****Fourth meeting**

Nairobi, 21–29 May 2024

Item 7 of the provisional agenda\*

**Cooperation with other conventions  
and international organizations****Report of the Bern III Conference on Cooperation among the  
biodiversity-related conventions for the implementation of the  
Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework****Note by the Secretariat**

1. The Secretariat is pleased to provide herewith, for the information of participants at the fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, the report of the Bern III Conference on Cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions for the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, prepared by the United Nations Environment Programme. The report includes a summary of the areas identified for further strengthening cooperation, actions consolidated by the co-chairs based on conference discussions, and considerations for the planning of future activities in the context of the Bern process.
2. The report is circulated in the form in which it was received by the Secretariat.

---

\* CBD/SBI/4/1.

# Report of the Bern III Conference on Cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions for the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

*Bern, Switzerland, 23-25 January 2024*



## Contents

Executive summary .....	<b>4</b>
Goals and objectives of the conference.....	<b>9</b>
Preparation for the conference .....	<b>9</b>
Organization of work .....	<b>10</b>
Opening of the conference.....	<b>10</b>
Setting the scene.....	<b>11</b>
Exploring opportunities for collaborative progress at the global level .....	<b>12</b>
Support for planning and implementation at the national level .....	<b>19</b>
Enhancing practical ways and mechanisms that facilitate cooperation .....	<b>22</b>
Roadmap .....	<b>32</b>
Case studies.....	<b>36</b>
Actions consolidated by the co-chairs based on conference discussions .....	<b>37</b>
Future of the Bern Process .....	<b>39</b>
Closing of the conference .....	<b>40</b>
Annex 1 – Provisional Agenda .....	<b>42</b>

Annex 2 – Summary of participants .....	<b>43</b>
Annex 3 – List of key upcoming meetings .....	<b>44</b>
Annex 4 – Case studies.....	<b>46</b>
Annex 5 – Views of participants on the conference .....	<b>54</b>

## I. Executive summary

The Bern III Conference brought together representatives of parties and secretariats of 16 multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), and a range of other stakeholders, organizations and individual experts. The open exchange on cooperation to implement the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework resulted in a wide range of concrete ideas for increased collaboration among MEAs at global, regional and national levels. During three days of facilitated discussion, a wide range of ideas were discussed in a very positive spirit, addressing each of the following areas.

### ***Areas identified for further strengthening cooperation***

- With support from parties, secretariats of several MEAs have already reflected on how they can contribute to achieving goals and targets of the Framework, and how addressing the goals and targets of the Framework contributes to achieving their own MEA's objectives, and to creating synergies that accelerate progress on biodiversity overall. It is crucial for parties to continue to explicitly encourage and fund this work.
- There is a rich body of knowledge among parties and secretariats about effective, inclusive and collaborative approaches to achieving the targets. The conference provided an excellent opportunity for mutual learning, but significant support and continued momentum is needed to continue this work.
- There is great potential for individual MEAs and especially thematic clusters of MEAs to serve as champions or custodians in partnerships for specific targets, drawing on their own expertise and data sources. Existing partnerships relating to specific SDGs can provide a model for how this might be done and what to avoid.
- Monitoring and reporting on achievement of the targets can benefit significantly from using existing data sources, including those used by other MEAs. There are tools that can support this, such as the Data Reporting Tool for MEAs (DaRT), but cooperation is crucial to ensure parties and secretariats are aware of available data and interpret them in consistent ways.
- Cooperation on development and use of indicators across conventions is needed to increase consistency and improve efficiency. One opportunity identified for working on this further is collaboration on indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the Global Goal on Adaptation.
- At the national level, effective implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework requires inclusive and coordinated approaches that support sustained dialogue across government agencies, with local government, with the private sector, and with rights holders and other stakeholders.
- Such dialogue and active engagement is also essential for the development of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) consistent with other national plans and strategies, including those for climate change mitigation and adaptation, pollution control and sustainable development.
- Sustained and inclusive dialogue across sectors and with rights holders and civil society, from local to global level, is crucial for integrating the targets into development strategies, to promote synergistic (and avoid non-synergistic) actions, address potential conflicts, and ensure the most vulnerable are not left behind. Whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches are essential.
- National leaders have a central role to play in the success of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the achievement of synergies, by championing biodiversity, explicitly linking it to other environmental challenges, development objectives and human well-being.

The nature of the conference was such that while many ideas were discussed, and many follow-up actions identified, there was no one set of conclusions agreed by participants. Having said that, during the concluding session of the conference, the co-chairs invited participants to consider a range of concrete actions, which drew heavily on the discussions that had taken place over the preceding three days.

### ***Actions consolidated by the co-chairs based on conference discussions***

- a) Where a need has been identified, enhance ***cooperation among relevant MEA secretariats*** as a basis for sharing information and experience, planning activities, and communicating relevant decisions of governing bodies. Such cooperation could be formal or informal, depending on circumstances and needs, and as appropriate would extend to briefing and engaging parties to the relevant MEAs.
















- b) Establish a **platform at the national level** which brings together relevant focal points, governmental implementing agencies, rights holders and other stakeholders. This is a key step not only with respect to the effective update, review and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and actions plans, but also for achieving whole of government and whole of society approaches.
- c) Contribute effectively as MEAs to the **global review of collective progress** in implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, which the CBD COP has already decided will be considered at COP-17 in 2026 and COP-19 in 2030. The detailed procedures will need to be addressed at upcoming CBD meetings in 2024, which are discussing process and format of the global review.
- d) Both individually and collectively, MEAs should enhance **outreach on the benefits of cooperation and synergies**, so as to increase understanding and to increasingly share ideas and experiences. This ranges from communication of the outputs of the Bern III Conference, to talking about cooperation and synergies in consistent ways across MEAs, to sharing of case studies.
- e) Where this is not already the case, include a **standing agenda item at all MEA governing body meetings** on the contribution of the respective MEA to implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, and associated outcomes. This relates to both implementation and the global review of collective progress implementation.
- f) **Build on the Bern Process**, and keep the Bern III dynamic, spirit, and network alive through activities such as webinars on key topics. Throughout the conference participants had welcomed the discussions and progress made, and made a range of suggestions about possible future meetings and opportunities which need to be reviewed and built upon.
- g) Propose a decision at CBD COP-16 for an **expert group or committee on synergies among MEAs**. This would ideally be raised at the meeting of the CBD Subsidiary Body on Implementation in May 2024, where there would also be a review progress in addressing [decision 15/13](#) on cooperation. The Bern III Conference also discussed other ways in which the COP-16 could build on the issues discussed, which could also be considered further.
- h) Use **upcoming events as opportunities to enhance collaborative action**, including the United Nations Environment Assembly, the Annual Adaptation Forum under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the COPs of the Rio conventions, which all take place in the last quarter of 2024 and which could be approached with aligned communications and draft decisions.
- i) Draw on the **cross-mapping of MEAs against the targets** in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (see Table 1 below) as a basis for identifying potential opportunities for increased cooperation in supporting implementation, or for identifying “champions” and contributors for particular targets. The cross-mapping may also have potential for informing cooperation at the national level.
- j) Consider how to most effectively establish **“partners” or “friends” of specific targets or activities** in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, building on experience relating to the partnerships for targets 2 and 3, which have already been established, and/or the experience of groups such as the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management.
- k) Actively encourage approaches to **“collect once, use many times”** in MEA-related monitoring and reporting at both global and national levels, through: increased alignment in use of indicators; further exploration of opportunities for harmonizing reporting; enhanced sharing of data and information; and encouraging the use of tools such as the Data Reporting Tool for MEAs (DaRT).
- l) Consider the most effective ways to **review progress on the Bern III roadmap** to 2030 and the other issues discussed during the Bern III Conference, so that the many ideas contributed by conference participants are not lost, but are followed up on in the most appropriate manner.

***Other issues discussed needing further consideration***

- m) The proposal to convene a ***“common COP” or high level intergovernmental meeting on biodiversity in 2030*** to bring the community working on biodiversity together, to raise the profile of biodiversity issues, and to provide opportunity for substantive discussion on programmatic alignment.
- n) Opportunities for ***strengthening support at regional and sub-regional levels***, including through building on existing regional networks and activity centres established to support MEA implementation, and building on the work of existing bodies and partnership arrangements.
- o) The need to ***ensure engagement of all relevant rights holders and other stakeholders*** in activities at all levels that seek to enhance cooperation in the implementation of MEAs and the delivery of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

As indicated in (f) above, feedback on the conference was positive, in particular given the breadth of issues addressed and the diverse nature of the participating MEAs, and participants felt that there was value in continuing the “Bern process”. It is foreseen that the conference will also result in a strengthened network of “friends of the Bern process”, championing the related issues of cooperation and synergies and support for implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework within their respective MEA negotiations.

















**Table 1: Indicative cross-mapping of targets and MEAs**

																
<b>Target 1</b> (spatial planning)		✓✓		✓✓		✓✓✓		✓✓								
<b>Target 2</b> (restoration)						✓✓✓		✓✓								
<b>Target 3</b> (protected areas)		✓✓				✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓								
<b>Target 4</b> (species conservation)	✓✓	✓✓✓		✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓									
<b>Target 5</b> (sustainable use of species)	✓✓✓	✓✓✓		✓✓												
<b>Target 6</b> (invasive alien species)			✓✓✓			✓✓										
<b>Target 7</b> (pollution)											✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	
<b>Target 8</b> (climate change)						✓✓			✓✓✓							
<b>Target 9</b> (species management)	✓✓	✓✓✓		✓✓	✓✓											
<b>Target 10</b> (other key sectors)				✓✓✓		✓✓										
<b>Target 11</b> (nature's contributions to people)						✓✓	✓✓		✓✓✓							
<b>Target 12</b> (urban nature)																
<b>Target 13</b> (access and benefit sharing)				✓✓✓												
<b>Target 14</b> (mainstreaming)		✓✓														
<b>Target 15</b> (business and biodiversity)				✓✓✓												
<b>Target 16</b> (sustainable consumption)											✓✓					
<b>Target 17</b> (biosafety)																
<b>Target 18</b> (incentives and subsidies)																
<b>Target 19</b> (financial resources)				✓✓✓												
<b>Target 20</b> (capacity-building)				✓✓							✓✓	✓✓				
<b>Target 21</b> (data, information, knowledge)				✓✓												
<b>Target 22</b> (IPLCs)								✓✓							✓✓	
<b>Target 23</b> (gender equality)								✓✓							✓✓	

✓✓✓	Potential 'champion' or partner	✓✓	Contributing 'champion' or partner		Also relevant to the MEA
-----	---------------------------------	----	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------

<b>Notes on Table 1</b>
-------------------------

During the Bern III Conference, the participants representing each MEA were asked to consider which of the targets in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework were most relevant to their interests, and to ‘score’ the level of relevance. The aim of this exercise was to identify **potential clusters of interest** as a basis for identifying ‘champions’ or more likely future partnership or collaborative arrangements – while recognising that the need and approach might vary from one target to another. The result of this exercise is presented in the table. The MEAs involved were the following.

	Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)		Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (WHC)
	Logo of the “The Biodiversity Plan” for Life on Earth, the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework		United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)
	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)		United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)
	Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)		Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal
	International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)		Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade
	International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA)		Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants
	International Whaling Commission (IWC)		Minamata Convention on Mercury
	Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention)		Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer



## Introduction

1. The Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework was adopted by the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in December 2022 through [decision 15/4](#). Delivery of the framework and achievement of its goals and targets is not only fundamental to achievement of the objectives of the CBD and its Protocols, but is also directly relevant to the mandates, interests and activities of other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). This is recognized not only in the decisions of the CBD COP, but also in the decisions of the governing bodies of other MEAs across a range of sectors.
2. During development of the framework, two consultation workshops were organized ([Bern I](#) and [Bern II](#)) which brought together party and secretariat representatives of a range of MEAs to consider the role of the different agreements in supporting its development and subsequent implementation. The valuable role of the 'Bern Process' has since been recognized by a number of MEA governing bodies, and through [decision 15/13](#) the CBD COP invited the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to build on the Bern Process. In addressing this mandate UNEP convened the Bern III Conference, with the support of the Government of Switzerland.
3. The Conference took place in the Universal Postal Union in Bern, Switzerland from 23-25 January 2024. It was convened in person with participation by invitation only, and chaired by Clarisse Kehler Siebert from Sweden and Camila Isabel Zepeda Lizama from Mexico, with the support of professional facilitators and a conference planning team. Amongst its 133 participants, the conference included representatives of parties and secretariats from 69 countries and 16 MEAs, in addition to a range of other stakeholders, organizations and individual experts. The conference agenda is provided in Annex 1 and participation is summarized in Annex 2.

## II. Goals and objectives of the conference

4. The aim of the Bern III Conference was to contribute to the efficient and effective implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework by identifying practical opportunities to drive and coordinate an inclusive collaborative approach towards implementation of the framework while respecting the respective mandates of participating MEAs. The primary objectives of the conference were defined as being to:
  - Identify opportunities to strengthen cooperation and collaboration within and among Parties to the biodiversity-related conventions, Rio conventions and other relevant MEAs in implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework at all appropriate levels.
  - Make recommendations on further steps that could be taken to strengthen cooperation and collaboration, while recognizing and respecting the roles and mandates of each MEA.
  - Share practical experiences of cooperation and collaboration in implementation.

## III. Preparation for the conference

5. Two webinars were organized in advance of the conference, in order to inform invited participants on key issues likely to be discussed, and thereby help build common understanding. The **first webinar** ([slides](#), [recording](#)) held in December 2023 covered: perspectives from the host country on the Bern Process; the format of the conference; UNEP's role in facilitating MEA synergies; an overview of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and related CBD COP decisions; and perspectives from the conference co-chairs. The **second webinar** ([slides](#), [recording](#)) held in early January covered: illustration of the potential relationships between MEAs (introducing the 'cross-mapping' paper described below); alignment between Global Framework on Chemicals and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework; and an introduction to the Co-chairs' paper (described below).
6. A number of documents were prepared or identified in advance of the meeting, the majority of which were also presented in the webinars, as well as being made available from the [conference webpage](#). These include:
  - Provisional [agenda](#) and [programme \(both also annexed to this report\)](#)
  - [Co-Chairs paper](#) with options for enhanced collaboration to strengthen the policy, engagement and implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
  - [Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework](#)

- [Information paper 1 – Mandates](#) summarizing mandates relating to the Bern Process and Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework adopted by the governing bodies of participating MEAs.
- [Information paper 2 – Meetings](#) listing upcoming meetings of MEA advisory and governing bodies, together with other particularly relevant meetings
- [Information paper 3 – Cross-mapping MEA strategies](#) identifying key entry points for cooperation and collaboration amongst MEAs in implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

7. It was suggested that participants might also find it useful to be aware of the report of the [Bogis-Bossey Expert Meeting](#) held to help prepare for the conference, the [Global Framework on Chemicals](#) and the [GEF 8 Programming Directions](#). A number of other resources were identified by participants during the conference.

8. Participants were also invited to submit case studies on good collaborative practice at national, regional or global levels in advance of the conference, and during the conference there was opportunity to share stories, recognizing that sharing and scaling up of practical experience is key to future practical action. Links to relevant documents are provided below.

#### IV. Organization of work

9. The organization of work focused on maximizing discussion amongst participants, and almost no time was given to presentations. Sessions were professionally facilitated, and plans evolved as the sessions progressed in order to maximize participation, to build on the preceding discussion, and to respond to the interests and energies of participants. Effort was made throughout to get participants to identify practical actions and to specify the next steps that needed to be taken, in order to help ensure practical outcomes.

10. The results of discussions were captured through rapporteur's notes, flipcharts, online tools, and posters and notes added a timeline from 2024-2030 (the "roadmap"). Participants were also invited to provide feedback on the background documents for the meeting, and in particular elements of the cross-mapping paper referred to earlier. These various resources are being used in developing the conference report which will be made available for review as soon as possible, and then communicated through appropriate channels.

11. The Conference was conducted in the spirit of the [Chatham House Rule](#), and the views of participants are in the majority of cases not attributed. However there are occasional exceptions to this, for example where the activities of specific MEAs are referred to, or case studies, where it may well be obvious which organization contributed the information.

#### V. Opening of the conference

12. Participants were welcomed to Bern and to the Bern III Conference by **Ambassador Felix Wertli** speaking on behalf of the Government of Switzerland and **Tita Korvenoja** speaking on behalf of UNEP. Ambassador Felix Wertli is Head of the International Affairs Division at the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment, and Tita Korvenoja is Chief of the Environmental Conventions and Policy Branch in the UNEP Law Division. Between them they recognized:

- The good range of knowledgeable participants representing 16 different MEAs as parties or secretariats, as well as a number of stakeholders.
- That while mandates may be key in helping to define roles and responsibilities, it was important during the conference to also look 'outside the box' and avoid taking positions.
- The existing invitation from the CBD COP for other relevant MEAs to actively engage in implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.
- The willingness to engage, as evidenced by other MEA actions and decisions, and that it would be important for the conference to find ways to build on this.
- That it would be valuable to think about opportunities or 'entry points' for collaboration, and major opportunities for rapid follow up, again recognizing and building on existing opportunities.
- The challenge of addressing multiple environmental crises in an integrated manner, and the opportunities provided by the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework for doing so.

- The importance of ‘whole of society’ and ‘whole of government’ approaches, and how this relates to cooperation and synergy in implementation of MEAs.

13. The conference co-chairs introduced themselves and their personal ambitions for the conference. **Clarisse Kehler Siebert** is a Senior Policy Advisor in the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, and **Camila Isabel Zepeda Lizama** is Director General for Global Issues at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mexico. In introducing their personal ambitions for the conference, they challenged participants to:

- Step outside their roles, engaging with the meeting in their personal capacity
- Mix and mingle, and meet new people, using the meeting to build new working relationships
- Focus on building on what has already been done, or is already being done
- Think about what can be achieved together, and think about how to avoid working in silos
- Recognize people from other communities in the room, and provide necessary explanations
- Seek to build solutions relevant across multiple MEAs
- Work towards shared narratives and mutual support in implementing Framework
- Draw on the excellent resources prepared for the meeting, in particular the case studies

14. The conference facilitators, **Natasha Walker** and **Hannah Büttner**, introduced the goals and objectives of the conference, the expected organization of work, and working modalities (see above). In doing so they introduced participants to an online tool that would be used to capture views and inputs of participants during the conference. In doing so they asked participants about their perceived need for cultural change – 76% of participants saw a need to adapt mindsets and behaviours, and 20% considered that a ‘cultural revolution’ was needed. Some participants were asked to expand on the views, and they identified impediments in MEA decision making and a clear need to address them, resistance to change which needs to be overcome, and the need to avoid competition as resources are limited. It was also noted that the action to be taken depends on what we are trying to achieve, as different levels have different approaches and levels of difficulty.

15. The conference co-chairs introduced the concept of the roadmap, a large poster with a timeline from 2024 to 2030, to which it was hoped that conference participants would add proposed activities and key meetings. In order to generate thinking on this, a number of examples of potential activities were given, such as the upcoming meeting of the United Nations Environment Assembly which already has a focus on MEAs, and opportunities that might be provided by all three Rio convention COPs taking place in the last quarter of 2024. It was stressed that actions could be at any level, and that there was no “right or wrong”. The aim is to focus on finding ways of bringing what we are talking about into practice by taking it to the right places/for a.

## VI. Setting the scene

16. Background documents particularly key to the conference were then briefly introduced (see above) to ensure that participants were aware of the resources available. **Jihyun Lee** from the CBD Secretariat briefly introduced the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and associated decisions of the CBD COP, **Clarisse Kehler Siebert** and **Camila Isabel Zepeda Lizama** briefly introduced the co-chairs’ paper which aimed to inspire participants, and provoke thinking about the key issues, and **Jerry Harrison** from UNEP-WCMC introduced the information paper on “cross-mapping”. The facilitators also drew attention to the many case studies submitted, and encouraged participants to review them.

17. Additionally, the views of a number of different stakeholders were sought, in order to gain different perspectives that would help feed conference discussions:

- **Christian Schwarzer** from the Global Youth Biodiversity Network observed that the biodiversity community was already working well together, and that this could be built on. He felt that the biodiversity-climate nexus needed to be more effective, but that the annual UN Climate Conference provided a good existing opportunity for bringing different communities together.

- **Lucy Mulenkei** from the Indigenous Information Network and co-chair of the Indigenous Women Biodiversity Network stressed the need to work more effectively together at all levels, and to enhance the sharing of experience so as to build on what was already being achieved.
- **Ruth Spencer**, a member of the CBD Women’s Caucus, recognised that there was already a great willingness to engage amongst stakeholders, but that full inclusion was not always an option and this needed to be worked on further in order to harness the enthusiasm and experience of stakeholders.
- **Ingrid Koetze** from ICLEI spoke about the importance of engaging with sub-national governments and cities in implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, and drew the attention of participants to the action plan annexed to CBD COP [decisions 15/12](#).
- **Teresa Mundita Lim**, currently chair of the Global Partnership on Business and Biodiversity, drew attention to the relevance of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework to the interests of the business sector, who could be recognised as key partners in implementation at all appropriate levels including with respect to the climate-biodiversity nexus.

18. The facilitators asked participants to indicate through the online conference tool *Slido*<sup>1</sup> the topics or questions that they would like to address during the Bern III Conference, in order to get a sense from the room of key concerns and ideas for both discussion and to add to the roadmap. This resulted in around 100 responses, the most frequent and/or popular including the following:

- Enhanced cooperation amongst national focal points at the national level
- Engagement of all relevant MEAs in NBSAP development and implementation
- Increased coherence in reporting and use of indicators
- Means of implementation, including resource mobilization and capacity building
- Cooperation at the regional level to support national implementation
- Convergence amongst MEAs on addressing biodiversity-related topics
- Collaboration in addressing priority issues, including drivers of change
- Targeted engagement with key upcoming meetings
- Global review of collective progress in implementing the framework

19. This was augmented by asking several participants to expand on their views, which led to additional observations. These and the ideas set out above were all considered pertinent issues for bringing to the table during substantive discussions.

- Need to understand where and why cooperation is not happening, and underlying reasons
- Leadership matters, which needs the right people with the right skills
- Focus on areas of common interest where opportunities are easier to identify and address
- Explore levels of ‘interest’ of MEAs in particular targets as a basis for cooperation
- Identifying clusters of issues might be useful, with some sort of coalition to address them
- Also consider cross-cutting elements such as gender issues and human rights
- Consider joint clearing house mechanisms and other opportunities to share knowledge
- Focus on practical, clearly defined activities that will have a clear outcome

## VII. Exploring opportunities for collaborative progress at the global level

20. The primary purpose of this first substantive session was to explore opportunities for collaborative progress in delivering the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework through action at the global level. Participants were invited to sit with others representing the same MEA and to consider progress in addressing four goals identified by the co-chairs. The goals and questions are set out in the following table.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Slido* ([www.slido.com](http://www.slido.com)) is an online set of tools that aim to support meetings. These include opportunity to collect information through response to questions in a range of formats, or response to polls.

Goals	Questions to address for each goal
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supporting the achievement of GBF targets enables all MEAs involved to achieve their own goals more effectively and efficiently.</li> <li>2. Engaging with the GBF contributes to enhanced collaboration among clusters of MEAs and other relevant agencies with shared concerns/priorities/topics/targets.</li> <li>3. Monitoring and reporting processes for the GBF use the same indicators, data sources and systems as other relevant MEAs to the extent possible, enhancing transparency and efficiency.</li> <li>4. The roles of all relevant MEAs in supporting the GBF are clearly recognized, both in preparing for implementation, and in the global review of collective progress towards the 2030 targets.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are we already doing to achieve these goals?</li> <li>2. What needs doing and what do we require to do it?</li> <li>3. What concrete actions can we put on the roadmap?</li> </ol>

21. Amongst other things, this session served to illustrate the extent to which individual MEAs are already considering the relevance of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework to their work and interests, providing opportunities that can be built upon (some of which is already summarised in [information papers](#) prepared for the conference). At the end of the discussions there were 39 flipchart sheets responding to the questions which for each MEA identified the following:

- Actions that were already being considering in response to adoption of the Framework
- Actions that the MEA's governing body had already taken to respond to the Framework
- Existing and planned actions responding directly to the adoption of the Framework
- Existing and planned actions relevant to the Framework but not explicitly identified as such
- Tools and guidance relevant to implementation of the Framework
- Formal agreements and joint plans between some secretariats and the CBD Secretariat
- Specific experience and interests of some MEAs have that others can draw on
- Membership of collaborative partnerships relating to specific topics
- Importance of drawing on existing MEA-related monitoring and indicators
- Contributions from other MEAs to reporting and review of implementation of the Framework
- Opportunities for promoting/facilitating increased cooperation in national implementation
- Opportunities for enhancing communication/visibility on joint action and mutual benefit
- Opportunities provided by upcoming MEA meetings and other key fora
- Further actions to be considered, both as individual MEAs and together

22. At the end of the session, each MEA<sup>2</sup> was invited to very briefly identify the key issues for them, and as appropriate to include specific activities on the roadmap for later consideration. The key issues raised during these brief reports back to the plenary included the following:

- The **International Plant Protection Convention** mandate directly contributes to supporting target 6 on invasive alien species, as the convention aims to protect the world's plants, agricultural products and natural resources from pests. For example, the Africa Phytosanitary Programme aims to *inter alia* support the prevention, detection and management of the spread of invasive alien species.
- The **International Whaling Commission** promotes the establishment of sanctuaries for whale species, and the development and implementation of conservation management plans. In doing so it engages with other MEAs where this is appropriate, but recognises that opportunities for collaboration could be explored further using the targets as a framework for doing so.

<sup>2</sup> The full names of each convention are provided in Annex 2

- The **Carpathian Convention** has already been working on alignment with the targets, as is evident from the recently adopted Carpathian Biodiversity Framework. Relevant action under the Convention is now focused on implementation, including through embedding relevant activities within NBSAPs (with guidance being prepared for Parties on this).
- The **Minamata Convention on Mercury** sees its activities as critical to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity because of the impacts of mercury pollution on nature and people, particularly through the use of mercury in gold mining and its impacts on Indigenous Peoples and local communities, who are stewards of much of the remaining global biodiversity. Key areas of mutual interest include not only the targets, but cross-cutting issues including communication, human rights and gender. As other MEAs, they see potential for increased cooperation in monitoring and use of indicators to track progress in implementation.
- The strategic plan of the **Ramsar Convention on Wetlands** already includes an annex illustrating the relationship with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, and the next strategic plan (already in development) will also do so. The Ramsar Convention contributes to many of the targets, and while different MEAs have different reporting processes and timings, it is necessary to find ways for MEAs to contribute to the review of the framework and its future implementation.
- The **International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture** already has a close relationship with the CBD and recently adopted a resolution welcoming the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and recognising the mutual interest in its implementation. Particular attention was drawn to the need to build collaboration with other bodies relevant to addressing the targets, and the need for better coordination amongst focal points at the national level.
- Discussion on the **UN Framework Convention on Climate Change** recognised the interdependencies between climate change and biodiversity, and the implications of this for building a common knowledge base, benefiting from meetings of chairs of scientific advisory bodies, potential for using common metrics, the common interests in nature-based solutions and monitoring, reporting and verification, as well as gains that could come from better knowledge exchange in advance of negotiations.
- The group working on the **Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions** (BRS conventions) and the **Montreal Protocol** recognised the potential for collaboration on specific targets, and noted steps that had already been taken within their respective processes to consider areas of mutual interest and ways in which the instruments could support implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. This included reference to the report on interlinkages between the biodiversity and chemicals and waste MEA clusters that had already been prepared by the BRS and Minamata conventions.
- The **Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species** welcomed the increased visibility given to sustainable use of species in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, directly relevant to the mandate of the Convention. Key potential areas for building collaboration include addressing illegal activities (where CITES has experience), and collaborative partnerships in key areas of interest building on experience with the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management.
- The **Convention on Migratory Species** had held an online meeting prior to the Bern III Conference to discuss issues likely to arise, and the priorities for the Convention.<sup>3</sup> In the discussions in Bern, the participants representing CMS noted the importance of recognising mutual interest, not just focusing on how MEAs support implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. They also noted that the CMS COP taking place a month after the Bern III Conference would include launch of a Global Partnership on Ecological Connectivity, as well as taking resolutions relevant to implementation of the framework.

---

<sup>3</sup> Priorities identified by the CMS preparatory meeting included enhancing cooperation at the national level on NBSAPs and associated issues, and collaboration relating to a range of issues including ecological connectivity, sustainable wildlife management, addressing drivers of change, and indicators, as well as cooperation on transboundary issues, and on finance and projects for supporting implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

- The **World Heritage Convention** increases the protection offered to some of the most important sites for biodiversity in the world, increasing their profile and ensuring regular review. All the sites are important for tourism and associated opportunities for outreach. Such contributions to implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework need to be taken into account in the global review of collective progress in implementation. Particular importance was accorded to the relationship between biodiversity and culture.
- The **UN Convention to Combat Desertification** strategic framework includes strategic objectives relating to enhancing the resilience of ecosystems and generating global environmental benefits, both relevant to delivery of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. There is therefore mutual interest in issues such as engagement in formulation of NBSAPs, combined global assessment of the effectiveness of the Rio conventions, and possibly also in future land summits.

23. Reacting to the discussions and presentations from MEA representatives, the Secretariat of **Convention on Biological Diversity** welcomed the excellent suggestions from all participating MEAs, recognising how important this was for the CBD which has a special responsibility for implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. CBD COP-15 had already invited other MEAs to recognise the framework in decisions of their governing bodies, and COP-16 will provide further opportunities to continue the work, for example on the global review of collective progress in implementation.

24. The wealth of information already available to support implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework was recognised, and the need to ensure that it was readily accessible to those that might need it. This includes a wide range of tools and guidelines prepared to support implantation of MEAs and other intergovernmental initiatives, which are also relevant to implementation of the framework. Other key issues brought up by participants following the feedback from the MEA group discussions were the need for MEAs to communicate effectively one with another (for example through sharing of relevant decisions, or more effectively engaging in other MEA processes), opportunities for joint declaration and/or decision of the three Rio conventions taking place in the last quarter of 2024, potential for new or renewed engagement among secretariats in clusters and around specific topics, and opportunities afforded by projects such as the NBSAP Accelerator working to improved planning and implementation at the national level.

25. Particularly pertinent to these discussions were the **lists of upcoming MEA meetings**, which participants also included on the roadmap. These meetings are clearly opportunities for further action by MEAs to build collaboration in implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, and opportunities for further communication and support to parties around this. Accompanying this is a list of **other potentially relevant key meetings** that are already scheduled. These tables are provided in Annex 3.

26. The groups of participants representing each MEA were also asked to consider which of the targets in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework were most relevant to their interests, and to 'score' the level of relevance. The aim of this exercise was to identify **potential clusters of interest** as a basis for identifying 'champions' or more likely future partnership or collaborative arrangements – while recognising that the need and approach might vary from one target to another. This is illustrated in Table 1 on the following page.

27. Reflecting on the discussion on exploring opportunities for collaborative progress at the global level, many participants (71%) felt that there was a need to work further on trust between MEAs, given that trust is the basis for collaboration. As one participant put it, *"the trust between the MEAs ultimately rests on our confidence that what we are doing represents the best course of action for collective well-being, we must foster trust and assurance that our actions are optimal and that our guiding goals and visions are adequate"*. Some participants certainly thought that there was already good trust, and that the key question was how this could be built upon to achieve more. A number of key observations were made:
















- **Limiting issues** may include finding the spaces to work on cooperation and synergies (as in many meetings the opportunity to discuss additional issues is limited), and in ensuring the flexibility to fully engage given mandates and available budgets.
- **Resources are rarely sufficient** to address everything that needs to be done, so it is important to find ways not to duplicate, and this may well include 'letting go' and trusting others do the work.

- There are **additional challenges** concerning engagement with other sectors and stakeholders in order to ensure whole of society and whole of government approaches, which increases the size of the task of building cooperation and synergies.
- Whatever the issues, there is a need to find ways to **move on from setting out principles to ensuring action**, and the most effective way to do this quickly seems to be to identify areas of mutual interest and then build up from that.

28. Recognising the level of interest in issues relating to financing, two brief presentations were made on the morning of the second day, ahead of the start of the day's work. **Jurgis Sapjanskas** from the Secretariat of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) provided an update on GEF-8 programming and the creation of the Global Biodiversity Framework Fund, and **Liu Ning** from the Government of China introduced the Kunming Biodiversity Fund.



















**Table 1: Indicative cross-mapping of targets and MEAs**

																
<b>Target 1</b> (spatial planning)		✓✓		✓✓		✓✓✓		✓✓								
<b>Target 2</b> (restoration)						✓✓✓		✓✓								
<b>Target 3</b> (protected areas)		✓✓				✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓								
<b>Target 4</b> (species conservation)	✓✓	✓✓✓		✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓									
<b>Target 5</b> (sustainable use of species)	✓✓✓	✓✓✓		✓✓												
<b>Target 6</b> (invasive alien species)			✓✓✓			✓✓										
<b>Target 7</b> (pollution)											✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	
<b>Target 8</b> (climate change)						✓✓			✓✓✓							
<b>Target 9</b> (species management)	✓✓	✓✓✓		✓✓	✓✓											
<b>Target 10</b> (other key sectors)				✓✓✓		✓✓										
<b>Target 11</b> (nature's contributions to people)						✓✓	✓✓		✓✓✓							
<b>Target 12</b> (urban nature)																
<b>Target 13</b> (access and benefit sharing)				✓✓✓												
<b>Target 14</b> (mainstreaming)		✓✓														
<b>Target 15</b> (business and biodiversity)				✓✓✓												
<b>Target 16</b> (sustainable consumption)											✓✓					
<b>Target 17</b> (biosafety)																
<b>Target 18</b> (incentives and subsidies)																
<b>Target 19</b> (financial resources)				✓✓✓												
<b>Target 20</b> (capacity-building)				✓✓							✓✓	✓✓				
<b>Target 21</b> (data, information, knowledge)				✓✓												
<b>Target 22</b> (IPLCs)									✓✓						✓✓	
<b>Target 23</b> (gender equality)									✓✓						✓✓	

✓✓✓	Potential 'champion' or partner	✓✓	Contributing 'champion' or partner		Also relevant to the MEA
-----	---------------------------------	----	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------

<b>Notes on Table 1</b>
-------------------------

During the Bern III Conference, the participants representing each MEA were asked to consider which of the targets in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework were most relevant to their interests, and to ‘score’ the level of relevance. The aim of this exercise was to identify **potential clusters of interest** as a basis for identifying ‘champions’ or more likely future partnership or collaborative arrangements – while recognising that the need and approach might vary from one target to another. The result of this exercise is presented in the table. The MEAs involved were the following.

	Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)		Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (WHC)
	Logo of the “The Biodiversity Plan” for Life on Earth, the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework		United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)
	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)		United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)
	Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)		Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal
	International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)		Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade
	International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA)		Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants
	International Whaling Commission (IWC)		Minamata Convention on Mercury
	Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention)		Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

## VIII. Support for planning and implementation at the national level

29. Cooperation and synergy in MEA implementation at the national level was seen as vitally important to the efficient and effective delivery of both the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the associated goals and objectives of each MEA. However, the majority of participants (61%) considered national and subnational synergies the most challenging to achieve, and this is presumably also relevant to the earlier discussion on the need to change mindsets and behaviours.

30. Discussion on this issue took place both in plenary and in groups, focussed around four goals for supporting planning and implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework at the national level that had been identified by the co-chairs. It was made clear that the purpose of these goals was to frame and stimulate discussion, and not to constrain it. It was also clear that in each case actions would build on what was already happening.

31. The wording of the co-chairs' goals follows, together with some of the key considerations relating to each that were raised in discussions.

*a) Enhance cooperation in the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), ensuring that focal points for other relevant MEAs and relevant government units are engaged, and that the plans for achieving the targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework include mutually beneficial actions.*

- It is important to consider not only the benefits of cooperation and synergy for development and implementation of NBSAPs, but also the mutual benefits to MEAs that come from cooperation in working on NBSAPs and other activities.
- There are several different groups implied by this goal, and how they are each involved may depend on national needs and circumstances. The various groups can be loosely identified as MEA focal points, relevant government entities, other stakeholders, similar groups from other sectors.
- There is a need to formalise coordination among focal points at the national level, and national coordination mechanisms for implementation need to be formalised and officially recognised so that they can have continuity with budgets and mandates for cooperation.
- This could be achieved, for example, by bringing the coordination of all MEAs related to biodiversity and potentially other environmental issues at the national level under one coordinating committee involving all relevant ministries, civil society and private sector.
- Focal points having related targets can come together in smaller technical groups to develop clear action plans to achieve the targets. This will enhance cooperation and sense of both engagement and responsibility. This can also apply to larger stakeholder groups working on technical issues.
- Increased collaboration amongst focal points and those responsible for MEA implementation would be supported by clear guidance from MEAs, and sharing of good practice, in particular with respect to engagement in development/implementation of NBSAPs and associated financial plans.
- Engaging with other sectors where there are economic interests can be challenging, but NBSAPs can be a useful vehicle for achieving this. At the same time the engagement of more sectors in NBSAPs would increase their relevance and impact, and there is added value in aligning plans.
- Stakeholder mapping is a valuable approach for helping to ensure an inclusive process, supporting identification of who to involve and how their interests relate. This can cover different themes and clusters of issues, but also relates to cross-cutting issues such as finance and capacity-building.
- When preparing their delegations for MEA advisory and governing body meetings, national governments should carefully consider the relationship to implementation of other MEAs and how cooperation and synergy in implementation can be further advanced.

*b) Create avenues for ongoing dialogue, collaboration and capacity-building on biodiversity-related issues, both within governments and with a broad range of stakeholders.*

- Work within existing systems at both national and subnational level, taking advantage of existing mechanisms for stakeholder consultation and engagement, bringing biodiversity as a topic. This may require expanding mandates and training, but may be more effective than starting anew.
- Build collaboration among different institutions, mainstreaming biodiversity in different economic sectors, creating opportunities for building dialogue across ministries and sectors, and recognizing and engaging with activities implementing the various MEAs.
- Identify and work with the right stakeholders, including the key stakeholders outside of government. This requires an effective stakeholder mapping to identify who to engage, and co-ownership of the dialogue, providing opportunity for all to contribute in a constructive manner.
- Create a standing platform for rights holders and civil society to engage in a sustained manner in NBSAP development and implementation as well as with broader biodiversity issues, using social media for direct engagement and awareness raising, and as needed build capacity to engage.
- Carry out national dialogues on key issues to bring actors from different levels together to discuss the issues and how to respond, identifying what is needed to enable focal points and stakeholders to have the space, desire and time to work together.
- Create and disseminate clear, accessible information at the national level on the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, NBSAPs and related MEA activities to inform stakeholders and invite their engagement, making the content relevant to different audiences.
- Collaboratively develop activities that leverage expertise and resources for on the ground projects contributing to implementation MEAs from biodiversity, pollution and climate change clusters, and encourage funding agencies to prioritize funding for such integrated projects.
- Allocate sufficient budget for ongoing collaboration, mutual learning and capacity-building across government agencies (including focal points and implementers for different MEAs) and with stakeholder groups, recognising that resources are key to sustained engagement.

*c) Continue efforts to align national monitoring, assessment and reporting systems across MEAs (in the spirit of implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework), to create efficiencies and reduce the burden on focal points.*

- At the national level synergies in monitoring and reporting across MEAs closely relates to synergies in planning, so engagement of all MEA interests in NBSAPs will help in development of nationally coherent approaches to planning, monitoring and reporting.
- As necessary develop the capacity for monitoring progress of biodiversity outcomes at the national level, establishing a national repository of data for reporting to facilitate data sharing for reporting and review on the basis of collect once use many times.
- Prioritize development of national monitoring systems of indicators that respond to the needs of reporting across multiple MEAs and the SDGs, and strengthening the use of the headline indicators included in the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.
- Provide national data to contribute to aggregated global indicators, and draw on global level datasets to supplement nationally derived indicators where this is necessary and appropriate, validating the information that this provides
- Establish a cross-MEA working group to identify opportunities for further harmonisation of reporting so that a more modular approach can be adopted across MEAs to facilitate reporting by parties to each MEA.
- Use the Data and Reporting Tool for MEAs (DaRT) as a platform that brings relevant data together to support the drafting of reports for each MEAs drawing on available data and content of previous reports, also facilitating delivery to MEA online reporting tools.

- In order to ensure recognition of the contribution of each MEA to implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, review MEA reporting formats with this in mind. This has potential value at both national and global levels in reviewing implementation.
  - In addition to seeking better alignment of monitoring, assessment and reporting systems, it is also important to consider opportunities to enhance knowledge exchange and develop common knowledge platforms, and to work together to identify and address knowledge gaps.
  - Where not already in place establish a national biodiversity platform to support information sharing across MEA focal points and others responsible for national implementation and reporting across the scope of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.
  - Carry out national ecosystem assessments that respond to the implementation needs of multiple MEAs, using this as a basis both for developing a common information platform and building the community and cooperation amongst them
  - At its 10th session the IPBES Plenary agreed to carry out a methodological assessment on monitoring biodiversity and nature's contributions to people (due for completion in 2026), and this assessment is likely to contribute usefully to addressing this goal.
- d) *Seize opportunities for collaboration at regional and sub-regional levels to advance implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and other relevant MEAs, aiming to foster lasting partnerships and mutual learning.*
- While explicit mention is made of regional and sub-regional levels, there is a range of circumstances where it is also important to consider other transboundary issues where countries may not be in the same region or sub-region, for example countries on flyways and wildlife corridors.
  - Use existing regional networks and activity centres where it is feasible to do so, such as those established by the BRS and Ramsar conventions, the Regional Seas Programme and other international initiatives such as those run by UNESCO. It is practical to benefit from existing infrastructure and experience where it is appropriate to do so.
  - Find ways to use the evolving CBD network of regional, and/or additional subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centres to support collaboration, and to foster partnerships and mutual learning in implementation the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.
  - Existing bodies at regional and sub-regional levels could usefully be involved in promoting and supporting cooperation and synergies in implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, including ministerial meetings, intergovernmental organizations, and networks.
  - Develop and implement regional plans/programmes to address issues of common interest, while recognising the need for resources and that some regional action plans have not been fully implemented for both political and resource-related issues. Build on existing experience.
  - Link the clearing house mechanisms of relevant conventions to make sure that information is available and readily accessible to all interested stakeholders, and as appropriate develop platforms and shared calendars for better sharing of regional events and opportunities.
  - Continue to organize regional NBSAP forums to build the community working on NBSAPs and help share experience, and encourage ongoing dialogue with national focal points (the latter possibly facilitated by UNEP Regional Offices or other regional and sub-regional centres).
  - Conservation management plans at regional level can be used to protect species that move across borders. CMS plans have a coordinator and a steering group composed of stakeholders from all countries, regular monitoring and progress reports, and gives ability to adapt national plans.

32. Following review of many of the ideas coming from discussion on the four goals, participants were again encouraged to think about how to support planning and implementation of synergies at the national level, and come up with concrete actions for the way forward that can be included in the roadmap. It was also recognised that some of the discussion would also feed directly relevant into discussions under the next agenda item.

## IX. Enhancing practical ways and mechanisms that facilitate cooperation

33. Throughout the earlier discussions, ideas had surfaced on practical mechanisms that could help to facilitate cooperation for effective implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework at different levels. The aim of this session was to explore some of these ideas further, and as appropriate to incorporate them within the roadmap. In preparing for the session, two panel discussions were convened to help in considering what issues might be focused on, and to identify any gaps. In each of the panel discussions, five participants responded to questions from the facilitator. Key issues raised during the panel discussions included the following:

- build on what exists, while recognising that new actions and renewed efforts are needed
- identify those issues that are more amenable to being handled in an integrated manner
- be innovative, motivational and optimistic, and start now
- focus on how we can work together for mutual interest
- avoid losing credibility because of slow progress
- base what we are doing on facts, and recognise and avoid 'false solutions'
- anchor processes in people's lives, ensuring understanding and engagement
- fully engage stakeholders through whatever means are appropriate
- invest in people, not just expect them to be ready to engage
- make better use of opportunities presented by major meetings
- find a common narrative, and identify what can be achieved collectively
- communicate more actively and more effectively
- reduce the gap between MEAs when they are discussing the same issues
- recognize that negotiators and not usually implementers
- find resources to make the good ideas work
- find the ground between the *status quo* and the dreamers

34. For each of the issues below, mixed group discussions were convened on how to promote, facilitate and coordinate cooperation, addressing what can be done in the short term, what the longer term recommendations are, how it can be made real and who needs to do what, and what the main message from the Bern III Conference would be on the topic. Groups representing the different MEAs were then asked to discuss the issues amongst themselves and add further comment.

*How can the main messages from the Bern III Conference be most effectively communicated, starting with the sixth session of the **United Nations Environment Assembly** and continuing in other intergovernmental fora?*

35. UNEA-6 takes place 26 February-1 March 2024 and includes for the first time a supplementary agenda item on "cooperation with MEAs". UNEA-6 provides an early opportunity to promote the outcomes from the Bern III Conference. Potential opportunities include the following:

- High level dialogue, when the preliminary report of the Bern III Conference and the reflections of the co-chairs can be used to inspire speaking points of Ministers
- Ministerial declaration, providing input as Member States drawing on the same sources to provide initial ideas and inputs
- Reference cooperation and synergies in resolutions, noting the draft resolutions submitted by Japan on promoting synergies and by Malawi and Morocco on cooperation between UNEA, UNEP and MEAs
- Identify "friends of synergies" to spread the word on importance of synergies, including exploring which Ministers might be willing to be "synergies Champions", and make contacts in the margins of UNEA
- Use available exhibit space at UNEA-6 and side events and to bring together multiple MEAs, and as appropriate communicate key messages from the Bern III Conference

- Work with the Biodiversity Liaison Group to develop a joint statement by the executive heads of the biodiversity-related conventions to be made at UNEA-6

36. It will be important to use a range of upcoming intergovernmental events to leverage cooperation and synergies, following up on the Bern III Conference. Activities would include:

- Mentioning cooperation and synergies and the Bern process at all major upcoming events, such as the Summit of the Future being organized under the UN General Assembly in September 2024
- Organize side-events at relevant meetings, in particular those identified in Annex 3, starting with the CMS COP in Samarkand, Uzbekistan in February 2024
- Develop common messaging, teasing out 3-5 key messages from the Bern III Conference and communicating these out to MEAs
- Develop the Bern process webpages further through the sharing of communication materials, and through sharing of relevant materials developed by each of the MEAs
- Develop a logo for this process to promote visibility and recognition, for example through using the logo developed for "[The Biodiversity Plan](#)", with logos of various MEAs surrounding it.
- Identify and discuss cross-cutting topics across MEAs at appropriate levels, including through secretariat liaison and/or country interventions convened by UNEP
- Leverage existing liaison groups at the technical level to build cooperation and create synergies, furthering the work of the Bern III Conference and providing recommendations to MEAs

37. The following comments were made by participants on these suggestions:

- Volunteers will be needed as focal points for resolutions, moderating side events, etc.
- UNEP has a role, but so do other UN bodies especially when considering the need to integrate biodiversity into other sectors
- Focus needs to be broader than just addressing the goals and targets, and include identifying and addressing common challenges
- Messaging may need to be adjusted depending on the event and audience, for example at UNEA it may be more values and process oriented, and less about specific synergies
- It will be important to keep in mind the link to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals
- There is need to work towards shared beliefs and values as an essential building block for collaboration, reinforcing the move towards "living in harmony with nature"

*What should be the "MEA event and/or milestone" at CBD COP-16, to be held in Colombia in the last quarter of 2024?*

38. CBD COP-16 will be a key meeting for communicating the outcomes of the Bern III Conference, and allowing MEAs and Parties to showcase effective cooperation in implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, including through mainstreaming into other sectors. This will include, as appropriate, engagement in the subsidiary body meetings preparing for COP-16. Activities might include:

- Effective communication of the Bern III Conference outcomes, through interventions, side events and incorporation of relevant elements in negotiations and decisions
- Identifying agenda items that are relevant, including not only the agenda item on cooperation, but also those on planning, monitoring, reporting and review, on communications, on support for NBSAPs, etc.
- Having champions to watch for opportunities, and push for cooperation and synergies in decisions
- Use side events and the Rio Pavilion as opportunities to demonstrate mutual interest amongst MEAs in implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

- Support the CBD Secretariat in tracking implementation of CBD COP [decision 15/13](#) on cooperation, and reporting on actions taken by the CBD and other MEAs
- Supporting statements from MEA COP presidencies on cooperation and synergies, expressing political intention and demonstrating how MEAs relate to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

39. Realisation of this agenda will involve approaching the CBD Secretariat and the COP Bureau, including the current and future COP presidencies, to consider these actions in the planning process for COP-16 (including at its subsidiary body meetings). It may be useful to convene a small group of those interested in order to support such preparation. It may also be useful to get feedback from discussions on related topics at UNEA.

40. The following comments were made by participants on these suggestions:

- Other MEAs are also interested and have a role to play in preparation for discussion on this at CBD COP-16, and should be involved
- Important to focus on mutual interest amongst MEAs, not just on how MEAs support delivery of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
- Focus needs to be broader than just addressing the goals and targets, and include identifying and addressing common challenges
- The report of the Bern III Conference needs to be made available as an information document to support the agenda item on cooperation
- MEAs can present their contribution to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, and potential new actions in cooperation with other MEAs to deliver it

*How can we use the **golden opportunity of the three Rio convention COPs** taking place in the last quarter of 2024 to promote cooperation and synergies? What does a triple-COP outcome on synergies look like?*

41. Aim for coordinated Rio convention decisions on cooperation and synergies which could include a number of activities or joint initiatives such as the following:

- The CBD adopts a decision at COP-16 on cooperation with other convention which includes the basic elements to establish an expert group or committee of Parties with the clear objective and timeline with indications of resources needed to develop a joint work programme for the Rio conventions to enhance synergies in planning, implementation, monitoring and resource mobilization to achieve their respective strategies and action plans.
- The CBD decision would encourage the UNFCCC at COP-29 and UNCCD at COP-16 to accept this invitation in their respective decisions on cooperation, and each convention bureau would nominate members with regional balance, financed proportionately.

42. Starting a process is the most pragmatic and realistic way forward, and such a group would hopefully begin their work in 2025.

43. Additionally, high-level segments and political declarations could be used at each of the COPs to further promote Bern III Conference outcomes, possibly through a joint declaration as suggested earlier in the Conference. Side events and the Rio conventions pavilion could also be used to raise awareness and support the coordinated decision to commit to collectively work to advance the individual mandates.

44. The following comments were made by participants on these suggestions:

- The proposed decision should provide initial guidance on the objectives of the joint programme and the achievements of the already existing instruments
- The proposed mechanism should complement and inform the deliberations of existing secretariat liaison groups, collaborative partnerships, etc
- The proposed joint programme should help facilitate cooperation and synergies at the national level



- Please do not create separated synergy processes - it is important to continue synergies amongst Rio conventions but it is imperative to also give equal attention to other MEAs

*How are MEAs engaged and visible in the global review of collective progress in the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework?*

45. It is critical that relevant MEAs contribute to and are visible at the global review of collective progress in the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework that will take place at CBD COP-17 in 2026 and at CBD COP-19 in 2030.

46. Specifically, MEAs should contribute to the global report with their own chapter on interlinkages of MEAs with the Framework, and their contributions to its implementation. This would be concise, and include information *inter alia* on three highlights and/or achievements per MEA that demonstrate contribution to the Framework, indicate which targets or other related issues are being addressed). MEAs might also address the steps they have taken to recognise the links between their work and interests and the Framework, and joint action with other MEAs that they have undertaken.

47. The format and process for carrying out the global review is being considered by the fourth meeting of the CBD Subsidiary Body on Implementation in May 2024, and subsequently at CBD COP-16 in the final quarter of 2024, and relevant interventions will need to be made in these meetings to achieve this aim and include appropriate elements in the decision relating to the global review.

48. The following comments were made by participants on these suggestions:

- This might be the opposite of what is needed - instead contributions of MEAs should be integrated across the global review to better illustrate shared interests and activities
- If indicators could be defined for contributions that MEAs make to specific targets, then these could be reported on for the global review
- To be visible in the global review, MEAs should develop a common format to capture information on the implementation addressing each of the targets
- This needs a CBD COP decision inviting all MEAs to contribute

*What is our suggestion for how MEAs take custodianship for targets and indicators in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework?*

49. For national reporting on implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, prioritize use of indicators which are already in place for monitoring and reporting on other MEAs and other intergovernmental processes, for which there are already lead/custodian organizations. Meanwhile, at the global level MEAs can provide data and analysis relevant to their areas of interest that feed into the global review of collective progress in implementation.

50. Refine the cross-mapping of MEAs against the targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, to also include other relevant instruments, including, for example, UNESCO programmes and networks and the Global Framework on Chemicals. Use this information at the national level as a basis for guiding countries developing and implementation NBSAPs on which MEAs and initiatives might be considered when addressing each of the targets.

51. Coalitions, partnerships and “friends of” groups could be established for key targets, and include MEAs, other relevant organization and constituencies. The role of such groups should be clearly defined, including issues such as communication, building cooperation and synergies, sharing knowledge, and providing or facilitating support for implementation at the national level. This approach may also be relevant for other common issues and sectors, and not just targets.

52. In particular at CBD COP-16 recognition could be given to the role of the various MEAs in supporting implementation of particular targets, as well as to the inclusion of other indicators in the national reports where these are already being used to track the implementation of other MEAs.

53. The following comments were made by participants on these suggestions:

- Build on and learn from existing coalitions and partnerships involving MEAs, and build on and learn from existing “friends of” targets
- Further consider how indicators used by or being developed by other MEAs can be used in monitoring implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
- Work across MEAs to facilitate the integration of diverse perspectives, values, and knowledge systems into the development and implementation of strategies and plans
- There is no new reporting burden implied, the recommendation is that relevant indicators already being reported on in other MEAs should be included in CBD reports
- MEAs should be given the opportunity to be heard at other MEA governing body meetings, and given the floor under the relevant agenda items with sufficient time for intervention
- The role of the indicator lead needs to be clarified
- Mapping needs to be turned into action, and the stress should be on implementation of the Framework, even if not a perfect "system"
- Mapping should lead to a target "friends" or partnership approach, rather than expecting that one MEA will be the "owner" or single champion
- Using resources more effectively is critical to cooperation and synergies
- Contributing to a common framework is synergy in action, and priority should be given to indicators for which there is already an existing mandate, with existing processes for methodology, development, submission and use

*How can we come closer to **harmonising data protocols**, and how can we **share evidence and knowledge** for a common scientific base for implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework?*

54. In the short term, UNEP-WCMC should work with MEA secretariats to prepare an overview of common indicators used in different MEAs to support monitoring of the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. This would be brought to the CBD Informal Advisory Group on Technical and Scientific Cooperation, together with synthesis of the lessons learnt from Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators. This should be linked to capacity-building and getting traditional and local knowledge fully integrated in this process.

55. The aim is to get MEA indicators used in a more effective and ‘joined up’ manner at national and international levels. Follow-up to the initial review is a stepwise approach: identifying what data is needed to fill the indicators; addressing the gaps identified in the gap analysis; identifying for each MEA what data is available; cleaning up and standardising data and methodologies; and provide guidance for indicators, including for the private sector.

56. CBD COP-16 should take the necessary decisions, in the context of capacity-building and knowledge management, for the establishment of global and regional/sub-regional centres to facilitate technical and scientific cooperation supporting implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, with appropriate funding mechanisms in place (e.g. GEF). This builds on work already being undertaken to implement CBD COP [decision 15/8](#), and these centres can *inter alia* support the integrated use of data, information and knowledge to support implementation of the Framework. Similar decisions could be taken in other COPs, UNEA, UNGA.

57. In the longer term the aim would be cultural revolution, to address a systemic change which focuses on the utility of the data for decision-making at all levels and is inclusive. It is important to make the best use of available

tools and innovation, such as using science and artificial intelligence more effectively to address gaps. A knowledge governance system needs to be put in place to fill the implementation deficit.

58. The following comments were made by participants on these suggestions:

- CBD COP should adopt a decision inviting Parties to include in their National Reports indicators already in use in other relevant MEAs, related to obligations under those MEAs
- CBD COP should specify the relevant indicators so that everyone knows what they are, and this list can be added to in the future as needed
- This could be supported by aligned decisions by other MEAs which would mirror what is included in the CBD decision
- There are opportunities to work with other MEAs to address gaps in the monitoring framework and areas where indicators are missing (for example further pollution indicators)
- Improved knowledge management at all levels is critical to effective and efficient implementation of MEAs and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

*How can we work towards a “common COP”?*

59. There is a concern that biodiversity issues do not get sufficient high-level attention, and that the multiple MEAs dealing with biodiversity-related issues compound this problem as each has its own series of advisory and governance body meetings, which are only loosely related. Convening a “common COP” or high-level intergovernmental meeting on biodiversity in 2030 could:

- Bring all of the community working on biodiversity together in a visible way, raising the profile of issues discussed both within Governments and more broadly
- Provide opportunity for substantive discussion on programmatic alignment at global levels, and how this translates into facilitating and promoting increased alignment at the national level
- Consider mechanisms for continuing to strengthen cooperation and synergies in implementing biodiversity-related MEAs in the future
- Send strong messages to other intergovernmental fora and financial institutions on the inextricable and vital links between biodiversity and ecosystem services and all other sectors

60. Organization of such a meeting in 2030 is feasible but ambitious, given the independent mandates of the MEAs that would need to be involved and the timings of their various meeting cycles. Decisions would be needed in meetings of each of the MEA governing bodies in order to give sufficient mandate and legitimacy to the proposed meeting for it to be seen to be acting in the mutual interest of all the MEAs. An alternative approach might be to organize a more political summit on biodiversity in the context of the global review of collective progress in implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (on a similar model to the [Stockholm+50 Conference](#)).

61. Initially what would be needed to take this idea further is for a concept note with options to be developed as a basis for discussion by the bureau or equivalent of each of the biodiversity-related MEAs in order to gauge what might be the most appropriate way forward. The concept note would need to identify clear goals, and ensure that the proposed meeting would focus on what was both needed and achievable. In this regard, mutual interest in implementation of both the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and its successor will be central to discussion. The concept note might also propose language for decisions in the various MEA governing bodies.

62. The following comments were made by participants on these suggestions:

- This concept also relates closely to discussion on the future of the Bern process and how it might be institutionalised
- Any such meeting will clearly need to engage with stakeholders and rights holders in a meaningful way, ensuring their full participation

- The idea of a common COP or high-level meeting on biodiversity could usefully be discussed in the margins of upcoming intergovernmental meetings
- Might be useful to create an *ad hoc* group to take this concept forward, as without someone driving it the meeting is unlikely to happen

*How can we prepare for the **post-2030 strategy** (thinking of both the future of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the SDGs) to ensure implementation of synergies.*

63. In developing new approaches in 2030, it will be necessary to recognise that the political and technical dimensions both need to be addressed. We should be able to do this by making better use of existing structures, but it is important not to be prisoners of the past. Some of the issues that might be considered include the following:

- In 2030 it may not be appropriate to renegotiate the targets, but may be more important to find ways to further enhance implementation
- It will be important to increase the profile of biodiversity in intergovernmental fora, putting it on the same level as other global environmental challenges of climate change and pollution
- Monitoring, reporting, review, and communication will all need to be considerably enhanced, taking full account of the need to cooperate across MEAs, across sectors, and across society
- Capacity-building and resource mobilization are huge challenges now, and are expected to remain so into the life of the next generation of strategies and plans
- A narrative of understanding and managing the risk to society can be very powerful, which also relates to understanding the fundamental role of biodiversity and ecosystems services to other sectors
- Build the monitoring and indicators now cooperatively, so that it is in place for 2030 and beyond, increasing opportunities to transparency and accountability
- The better the implementation over the remaining years to 2030, the better the base on which we have to build from 2030 to 2050

64. Key actions between now and 2030:

- Keep thinking beyond 2030 even when implementing the current targets
- Each MEA should consider its interests with respect to the Kunming-Montreal Biodiversity Framework, and how they work with other MEAs in supporting its implementation
- MEA governing bodies should actively consider how working with other MEAs is mutually beneficial
- Need to consider how the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework relates to the interests of all relevant MEAs, and how this is integrated at the national level
- Enhance knowledge management and use of clearing-house mechanisms across MEAs, and as part of this facilitate cooperation in implementing MEAs

65. The following comments were made by participants on these suggestions:

- Is there need for systemic change and co-evolution of MEAs?
- Also relates to discussion on global review of collective implementation
- Remember Agenda 21 – “think global, act local”
- We need an ongoing synergies forum to pushing for change and making it real
- Partnership between MEAs needs to be visible in each MEA governing body meeting

*How can we **strengthen support at the regional and sub-national levels** for implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (e.g. capacity-building centres)?*

66. In the short term, carry out mapping exercises to identify the existing mechanisms and initiatives that provide relevant support at regional and sub-regional levels, recognising that the CBD is currently in the process of establishing regional and sub-regional centres to facilitate technical and scientific cooperation in implementing the

Framework (COP [decision 15/8](#)). Any regional or sub-regional entity supporting implementation of the Framework will need to consider the following:

- Establishing working modalities or protocols with lead MEAs and entities at the national and sub-national level working on biodiversity-related issues
- Take advantage of the NBSAP process in countries within the region or sub-region as a basis for identifying gaps and needs, and developing plans, including identifying roles and responsibilities
- Clarifying the roles and relationship between the bodies working within the region or sub-region, including with respect to both coordination and resource mobilization
- Aligning donor funding to regional and sub-regional priorities in the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
- Consider development of regional biodiversity strategies and action plans where these are needed to help support national action including development and implementation of NBSAPs
- Promote and facilitate the engagement and participation of local communities
- Support the establishment of regional response to specific targets, for example specific area-based conservation measures to address transboundary ecosystem conservation

67. In the longer term, consider joint coordination mechanisms which can lead to establishment of and support for transboundary initiatives, addressing areas of common concern including transboundary drivers of biodiversity loss. Related activities might include promoting and facilitating the following where it is appropriate to do so:

- Evaluating and considering the capabilities and capacity of countries and national governments to deliver on their global commitments
- Aligning policies, strategies, indicators, monitoring and reporting, and where appropriate carrying out monitoring and reporting at the regional level, and coordinating action
- Securing sustainable funding to support capacity-building and coordination activities, including support through regional mechanisms on resource mobilization working with accredited institutions
- Securing donor compliance to disburse their pledges and commitments, and to ensure coordinated funding and funding which addresses MEA commitments in a coherent, integrated manner
- Support for national governments to design targeted projects based on regional cross-cutting needs, for example on water, drought, coordination structure or governance structure

68. The following comments were made by participants on these suggestions:

- Mapping of what already exists is crucial in order to avoid reinventing wheel, and to ensure that we build on existing resources
- Avoid duplication as in some instruments mapping has already been done, while recognising that any mapping is a snapshot in time as the reality being mapped keeps evolving
- Carpathian Convention can be considered a good example of sub-regional cooperation, with an existing mechanism and relevant strategies and plans in place, including the Carpathian Biodiversity Framework which translates the global targets into tangible actions and initiatives in the region
- It is also important to recognise the potential of the UNESCO MAB Programme for supporting transboundary ecosystem conservation, in addition to MEAs
- In addition to regional and sub-regional approaches, it is important to recognise transboundary issues may affect countries in different regions (for example flyways)

*How to strengthen a **coordination structure at national level** and **what is needed to achieve it** (e.g. with non-governmental actors)?*

69. Strengthen coordination through a national mechanism with the ministry responsible for the environment taking the leadership role, engaging with local and sub-national governments and other relevant stakeholders to

develop and implement biodiversity strategies and action plans that align with NBSAPs to support National Government in implementing the nation's NBSAP and achieving the targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

70. The following comments were made by participants on these suggestions:

- It will depend on national governance which ministry is in charge
- Ministry of Environment will need to engage with all relevant sectorial ministries to implement the Framework and mainstream biodiversity
- There is value in having leadership from the highest level possible within government, in order to ensure maximum impact
- It is important to engage focal points of other MEAs in whatever NBSAP coordination process or mechanism is established, including with technical working groups
- Having NBSAP as a common platform to have all the related focal points to discuss and synergise their targets and action plans.
- Create national commissions which would bring together all relevant agencies and MEA representatives to help build cooperation and synergy in implementation
- This is closely linked the discussion on involving key rights holders and stakeholders, as an inclusive processes with sustained engagement of all is very important

*Moving forward on the GEF and Kunming financing approaches.*

71. Resource mobilization is a critical issue for implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, and this needs to be considered in the context of cooperation and synergies amongst MEAs in supporting implementation. Key issues include the following:

- Reversing the fragmentation of biodiversity-related resource mobilisation, and moving to a financial architecture that contributes to building cooperation and synergies rather than reinforcing silos
- Prioritising development of proposals for funding that have an integrated approach, which address the interests of multiple MEAs, incentivising cooperation and avoiding competition
- Ensuring that national focal points from all MEAs are involved in the elaboration of national biodiversity financial plans related to the implementation of NBSAPs
- Promoting alignment of financial institutions and economic systems for, and fiscal policies in favour of, the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and not against it
- Better communication on how the available funding sources could be better used to promote cooperation and synergies

72. The need for additional and new resources was also stressed, including for resources accessible to local actors and rights holders. It was also recognised as essential that any mobilised resource should not result in human rights violations.

73. The following comments were made by participants on these suggestions:

- Climate financing, which is much bigger than biodiversity financing, should be at least biodiversity friendly and preferably biodiversity positive
- Joint programming amongst MEAs, and collaboration in national planning, would facilitate development of approaches to funders that address mutual interests
- Ensure that UN Country Teams understand MEAs, and the opportunities of building cooperation and synergy in implementation

*How to establish the values, language and mindsets for collaboration (cultural change)?*

74. It is important to start with values, recognising that people are part of nature, and that biodiversity and development are inextricably linked. In processes, whether at global, national or local levels, it is essential to commit to inclusion and sustained, meaningful engagement, involving all cultural and linguistic groups, and all the diverse stakeholders). The Summit for the Future and UNEA are entry points for increasing this focus, and UNEA 6 should embody values about holistic view of nature and people, also about process which lead to greater inclusion and cultural diversity.

75. The following comments were made by participants on these suggestions:

- This relates to the discussion in another group on involving key rights holders and stakeholders at the global level, and high-level political will
- Support for commitment to inclusion and sustained engagement, which are actions that can be taken forward, but other points are more abstract and difficult to translate into action
- Awareness that values are important and non-negotiable, yet can differ from person to person
- Conservation values that help in achieving sustainability of resource use should be translated and communicated
- Promote sustainable eco-lifestyles that utilise the resources judiciously and efficiently, which will help in ensuring the sustainability of natural resources
- This is all easy to agree with, but what does it mean for synergies amongst MEAs
- The synergies among us emerge from a shared understanding of people as part of nature, and from recognition that the Framework is inextricably linked to sustainable development.
- The rationale to protect biodiversity should not only be based on scientific arguments but include cultural appreciation of nature

*Involving key **rights holders and stakeholders** at the global Level with respect to human rights and participation, and how can we **create high-level political will** to help ensure meaningful engagement*

76. Inclusive, meaningful and efficient engagement of Indigenous Peoples, local communities, women and youth is crucial to ensure the whole-of-society approach and human-rights based approach in the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (with particular attention to Section C on the cross-cutting 'considerations'), and to raise political will.

77. In the short term, action would include

- Follow up to the Bern III Conference and the future Bern process which engages organizations in addition to MEAs (including for example FAO) working to support implementation
- Further cross-mapping of stakeholders, networks, and existing strategies, action plans and programmes of work to provide a basis for enhanced engagement through better understanding of what is currently happening

78. In the medium term, action would include

- Joint action plan to increase engagement
- Identification of best practices for wider adoption.

79. It should be noted that the recommended actions were designed in such a way that they can be implemented by different actors without the need for formal endorsement by MEA governing bodies.

80. The following comments were made by participants on these suggestions:

- Having CBD COP recognize the mapping of MEAs for each target would be valuable, and could potentially be extended to other intergovernmental actors and processes,
- Also useful to identify key targets ask other relevant entities and they can be included in any future consultative mechanism around those targets

- The first step is to create public awareness in order to bring public pressure to bear on the political executive
- This is linked to the discussion on values, language and mindsets, and is the most substantive way to implement those principles
- Leverage existing mechanisms such as the CBD Open-ended Working Group on Article 8j and the UNFCCC Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform
- IPLCs, youth and women representatives are nominated and supported to participate in MEA expert/technical groups on thematic issues, considered as equal with other experts
- MEA secretariats to share best practice on IPLC and stakeholder engagement
- This is one of the ways in making synergies work on the ground, and this is one of the areas where the Framework has changed the game

*How can **business engagement** in implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework be enhanced.*

81. Business engagement is essential in the effective implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, not only because the private sector can impact on biodiversity and ecosystem services, but also because it can contribute to implementation of the framework working with a wide range of stakeholders at national and international levels.

82. In the short-term:

- Use existing mechanisms, such as Business For Nature, the Global Partnership for Business and Biodiversity, and existing MEA business-related activities, expanding these to cover other MEAs and increase recognition of the importance of cooperation and synergies in addressing biodiversity loss.
- Simplify communication of biodiversity targets and the link with business targets, SDGs and climate targets, using the business language for greater awareness. Look at the biodiversity flotilla on communications as a possible model, and build outreach, joint programmes, and coordination.
- Review the current activities of industries, and share information on best practices at multiple levels both for communication and as a basis for encouraging further action, using existing platforms both to facilitate access to the information, and as a forum to discuss opportunities and common challenges.

83. In the longer term

- Find ways to build trust between business and other stakeholders
- Through creating new incentives and reforming existing incentives, promote green and blue products
- Develop and apply ethics and safeguards, and promote a move away from green/blue washing
- Streamline certification processes for companies
- Incorporate biodiversity in existing standards (assess negative impacts and also the positive impacts)

84. In addition to the above, it is important to recognise the work of existing finance-related initiatives, such as the Task Force on Nature-related Financial Disclosures, and to avoid duplication of already existing similar initiatives involving financial institutions. It is also important to recognise the potential impact of consumers, and opportunities to influence their choices.

## **X. Roadmap**

85. Throughout the meeting, participants were invited to add to the roadmap. The aim here was both to capture the sense of the discussions in a pragmatic manner, and to add emphasis that practical actions need to be taken in order to achieve the enhanced cooperation and synergies that were being discussed. Ultimately the roadmap had a range of different elements included within it. The roadmap included:



- a) *Upcoming MEA meetings:*** These meetings are clearly opportunities for further action by MEAs to build collaboration in implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, and opportunities for further communication and support to parties around this. In planning for these meetings thought will need to be given as to how best to integrate and promote the issues discussed. The list of meetings over this year and next is included in the first table in Annex 3. Meetings will continue into subsequent years, but in most cases the dates and locations have yet to be announced.
- b) *Other key meetings already scheduled:*** These meetings vary more in nature. Some, such as UNEA are intergovernmental, others not. Opportunities to further cooperation and synergies in implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework will therefore vary from one meeting to another, yet all are opportunities for communication to the communities involved in the meetings, and for further building engagement and participation. Meetings that are already scheduled over the this year and next are included in the second table in Annex 3. Further meetings in subsequent years will also be relevant, and this will need to be tracked.
- c) *“Owned” actions already under way:*** In a number of cases participants have added to the roadmap actions that are already under way, relating to specific MEA’s mandated work and meeting schedules, and to UNEA. Lead responsibility is largely obvious, although inputs from others would be appropriate. These include:
- MEA governing body decisions on cooperation building on Bern III Conference outcomes
  - Decisions on species, connectivity and the new CMS strategic plan at COP-14
  - Launch of CMS report on status of migratory species at COP-14
  - Global Partnership on Ecological Connectivity launched at CMS COP-14
  - More active engagement on MEAs at UNEA-6, including a decision on MEA cooperation
  - New joint work programmes/plans between CBD and CMS, and between CBD and Ramsar
  - Establishment of regional centres for technical and scientific cooperation by CBD COP-16
  - IWC-69 resolution relating to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
  - New IWC Conservation Committee strategic plan and work plan
  - Roadmap for mutually supportive implementation of the Minamata Convention and Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework submitted to COP-6
  - New strategic plan for the Ramsar Convention adopted at COP-15
  - Global review of collective progress in implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework at CBD COP-17 and COP-19
- d) *“Owned” actions that are anticipated:*** A number of anticipated actions relating to specific MEAs and UNEP were also added following discussion in the conference. These relate to existing mandates, but are not necessarily explicitly requested in current governing body decisions. Again the lead is largely obvious. These include the following:
- Technical support provided by Minamata Convention Secretariat for development of NBSAPs that taking into account actions relating to mercury
  - Communication between MEA secretariats on shared interests and priorities, including sharing of relevant documents and decisions, and input to processes on common interests
  - Engagement of other MEAs across all clusters in indicators and reporting relating to the global review of collective progress in implementation
  - UNEA MEA day as an entry point for increasing visibility of MEAs and promoting concerted action on implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
  - Executive secretaries of the Minamata Convention and CBD to jointly invite other MEA secretariats to join a "chemicals & biodiversity Liaison Group"
  - Better integration of the Global Framework on Chemicals, including assessment of the relationship to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

- Improve briefing of UN Country Teams to enhance their understanding of MEAs and opportunities for increased cooperation and synergy in their implementation
- Adopt guidance to the GEF at CBD COP-16 that recognises the role of other MEAs in supporting delivery of NBSAPs and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

**e) National action potentially requiring further support:** A number of the milestones relate to practical action that can be taken by parties, and in some cases is already under way. Consideration may need to be given on what further may need to be done to facilitate or promote action, such as providing additional recommendations, guidance and sharing of the related experience of others. For example, action could be taken by MEA secretariats and/or UNEP to promote these actions, building on what is already being done and available. Further decisions could be taken by the CBD COP-16 reinforcing elements of [decision 15/6](#) with respect to national planning drawing on the list below. While the timing for delivery of the actions is “as soon as possible”, achievement depends on national circumstances. These actions include the following:

- Set national priorities for implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework together with other MEA focal points and begin implementation
- Secure whole-of government buy in for the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework at the national level as soon as feasible
- Ensure that NBSAPs are inclusive of all MEAs, and that associated national biodiversity finance planning for NBSAP implementation involves focal points for all relevant MEAs
- Create national mechanisms that bring together national focal points for the different MEAs so as to increase cooperation and synergy, and secure institutional memory
- Include all MEA focal points in preparation for MEA governing body meetings, and intergovernmental processes, to increase cooperation, awareness and mutual support
- Carry out a stocktaking of available resources for implementation, and identify entry points to other sectoral plans and responses to MEA obligations at national level
- Create national MEAs committees or processes to support focal points, engaging all relevant sectors and stakeholders through a permanent forum for multistakeholder dialogue at all levels
- Establish national coordination mechanisms with high level support for the planning and implementation of NBSAPs that include all relevant sectors and stakeholders
- Map the interests, competencies and mandates of state and non-state actors in order to help ensure a more coordinated approach to MEA implementation at the national level
- Ensure the effective engagement of all levels of government in implementation of MEAs, NBSAPs and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
- Enhance communications and outreach as a basis for helping to ensure broader societal engagement, and build communities that support implementation
- Work with focal points from across MEAs to support development of project proposals target to the integrated programmes of GEF and the GBF Fund

**f) Proposals for regional and transboundary action:** The following activities were proposed for enhancing regional, sub-regional and transboundary support in particular with respect to implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework:

- Make dedicated funding available through the GEF and GBF Fund to support transboundary and sub-regional projects addressing the related objectives of multiple MEAs, strengthening existing partnerships and organizations working at this level wherever possible. *Action by COPs of relevant conventions to encourage the approach.*
- Share experience of developing the Carpathian Biodiversity Framework with other subregional and regional MEAs, illustrating approaches to translating global targets at a regional level, exploring cross-sectoral consultations, and developing joint activities. *Action by the Carpathian Convention Secretariat and Parties to the Convention.*

- Identify and use existing cooperation frameworks for thematic implementation of NBSAP's actions across borders as a basis for increasing collaborative action in implementing MEAs, hopefully with seed funding from appropriate sources including the GBF Fund. *Action could originate with parties or with secretariats of cooperation frameworks convening relevant parties, but further guidance and encouragement might be needed.*
- Enhance use existing regional networks and centres, such as those already under the BRS and Ramsar conventions, the Regional Seas Programme, and also UNESCO. This will help to strengthen cooperation and synergy at the national level. *Action is for interested networks and centres to liaise, but this would need to be encouraged by relevant secretariats.*
- Build connections between the new CBD regional and sub-regional centres for technical and scientific cooperation and regional cooperation centres for other MEAs, helping to further build cooperation and synergies in MEA implementation within the regions and sub-regions. *Action can be encouraged by secretariats, potentially reinforced through COP decisions, for example through decision at CBD COP-16 relating to formal establishment of the regional and sub-regional centres and establishment of the associated global coordination entity.*
- Ministerial agreement for regional cooperation on implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, building on existing regional bodies and circumstances to raise profile and enhance cooperation amongst MEAs and governments. *Action will include encouraging regional bodies to pick this up, in particular those responsible for organized ministerial meetings on environment-related issues.*
- Encourage further regional and sub-regional support for countries in implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework through creating communities of practices, leveraging financial resources, developing common knowledge bases, and encouraging collaborative action. *Action by regional organizations and organizations with a regional presence, driven by the needs of countries in the respective region.*

**g) Proposals relating to indicators and national reporting:** The following activities were proposed for increasing cooperation and synergy in indicators and reporting related to implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework:

- Increase consistency in use of indicators by including all relevant indicators and indicator processes used by other MEAs either into the monitoring framework of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, and/or encourage their use by CBD Parties when reporting on implementation. *Action is on the CBD processes to assess how this can best be achieved, but support may be required.*
- Integrate use of data and information across MEAs so that information relevant to implementation of multiple MEAs (for example on specific targets) is readily available and accessible to all at both global and national level. *Action would need to be taken across MEAs to achieve this, and this would need both technical discussion and agreement.*
- Streamline MEA reporting by ensuring that parties are only expected to provide information that is needed and used, so as to reduce reporting burdens where this is possible, and further investigate options for a modular approach to MEA reporting. *Action is on MEA processes to ensure that report templates focus on data and information that is needed. With respect to modular reporting, a proposal is needed to support further consideration which could be prepared by UNEP.*
- Promote national participatory processes for monitoring, assessment and reporting, so as to ensure engagement of all relevant stakeholders, and to raise the profile of both the process and the resulting data and information. *Action is to prepare technical guidance to support this.*
- Create a common shared knowledge-base through a range of actions drawing on the scientific advisory bodies of MEAs, science-policy platform reports, scientific bodies working with MEAs, and bodies working with Indigenous and local knowledge. *Action would include as a first step dialogue among the chairs of MEA technical and scientific advisory bodies to identify opportunities/needs.*

- Enhance the Data and Reporting Tool for MEAs (DaRT) as a tool for supporting reporting to multiple MEAs at the national level, including through working with more MEAs and with more parties. This also relates to establishment of a central repository of data on MEAs for use in national reporting. *Action would include liaison between UNEP and MEA secretariats, and subsequent follow up.*

**h) Other significant proposals:** The following proposals not falling in the other categories were also added to the roadmap during the meeting:

- Organize and MEAs day and MEA Pavilion at CBD COP-16 in Colombia to create an opportunity for sharing experiences, ideas, and opportunities for MEAs and relevant stakeholders to work together on implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and other relevant strategies. *Action would be initiated by Colombia and CBD COP-16 Presidency and the CBD Secretariat.*
- Common approach to Rio convention COPs in 2024, using the opportunity that all three take place in the final quarter of the year. Consider common messaging and aligned decisions, and opportunities for coordinated outreach. This could then provide the basis for further considering transformative actions across the Rio conventions, identified in several actions on the roadmap. *Action would need to be initiated by development of a concept note as a basis for further consultation.*
- Address pollution as a cross-cutting issue, creating an increased understanding of the interrelationships and trade-offs involving chemicals, waste and biodiversity, in particular with regard to food security and poverty alleviation and also considering the related issues of climate change.
- Consider convening a global dialogue on biodiversity in 2027 with national dialogues taking place in all countries and amongst all stakeholder groups ahead of the global dialogue, and feeding into it. This could follow the model of the UN Food System Summit in 2021. *Action in the first instance would include development of a concept note as a basis for further consultation.*
- Consider convening a common COP or conference in 2030 in order to give increased profile to concerns about biodiversity loss and the efforts of multiple MEAs to address this, with the primary focus being on progress in implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. *Action in the first instance would include development of a concept note with options as a basis for further consultation.*
- All MEAs to have rights holders' caucuses and enhanced synergies among them for full implementation, looking for key events or spaces across all relevant MEAs to bring caucuses together. *Action would in the first instance include liaison amongst stakeholder groups working with MEAs in order to identify next steps.*
- Direct access to funds is available for stakeholders and rights holders to more effectively support their contributions to implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. This would include GEF funding, the GBF Fund, and other MEA-related funds. *Action would be needed by the bodies responsible for administration of the identified funds.*

## XI. Case studies

86. As part of the preparatory process for the conference, participants were invited to share case studies on good collaborative practice at the subnational, national, regional and global levels. Participants had the opportunity to provide examples of relevant experience through a dedicated online form, as well as to prepare case study posters. By the beginning of the conference, UNEP had received 45 case studies, including 42 responses to the online questionnaire and 35 posters. Of these, 29% were from countries, 15% were from MEA secretariats, 20% were from UN entities, and 36% were from stakeholder groups.

87. At the *international* level, the case studies include examples of:

- Win-win and co-benefits in achieving goals and targets of multiple MEAs more effectively and efficiently
- Enhanced collaboration across and within clusters of MEAs and relevant agencies through the Kunming Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
- Synergies between monitoring and reporting processes across MEAs, including through the usage of similar indicators, data sources, and systems

- Recognition of the roles of all relevant MEAs in supporting the implementation of the Kunming Montreal Global Biodiversity

88. At **regional, national and sub-national** levels, the case studies include examples of:

- Enhanced cooperation in the development and implementation of NBSAPs
- Creation of avenues for ongoing dialogue, collaboration, and capacity-building on biodiversity related issues, both within governments and with a broad range of stakeholders
- Alignment of national monitoring, assessment, and reporting systems that support implementation of the Framework with those for related MEAs
- Collaboration at the regional and sub-regional levels to advance implementation of the Framework along with related MEAs, aiming to foster lasting partnerships and mutual learning
- Whole of society approach in practice

89. The case study posters were available for viewing throughout the conference, and participants were encouraged both to view them and to discuss them with their proponents. Additionally, on the evening of the second day a 'story telling' session was organized for participants to further explore the wealth of experience that had been contributed and was represented in the room. During this session several participants who had submitted posters were invited to share their experience, and a number of other participants also did so.

90. Annex 4 provides brief summaries of all 45 case studies received by UNEP, presented in alphabetical order according to the title of the case study. On the conference website there is an [overview of case studies submitted by Bern III Conference participants](#), a [full list of Bern III Conference case studies posters submitted](#), and a document containing the [Bern III Conference case studies posters](#).

## XII. **Actions consolidated by the co-chairs based on conference discussions**

91. In order to promote further thinking and action, during the final afternoon of the conference the co-chairs invited participants to consider a range of concrete actions, drawing on the discussions that had been taking place. The proposed actions are listed below together with some of the feedback on them, the order reflecting the indications of preference expressed by conference participants.

- a) Where a need has been identified, enhance **cooperation among relevant MEA secretariats** as a basis for sharing of information and experience, planning activities, and communicating relevant decisions of governing bodies. Such cooperation could be formal or informal, depending on circumstances and needs, and as appropriate would extend to briefing and engaging parties to the relevant MEAs. Such cooperation would also extend to sharing of all relevant MEA governing body decisions with the secretariats of other MEAs for onward communication as appropriate.
- b) Establish a **platform at the national level** which brings together relevant focal points, governmental implementing agencies, stakeholders, etc. This is a key step not only with respect to the effective update, review and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and actions plans (NBSAPs), but also for achieving the whole of government and whole of society approaches advocated in Section C of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. *Key issues discussed relating to this can be seen in paragraphs 31(a)-(b), 69-70, 85(e), and to some extent 71.*
- c) Contribute effectively as MEAs to the **global review of collective progress** in implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, which the CBD COP has already decided will be considered at COP-17 in 2026 and COP-19 in 2030. The detailed procedures will need to be addressed at upcoming CBD meetings in 2024 which will address both process and format of the global review. *Key issues discussed relating to this can be seen in paragraphs 45-48.*
- d) Both individually and collectively, MEAs should enhance **outreach on the benefits of cooperation and synergies**, so as to increase understanding and to increasingly share ideas and experiences. This ranges

from communication of the outputs of the Bern III Conference, to talking about cooperation and synergies in consistent ways across MEAs, to sharing of case studies.

- e) Where this is not already the case, include a **standing agenda item at all MEA governing body meetings** on the contribution of the respective MEA to implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, and associated outcomes. This relates to both implementation and the global review of collective progress. In this regard it was also noted that the report from the Bern III Conference should be communicated to each participating MEA and discussed as appropriate in their advisory and governing body meetings.
- f) **Build on the Bern Process**, and keep the Bern III dynamic, spirit, and network alive through activities such as webinars on key topics. Throughout the conference participants had welcomed the discussions and progress made, and made a range of suggestions about possible future meetings and opportunities which need to be reviewed and built upon. *Key issues discussed relating to this can be seen in paragraphs 93-95 below.*
- g) Propose a decision at CBD COP-16 for an **expert group or committee on synergies among MEAs**. This would ideally be raised under the agenda item on cooperation at the meeting of the CBD Subsidiary Body on Implementation in May 2024, where there would also be a review of progress in addressing [decision 15/13](#) on cooperation. The Bern III Conference also discussed other ways in COP-16 could build on the issues discussed, including an potential MEAs day focused on mutual interest in implementing the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. *Key issues discussed relating to this can be seen in paragraphs 38-40.*
- h) Use **upcoming events as opportunities to enhance collaborative action**, including the United Nations Environment Assembly, the Annual Adaptation Forum under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the COPs of the Rio conventions which all take place in the last quarter of 2024 and which could be approached with aligned communications and draft decisions. *Key issues discussed relating to this can be seen in paragraphs 35-37 and 41-44, as well as 38-40, 85(a)-(d) and associated annexes, and parts of 85(h).*
- i) Draw on the **cross-mapping of MEAs against the targets** in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework as a basis for identifying potential areas for increased cooperation in supporting implementation, or for identifying “champions” and contributors for particular targets. The cross-mapping is illustrated in Table 1, where MEA representatives have ‘scored’ the relevance of the targets to their work and interests, building on work done in advance of the conference. This cross-mapping may also have relevance for informing cooperation at the national level. *Key issues discussed relating to this can be seen in paragraphs 49-53 as well as the associated Table 1.*
- j) Consider how to most effectively establish **“partners” or “friends” of specific targets or activities** in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, building on experience relating to the partnerships for targets 2 and 3 which have already been established, and/or the experience of groups such as the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management. *Key issues discussed relating to this can be seen in paragraphs 31(d), 66-68 and 85(f).*
- k) Actively encourage approaches to **“collect once, use many times”** in MEA-related monitoring and reporting at both global and national levels, through: increased alignment in use of indicators; further exploration of opportunities for harmonizing reporting; enhanced sharing of data and information; and encouraging and facilitating the use of tools such as the Data Reporting Tool for MEAs (DaRT). *Key issues discussed relating to this can be seen in paragraphs 31(c), 54-58 and 85(g).*
- l) Consider the most effective ways to **review progress on the Bern III roadmap** to 2030, so that the many ideas contributed by conference participants are not lost, but are followed up on in the most appropriate manner (also recognizing that this relates to discussion on the future of the Bern process). *Key issues discussed relating to this can be seen in paragraphs 85(a)-(h) and also 63-65.*

92. It was recognized that the co-chairs' list did not include all of the concrete actions proposed by conference participants, and the following also needed to be considered:

- m) The proposal to convene a **“common COP” or high level intergovernmental meeting on biodiversity in 2030** to bring the community working on biodiversity together, to raise the profile of biodiversity issues, and to provide opportunity for substantive discussion on programmatic alignment. *Key issues discussed relating to this can be seen in paragraphs 59-62 and parts of 85(h).*
- n) Opportunities for **strengthening support at regional and sub-regional levels**, including through building on existing regional networks and activity centres established to support MEA implementation, and building on the work of existing bodies and partnership arrangements. *Key issues discussed relating to this can be seen in paragraphs 31(d), 66-68 and 85 (f).*
- o) The need to **ensure engagement of all relevant rights holders and other stakeholders** in activities at all levels that seek to enhance cooperation in the implementation of MEAs and the delivery of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. *Key issues discussed relating to this can be seen in paragraphs 76-80 and 81-84, and to some extent also paragraphs 74-75 and parts of 85(h).*

### XIII. Future of the Bern Process

93. Feedback on the conference was positive, in particular given the breadth of issues addressed and the diverse nature of the participating MEAs, and it was considered to be of value to continue the Bern process. However, it was recognized that more needed to be done in the future to identify challenges and practical solutions to those challenges. In this regard the call for case studies to inform the conference was generally regarded as being a useful way to incorporate practical solutions into the discussions.

94. It was suggested that in planning further activities as part of the Bern process, including with respect to follow up to the Bern III Conference, consideration should be given to the following:

- Encouraging all participants to be “Bern ambassadors”, communicating Bern III Conference outcomes and ideas to their own constituencies
- Communicating the report and briefing note from the Bern III Conference to all relevant MEA advisory and governing body meetings both formally and through side events
- Developing a web presence for the Bern process to facilitate communication of relevant information to all who are interested, and ensuring appropriate links to MEA-related websites and services
- Identifying topics of common interest which could be addressed in the future, focusing on how cooperation and synergies in implementing MEAs can enhance action on the issue
- Recognising that work on cooperation and synergies at the scientific and technical levels is in most cases likely to be more straightforward than trying to address administrative and political issues
- Involving other institutions in future meetings where their interests are relevant to the issues being discussed and they are in a position to engage actively
- Considering formats for discussion – conferences, technical meetings, and so on – that are most appropriate for addressing issues
- Continuing the party-driven nature of the process, while recognising the essential role of secretariats in helping to coordinate engagement
- Further developing the mapping process and using it both as a basis for further discussion and in helping to drive and/or orient action at that national level
- Further encouraging the use of case studies to inform on practical actions being taken and their effectiveness, as a basis for scaling up what works and learning from what doesn't
- Considering how to increase engagement and participation, including with respect to use of other languages

- Evaluating progress on the issues discussed at the Bern III Conference

95. At the end of the conference, the facilitator asked participants to reflect on the conference and to provide feedback on what surprised them personally, what they missed, and what they loved about the conference. While recognising that these are the personal reflections of individuals, the observations have potential value in the planning of future meetings and have therefore been summarised in Annex 5.

#### XIV. Closing of the conference

96. The Bern III Conference aimed to identify practical opportunities, and participants were actively encouraged to follow up within their own constituencies in order to maximize impact. In this context, immediately following the conference a **briefing note** was prepared for early reporting on the conference and for communication to those participating in relevant events during UNEA-6. This **conference report** was prepared drawing on all of the meeting discussions in order to help identify the key elements and options for action discussed, together with information on their context.

97. It was recognized that each MEA would use these outputs to report on the Bern III Conference discussions within their own advisory and governing bodies, as well as following up as appropriate with respect to support for implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. Hope was also expressed that the conference had resulted in a strengthened network of “friends of the Bern process”, championing the related issues of cooperation and synergies and support for implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework within their respective MEA negotiations.

98. Following the conference, UNEP will be giving further consideration to how to build on two of the resources developed to support discussion. Consideration will be given to feedback received on the **cross-mapping paper**, and the potential value of revising and communicating all or part of it further. In addition, recognising that many participants saw the **case studies** as being a very valuable contribution to the conference, consideration will be given to how to build and communicate this resource in the future.

99. Closing remarks were made by **Tita Korvenoja** speaking on behalf of UNEP and **Norbert Baerlocher** speaking on behalf of the Government of Switzerland. Tita Korvenoja is Chief of the Environmental Conventions and Policy Branch in the UNEP Law Division, and Norbert Baerlocher is Head of Rio Conventions in the International Affairs Division at the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment. They thanked participants for their very active engagement, and between them recognized that:

- The conference had been valuable in bringing people together in an effective working environment, focusing on key issues for enhancing implementation
- There is benefit in being able to discuss issues of common interest outside of negotiations, seeking areas of mutual interest where we can work together effectively and efficiently
- It has been productive to bring together MEAs from more than one cluster, given their mutual interesting in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
- The Bern III Conference is not stand alone but part of a Bern process which will continue into the future to consider effective solutions for further enhancing cooperation and synergy in MEA implementation
- Building such cooperation and synergies is important at all levels, whether promoting opportunities to work together at the national level or considering more strategic issues at the global level

100. Particular thanks were extended to the Government of Switzerland, the Federal Office for the Environment and the City of Bern, not only for hosting the conference, but also for hosting the reception that took place in the Bern Rathaus on the first night of the conference, where participants were addressed by **Katrin Schneeberger**, Director of the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment and **Alec von Graffenried**, Mayor of the City of Bern. Participants also appreciated the guided tour of Bern organized by the Federal Office for the Environment and led by **Norbert Baerlocher**.



101. Finally, thanks were given for the hard work of the team planning and running the conference led by **Diane Klaimi** from UNEP, and for the work of the conference facilitator **Natasha Walker** and her assistant **Hannah Büttner**, the rapporteur **Jerry Harrison** from the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), and conference co-chairs **Clarisse Kehler Siebert** from Sweden and **Camila Isabel Zepeda Lizama** from Mexico.

## XV. Annex 1 – Provisional Agenda

### Day 1

1. Opening
  - 1.1. Welcoming remarks
  - 1.2. Introduction by the Co-Chairs
  - 1.3. Objectives and programme of the Conference
2. Setting-the-scene
  - 2.1. Kunming Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework: a universal framework for cooperative action
  - 2.2. Relationships between MEAs and KMGBF and potential way forward
  - 2.3. Synergies among thematic clusters of the MEAs
  - 2.4. Overview of case-studies
3. Key topic for deliberation 1:  
*Exploring opportunities for collaborative progress in delivering the KMGBF at the global level*
4. Evening reception

### Day 2

5. Key topic for deliberation 2:  
*Support for planning and implementation of the KMGBF at the national level*
6. Key topic for deliberation 3:  
*Enhancing practical ways and mechanisms that facilitate cooperation for effective implementation of the KMGBF at all levels*
7. Story Telling on the Case-Studies – what works and what’s not working?

### Day 3

8. Key topic for deliberation 3 (continued):  
*Enhancing practical ways and mechanisms that facilitate cooperation for effective implementation of the KMGBF at all levels*
9. Consideration of the results of the Conference
10. Closing

## XVI. Annex 2 – Summary of participants

The conference included representation from the following MEAs:

- Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal
- Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (WHC)
- Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
- Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)
- Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)
- Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention)
- Framework Convention on the Protection and Sustainable Development of the Carpathians
- International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)
- International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA)
- International Whaling Commission (IWC)
- Minamata Convention on Mercury
- Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer
- Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade
- Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants
- United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)

The Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions are collectively known as the BRS conventions

The CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC are collectively known as the Rio conventions

68 of the participants were from national governments and the EU, mostly representing MEAs

These 68 participants represented 44 countries and the EU

27 of the participants were from MEA secretariats, including one from UNEP representing regional seas

Nine of the participants were from civil society and stakeholder groups

One of the participants was from IUCN, which is both host to Ramsar and a WHC advisory body

One of the participants was from the IPBES Secretariat

12 other people were from UN entities, not including the planning and logistics team

## XVII. Annex 3 – List of key upcoming meetings

## Relevant MEA meetings

2024		
Ramsar STRP-26	Gland, Switzerland	5-8 February
CMS COP-14	Samarkand, Uzbekistan	12-17 February
UNFCCC Annual Adaptation Forum	Bonn, Germany	18-19 March
IPPC Commission on Phytosanitary Measures-18	Rome, Italy	15-19 April
IWC Scientific Committee 69B	Bled, Slovenia	22 April – 4 May
CBD SBSTTA-26	Nairobi, Kenya	13-18 May
CBD SBI-4	Nairobi, Kenya	21-29 May
Ramsar Standing Committee 63 <sup>rd</sup> meeting	Gland, Switzerland	3-7 June
UNFCCC intersessional meetings	Bonn, Germany	3-13 June
Montreal Protocol OEWG-46	Montreal, Canada	8-12 July
CITES Plants Committee 27 <sup>th</sup> meeting	Geneva, Switzerland	8-12 July
CITES Animals Committee 33 <sup>rd</sup> meeting	Geneva, Switzerland	12-19 July
World Heritage Committee 46 <sup>th</sup> meeting	New Delhi, India	21-31 July
CBD OEWG-2 on Benefit-sharing from the Use of Digital Sequence Information	Montreal, Canada	12-16 August
IWC-69	Lima, Peru	23-27 September
CBD SBI-5	Cali, Colombia	16-18 October
CMS Standing Committee	Bonn, Germany	TBD
CBD COP-16 and associated meetings	Cali, Colombia	21 October-1 November
Montreal Protocol MOP-36	Bangkok, Thailand	28 October-1 November
UNFCCC COP-29 and associated meetings	Baku, Azerbaijan	11-22 November
UNCCD COP-16	Riyadh, Saudi Arabia	2-13 December
2025		
CITES Standing Committee 78 <sup>th</sup> meeting	Geneva, Switzerland	3-8 February
UNFCCC intersessional meetings	Bonn, Germany	16-26 June
World Heritage Committee 47 <sup>th</sup> session	TBD	TBD
Ramsar COP-15	Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe	23-31 July
CITES COP-20	TBD	TBD
World Heritage General Assembly	TBD	TBD
CBD SBSTTA-27	TBD	TBD
Minamata Convention COP-6	Geneva, Switzerland	3-7 November <sup>4</sup>
Montreal Protocol MOP-37	TBD	3-7 November
ITPGRFA Governing Body 11 <sup>th</sup> Session	TBD	24-29 November
UNFCCC COP-30 and associated meetings	Belem, Brazil	10-21 November

## Other key meetings

2024		
OECP-6	Nairobi, Kenya	19-23 February
UN Environment Assembly 6 <sup>th</sup> Meeting	Nairobi, Kenya	26 February – 1 March
UN Ocean Decade Conference	Barcelona, Spain	10-12 April
INC-4 to develop an international legally binding instrument on plastic pollution	Ottawa, Canada	21-29 April
UN Forum on Forests 19 <sup>th</sup> Session	New York, USA	6-10 May
10 <sup>th</sup> World Water Forum	Bali, Indonesia	18-25 May

<sup>4</sup> The secretariats of the Minamata Convention and the Montreal Protocol are exploring how to resolve the overlap in the dates of the meetings.

International conference on small islands developing states (SIDS4)	Saint John's, Antigua and Barbuda	27-30 May
UNFCCC Local communities and Indigenous Peoples platform	Bonn, Germany	31 May – 1 June
OEWG3: Science-Policy Panel to Contribute Further to the Sound Management of Chemicals and Waste and to Prevent Pollution	Geneva, Switzerland	7-24 June
High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development	New York, USA	8-18 July
FAO Committee on Forestry 27 <sup>th</sup> Session	Rome, Italy	22-26 July
UN General Assembly 79 <sup>th</sup> Session	New York, USA	10-24 September
Summit of the Future	New York, USA	22-23 September
INC-5 to develop and international legally binding instrument on plastic pollution	Busan, Republic of Korea	25 November – 1 December
Global Nature Positive Summit	Sydney, Australia	14-15 October
Global Biodiversity Summit of Cities and Regions	Cali, Colombia	TBD [during CBD COP-16]
IPBES Plenary-11	Windhoek, Namibia	10-16 December 2024
<b>2025</b>		
OEWG for the sixth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management	TBD	TBD
Commission on the Status of Women 69 <sup>th</sup> session	New York, USA	10-21 March
FAO CGRFA - 20	Rome, Italy	24-28 March
UN-Habitat Assembly-2	Nairobi, Kenya	29-30 May
UN Ocean Conference-3	Nice, France	16-20 June (tentative)
IUCN World Conservation Congress	TBD	TBD
UNEA-7	Nairobi, Kenya	8-12 December

**XVIII. Annex 4 – Case studies**

Case study title	Contributor	Indicative content
ABS tandem workshops for national focal points	ITPGRFA Secretariat	Between 2014 and 2018, a number of tandem workshops for national focal points for ITPGRFA and the Nagoya Protocol were organized. These workshops brought together focal points in small groups to facilitate dialogue and improve understanding of their roles, challenges, and the importance of coherence in implementing both instruments at the national level. They also included presentations by experts and discussions on hypothetical scenarios to address overlaps and issues. The workshops promoted collaboration among lead agencies, facilitated the revision of ABS regulations, and helped develop common plans, milestones, and monitoring mechanisms.
Artisanal gold mining and biodiversity (ASGM): restoring the balance	UNEP	The development of National Action Plans (NAPs) to eliminate mercury use in ASGM is a requirement under the Minamata Convention. 27 NAPs submitted by June 2023 expressed concern about observed impacts of ASGM on the surrounding environment and biodiversity, with some NAPs reporting ASGM within or near protected areas. The data and information collected and presented in the NAPs could be used as an important data source for the NBSAPs and for a review of the implementation of the GBF in countries where ASGM occurs. Information from NBSAPs and other relevant strategy documents could also feed into Minamata NAPs.
Biodiversity conservation interventions in Lombardy Region (Italy) through the involvement of private sector	Advisory Committee on Subnational Governments to the CBD, coordinated by Regions <sup>4</sup> and the Government of Quebec	The Lombardy Region, in cooperation with the private sector, has granted non-repayable funding for biodiversity conservation, climate change adaptation, and enhancement of forest ecosystem service through the Bioclima Initiative. The regional funding was 3.5 million Euros.
Biodiversity in the context of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer	UNEP Ozone Secretariat; Environmental Effects Assessment Panel, Montreal Protocol	The Environmental Effects Assessment Panel (EEAP) of the Montreal Protocol assesses the effects of interactions of ozone, ultraviolet radiation, and climate change on the environment, including impacts on biodiversity. EEAP prepares in-depth quadrennial assessment reports on current and projected scientific information relevant to the Protocol within the scope of environmental effects, as well as complementary Q&As, offering science-based assessments to guide collaborative action. EEAP's work has informed other assessment bodies, such as the IPCC.
Capacity-building workshop for national focal points of the MEAs and the Montevideo V Programme to facilitate the implementation of biodiversity and chemicals and waste MEAs	UNEP	The Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA) and UNEP organized a capacity-building workshop for national focal points of MEAs and the Fifth Montevideo Programme for the Development and Periodic Review of Environmental Law, with participation from nine countries in East Africa and the Southern Development Community (SADC) and several MEA secretariats. It focused on promoting synergies between biodiversity and waste conventions at the regional and national levels, facilitating information-sharing, strengthening coordination, and establishing new partnerships.

Case study title	Contributor	Indicative content
Carpathian Biodiversity Framework – regional instrument for implementing the GBF	UNEP Vienna Programme Office - Secretariat of the Carpathian Convention	In 2023, the Carpathian Convention COP-7 adopted the Carpathian Biodiversity Framework, which supports the implementation of the GBF within the Carpathian region. The framework translates global biodiversity goals into regional actions, encouraging stakeholder engagement and facilitating its integration into the NBSAPs of Carpathian countries. It also created avenues for continuous cooperation between the Carpathian Convention and the CBD, ensuring a regular exchange between the secretariats and national focal points of both MEAs. A trilateral Memorandum of Cooperation between CBD, the Alpine Convention, and the Carpathian Convention further supports GBF implementation.
CITES process for alignment with CBD-GBF and IPBES Sustainable Use Assessment	National Commission for the Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO), Mexico	CITES COP-19 instructed the CITES Secretariat to undertake a comparative analysis to illustrate linkages and highlight areas of potential synergy between the CITES Strategic Vision 2021-2030 and the GBF as a starting point for an assessment of how CITES can contribute to implementation of the framework. These discussions resulted in a new format for the implementation report that collects information to enable the Strategic Vision indicators to be monitored. Any relevant data collected that can contribute to the GBF's monitoring framework may be shared by the CITES Secretariat with the CBD Secretariat. In addition, the CITES Animals and Plants Committees established a joint intercessional working group, and the Standing Committee established an intercessional working group to identify elements from the IPBES Assessment Report on the Sustainable Use of Wild Species that may be relevant for CITES implementation.
Conexão Mata Atlântica in Rio de Janeiro	Advisory Committee on Subnational Governments to the CBD, coordinated by Regions4 and the Government of Quebec	Three Brazilian states (Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, and Minas Gerais) and Brazil's Federal Government established the project titled "Conexão Mata Atlântica," which promotes land restoration, biodiversity conservation, and climate change mitigation in the Mata Atlântica region, including through systematic monitoring and payments for ecosystem services. The conservation and restoration actions implemented and the support for implementing agroforestry systems directly contribute to meeting ecosystem conservation targets and restoring degraded areas in zones of high biodiversity importance.
Data Reporting Tool for MEAs – DaRT	UNEP	The Data Reporting Tool for MEAs (DaRT) is a tool developed by UNEP to facilitate coherence in national reporting to biodiversity-related conventions. It provides a single national working space for Parties to organize, share, and maintain information, data, and knowledge across conventions and reporting purposes. DaRT also offers visualization of cross-mapping among strategies of multiple MEAs and NBSAPs. It has been positively received for its ease of use, support for synergies at the national level, and its contribution to reducing the reporting burden. Countries like Cameroon, China, Nigeria, and Switzerland have successfully utilized DaRT for different purposes, resulting in increased efficiency and cooperation.
Data Reporting Tool for MEAs (DaRT) roll-out workshop in China	Deputy Representative of President and Negotiator for CBD COP15, Ministry of Ecology and Environment, P.R. China	UNEP, in collaboration with the Nanjing Institute for Environmental Sciences (NIES) and UNEP-WCMC, has organized a two-day workshop in China about the Data Reporting Tool for MEAs (DaRT). The tool is designed to streamline reporting processes and promote synergies. The workshop brought together, for the first time, China's biodiversity-related MEA focal points alongside other relevant stakeholders to explore how DaRT could be used in the country. Participants were able to practice and provide feedback for further improvement of the tool.

Case study title	Contributor	Indicative content
Developing an LBSAP exploring the importance of participatory approaches in Kochi, India	ICLEI Africa and ICLEI Cities Biodiversity Center	Kochi's municipality developed a Local Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (LBSAP) through a participatory process. The LBSAP helps translate international and national biodiversity policies and targets into implementable action plans at the local level. It has identified nine focus areas and twenty-nine biodiversity goals. The LBSAP also includes provisions relating to climate change, mangroves, and the conservation of bird migratory paths (which supports the implementation of the Ramsar Convention, the CMS, and the UNFCCC).
Ecological tax distribution in Brazil	Advisory Committee on Subnational Governments to the CBD, coordinated by Regions4 and the Government of Quebec, on behalf of Paraná (Brazil)	The "Ecological ICMS" initiative in the state of Paraná, Brazil, was established in 1991 and is currently ongoing. It involves the distribution of tax revenues to municipalities based on environmental conservation criteria. This led to a significant increase in protected areas' cover and the creation of biological corridors. Paraná gained international recognition, receiving praise from the United Nations and the Henry Ford Award as a top-ten global ecological project. Currently, 16 Brazilian states use environmental criteria for "ICMS" resource distribution among municipalities.
Enhancing national coordination to implement Brazil's commitments with all global biodiversity conventions and to update and implement Brazil's NBSAP and the GBF	Brazilian Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MMA), Brazil	Brazil is in the process of expanding the mandate of its National Biodiversity Committee (CONABIO) to include the coordination of implementation of all global biodiversity conventions and protocols. In addition, the Brazilian Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change co-organized a consultation workshop in 2023 focused on the 23 GBF targets, which brought together experts from all Brazilian states and prepared proposals for national targets. The Ministry is also establishing a Permanent Task Force to coordinate the update and implementation of the country's NBSAP.
Establishment of Regional Learning Hub for the implementation of the GBF and the Paris Agreement	Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP) and International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB)	The Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP) and the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB) established a Regional Learning Hub for the implementation of the GBF and the Paris Agreement. Since 2019, the AIPP's annual conference has served as a forum for Indigenous Peoples and other Indigenous stakeholders to stock-take the implementation of the CBD and the UNFCCC at the local level. The 2023 Conference resulted in a three-year action plan to facilitate the full and effective participation of Indigenous Peoples in the implementation of NBSAPs and NDCs.
Example of financing and implementing national 30x30 plans to achieve Target 3 in the GBF	Campaign for Nature	SPACES is a consortium that provides technical support to low and middle-income countries in the development of national plans and related policy and financial strategies to achieve target 3 of the GBF. In partnership with SPACES, Panama has developed a comprehensive implementation plan for Target 3 based on integrated spatial planning. The implementation plan jointly addresses the protection of nature and climate change mitigation.
Examples from the GYBN Community of youth-led actions to support Synergies between MEAs	Global Youth Biodiversity Network (GYBN)	GYBN national chapters from all over the world and partner youth constituencies have organized a large number of activities, projects, and campaigns on all levels (global, regional, national) that have contributed to the implementation of targets under various MEAs as well as to the coordination of youth actions working on different international processes, contributing to synergies. Examples of the main GYBN contributions to creating synergies include the organization of youth consultations, participation in national-level initiatives relating to NBSAP-NDC implementation, and awareness-raising campaigns.



Case study title	Contributor	Indicative content
GBF as an opportunity to streamline EU & Member States environmental planning, monitoring and reporting	European Union	The EU is committed to further streamlining environmental planning, monitoring, and reporting obligations across the board. The GBF offers a solid binding basis for streamlining EU and national environmental planning and reporting. For example, the EU Governance of the Energy Union and Climate Action supports aligned, coordinated processes across the EU and Member States for target-setting, monitoring, and reporting. The EC Knowledge Centre for Biodiversity (KCBD) and its Science Service for Biodiversity are supporting these developments by setting up <i>ad hoc</i> technical groups with the objective of working on a detailed technical overview of the methods used. If successful, this work could result in technical guidance papers.
Identifying needs for integrating One Health and NBSAPs	UNEP Asia and the Pacific Office	In September 2023, the Asia-Pacific Quadripartite One Health Workshop, jointly organized by FAO, UNEP, WHO, and WOA, brought together representatives from seventeen countries in the Asia-Pacific region to discuss plans for implementing the One Health Joint Plan of Action at the national level. During the workshop, a number of countries expressed the need to integrate One Health into their NBSAPs, recognizing the interconnections between human health, animal health, ecosystem health, and food security.
Improving access to guidance that supports building of cooperation and synergies in implementation of biodiversity-related MEAs	UNEP-WCMC	As part of a joint UNEP and CBD Secretariat project supporting the implementation of CBD COP decision XIII/24 on cooperation, a series of 'compendia' of guidance was published in 2018. UNEP-WCMC has now developed the compendia into an interactive online resource within DaRT, which allows users to add new resources. The tool is available at <a href="https://dart.informea.org/compendia">https://dart.informea.org/compendia</a> .
Increased coherence in national reporting requires engagement of whole-of-society and whole-of-government	Marine Ecosystems Protected Areas Trust (MEPA Trust)	Community-based actions contribute to the achievement of many global targets and goals. In Antigua and Barbuda, the MEPA Trust brought together local groups, National Focal Points, and experts to discuss and develop case studies that highlighted synergies between the various conventions. Five of them were included in the country's Sixth National Report. The case study also highlights the added value of synergies between the Escazu Agreement and the GBF.
Indigenous Peoples specially indigenous women Capacity Building on NBSAPs	Indigenous Women Biodiversity Network for Latin America and Caribbean Region (RMIB-LAC) and International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB)	The Indigenous Women Biodiversity Network for Latin America and Caribbean Region (RMIB-LAC) and the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB), in collaboration with several partners, organized the "Virtual Course for Indigenous Peoples, especially women and youth, on the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework." One hundred and thirteen participants attended, and six participants received funding to implement "advocacy plans" relating to NBSAPs' implementation at the local level.
International cooperation on a Lynx Initiative to generate joint conservation actions under the Convention on Migratory Species	Secretariat of the Carpathian Convention	The Macedonian Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning, along with other environmental ministries of Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Uzbekistan, submitted a proposal for listing the Eurasian Lynx in Appendix II of CITES and the critically endangered subspecies Balkan Lynx in Appendix I of CITES. This listing aims to enhance lynx conservation on a policy level, attract more funding, and promote transboundary cooperation among neighbouring range countries. The listing proposal received positive feedback and will be discussed at the CMS COP in February 2024.

Case study title	Contributor	Indicative content
IPLCs Capacity Building on NBSAPs	International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity	The Indigenous Information Network has contributed to networking, coordination, and information exchange between Indigenous stakeholders in the African Region. This included maintaining communication and sharing materials on the GBF and its implementation through online media channels, especially WhatsApp. Indigenous Information Network and IIFB have worked with various actors to ensure capacity building and effective implementation of the GBF. For example, in Kenya, they worked with the Ministry of Environment and other key partners to strengthen cooperation in the development and implementation of the NBSAP.
IWC Conservation Management Plans: a framework for transboundary conservation	International Whaling Commission	Conservation Management Plans (CMPs) provide a framework to facilitate collaborative efforts among countries and stakeholders for the protection and recovery of vulnerable cetacean populations. These science-driven plans are focused on practical management actions, emphasizing scientific advice and involving governments and experts. The CMPs promoted increased collaboration and communication between the IWC and CMS towards ensuring that priority actions relating to the species involved can benefit the objectives of both MEAs.
Joint CITES-CMS African Carnivores Initiative (ACI)	CMS Secretariat	The Joint CITES-CMS African Carnivores Initiative (ACI) was established in 2020. It aims to support the conservation of iconic African predators like lions, cheetahs, leopards, and African wild dogs, whose populations are declining. This initiative is a collaborative effort between the CMS and CITES. It helps drive more effective conservation of carnivores, avoids duplication of activities, generates resources, and pools funds and expertise. It also creates opportunities for donors to allocate resources to well-coordinated and internationally recognized conservation actions.
KAZA Carnivore Conservation Coalition - A Case Study for Transboundary Conservation	CITES Management Authority, Department of National Parks and Wildlife, Ministry of Tourism, Zambia	The KAZA Carnivore Conservation Coalition (KCC) was established in 2015 to address large carnivore conservation challenges in the Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area (KAZA). The Coalition identified five focal areas and focused on five-year plans for 18 priority projects. It adopted a collaborative approach to implementation, which engaged 177 participants from over 100 organizations and brought together government wildlife authorities from KAZA states. The Coalition was formalized as a sub-working group of the KAZA Treaty institutional framework and prepared a clear strategy providing a roadmap and framework for action.
Mediterranean Climate Action Partnership (MCAP)	Advisory Committee on Subnational Governments to the CBD, coordinated by Regions4 and the Government of Quebec	The Mediterranean Climate Action Partnership was launched at COP28. It represents a global alliance of regions with a Mediterranean climate. The partnership seeks to encourage the sharing of information, facilitate capacity-building, and exchange of approaches in cross-cutting policy areas, among other things. It also aims at accelerating concrete actions in the Mediterranean region to protect communities from climate change impacts while reducing greenhouse gas pollution, conserving ecosystems, halting biodiversity loss, implementing nature-based climate solutions, increasing nature restoration, and promoting a clean energy transition.
Multidisciplinary hub of expertise on sustainable management in the littoral zone of Lake Saint-Pierre, a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve (Québec, Canada)	Advisory Committee on Subnational Governments to the CBD, coordinated by Regions and the Government of Quebec	The Government of Québec created a multidisciplinary Hub in 2018 to develop sustainable agriculture and protect the ecosystem of Lake Saint-Pierre. Following a stakeholder consultation, the Hub presented its 2019-2022 research program, comprising 25 projects led by almost 30 researchers from participant universities. 25 agricultural producers were actively involved in scientific work by making farmland available and, in some cases, by conducting field operations. The Hub's governance structure involves several key stakeholders.

Case study title	Contributor	Indicative content
Multi-stakeholders dialogues for more equitable and inclusive conservation. Case study from Indonesia, 2020	WWF International	The Working Group for ICCAs in Indonesia, a platform for national civil society organizations, organized two multi-stakeholder dialogues in 2020 to foster the recognition of indigenous conservation in the context of the CBD. These dialogues brought together Indigenous Leaders and representatives from the Ministries of Environment and Forestry and the Ministry of Marine Affairs. They initiated a process to help build a common and integrated vision around the recognition, mainstreaming, and support of indigenous biodiversity governance practices in conservation and climate resilience.
National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan	Ministry of the Environment, Finland	Cooperation and exchange between national focal points from different MEAs has been institutionalized in Finland for over twenty years. The preparation of the revised NBSAP has involved focal points of all other relevant biodiversity-related conventions, other Rio Conventions, chemicals conventions, the international agreement on Forests (IAF), and the GEF. It also engaged all relevant ministries and stakeholders, including youth and IPLCs (Saami). The new NBSAP will be approved by Government in 2024.
NBSAP Accelerator Partnership	German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection (BMUV)	The NBSAP Accelerator Partnership contributes to greater biodiversity action and the implementation of GBF-aligned NBSAPs. The partnership provides a matchmaking service (to enable countries to access existing technical and financial resources to elevate their NBSAP ambitions) and an in-country facilitation service (country, regional, or transboundary liaisons). The partnership fosters stronger synergies, integration and alignment in the planning and implementation of conservation and sustainable use plans and strategies, and coherence between the nexus of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), recognizing that the increasing and projected impacts of climate change critically threaten biodiversity.
Participation of relevant stakeholders for implementation of GBF and synergies among biodiversity-related conventions	Minister Advisor on Biodiversity and National Focal Points of CBD, Ramsar and CMS, Ministry of Environment of Egypt	This case study addressed how Egypt adopted a participatory approach in the process of updating the country's NBSAP in accordance with the GBF. Tools and guidance from UNEP, as well as plain language, were used in the process. The outcome recommendations underscored the importance of online monitoring and reporting, capacity-building, enhancing the national liaison group on biodiversity-related conventions, and establishing a national committee with all relevant focal points to implement a national programme and follow up on emerging issues from all biodiversity-related conventions.
Practical support for sustainable whale watching: an international partnership	International Whaling Commission	The IWC partnered with the CMS to develop the Whale Watching Handbook, which is a comprehensive, evolving resource available in three languages (English, French, and Spanish). The handbook seeks to promote sustainable whale watching for both the well-being of whale populations and the economies dependent on them. It offers international best practices, educational resources, scientific information, and an interactive map with country profiles.
Promoting synergies between food systems transformation and MEA implementation	UNEP Asia and the Pacific Office	In the third quarter of 2023, FAO and UNEP, in collaboration with the UN Food Systems Coordination Hub and other partners, organized technical workshops for representatives of planning, agriculture, and environment ministries in Southeast Asia and South Asia. The workshops highlighted the need to strengthen the environmental dimensions of food systems in both national agrifood systems pathways and action plans. Participants also suggested specific entry points and opportunities to assist such process (e.g., through connecting with MEA implementation such as NBSAPs, NDCs, and NAPs).

Case study title	Contributor	Indicative content
Promoting synergies in implementing NBSAPs	UNEP Asia and the Pacific Office	With the technical support of UNEP and IUCN, the ministries of natural resources and environment Lao PDR and Thailand developed national action plans for promoting synergies among biodiversity-related conventions and SDGs in the implementation of NBSAPs. These plans were developed and validated through national consultations that brought together national focal points of key biodiversity-related conventions including CBD, CITES, CMS, Ramsar and WHC. The plans include practical actions for increased coordination in monitoring and reporting, a better understanding of the linkages between NBSAPs and relevant biodiversity-related strategies and action plans, and improved information and knowledge management, among other things.
Regional Dialogue on Biodiversity Beyond Borders and Raptor Monitoring Strategy for West Asia	UNEP Regional Office for West Asia	The UNEP Regional Office for West Asia partnered with CMS Secretariat and its Abu Dhabi Office to hold a regional dialogue focusing on strengthening regional cooperation for biodiversity and ecosystems in West Asia. The dialogue brought together national focal points of biodiversity-related MEAs, including CBD, CMS, and CITES. It aimed at identifying priorities, opportunities, and practical experiences for regional cooperation. Key outcomes included an enhanced understanding of the GBF and the identification of key priorities for regional cooperation in the next two years, namely, NBSAP revisions, data sharing, regional Migratory Flyway conservation, and regional cooperation platforms.
Reviewing the UK Biodiversity Indicators for the GBF	Joint Nature Conservation Committee, United Kingdom	The UK, through JNCC and Defra, is reviewing the UK Biodiversity Indicators in the light of the GBF and its monitoring framework. The review is ongoing and has included so far: consultation with each of the UK's four-country administrations; the deconstruction of the complex GBF goals and targets into discrete 'components' / 'component-targets' and identification of relevant headline, component and complementary indicators; and mapping of existing UK and country-level indicators to the deconstructed framework to identify gaps. Indicators can focus on outcomes that are common across multiple MEAs and the SDGs.
Reviving endangered species and critical habitats: A participatory approach to biodiversity conservation	Ministry of Climate Change and Environmental Coordination, Pakistan	Since the early 1990s, Pakistan has been implementing a community-based trophy hunting program, which generates revenue used for wildlife protection and local community development. Provincial wildlife authorities designated community-managed conservation areas, managed according to Conservation Management Plans with clear roles for local communities. This initiative has increased wildlife protection and social benefits, leading to its replication in other parts of Pakistan. The protection of species through sustainable use of natural resources and sharing of resources with local communities contributes to the priorities of all the relevant biodiversity-related conventions.
Sharm El-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda partners with CWN to mainstream the whole-of-government approach in reporting and monitoring	ICLEI Africa and ICLEI Cities Biodiversity Center	ICLEI, TNC, and IUCN launched the CitiesWithNature initiative, which serves as an online 'one-stop-shop' for all levels of subnational governments to share and report on their actions in contributing to achieving global biodiversity targets. Since its launch, over three hundred commitments have been made through the platform in support of the GBF implementation. The platform helps cities to set their targets, track progress, and compare actions with other cities, both nationally and globally.

Case study title	Contributor	Indicative content
Strengthening of the regional governance on transboundary ecosystems using international designation mechanisms in Central America	Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)	This work funded by JICA aims to identify tools and mechanisms to strengthen transboundary land governance within the framework of the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor. It focuses on four specific ecosystems (Selva Maya, Fonseca Bay, La Amistad, and Monte Cristi), which encompass internationally designated areas including Biosphere Reserves, Ramsar sites, and World Heritage Sites. Pilot activities are implemented in selected countries and include the analysis of existing spatial plans. The results indicate that the peripheries of legally protected areas hold great potential for collaboration with indigenous and local communities, enhancing local land governance, which can promote the recognition of OECMs.
Subnational cooperation across borders - Group of Leading Subnational Governments toward Global Biodiversity Targets (GoLS)	Advisory Committee on Subnational Governments to the CBD, coordinated by Regions4 and the Government of Quebec	The "Group of Leading Subnational Governments toward Global Biodiversity Targets" (GoLS) brings together subnational governments from around the world to share experiences and case studies, as well as develop awareness-raising materials in support of the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.
Supporting national policies by subnational governments	Advisory Committee on Subnational Governments to the CBD, coordinated by Regions4 and the Government of Quebec	The Prefecture of Aichi launched a program to support the 'Other effective area-based conservation measure' (OECM) national certification system and is building the capacity of corporate stakeholders to conserve biodiversity.
Synergies between WHC and CITES in protecting the vaquita, flagship species of the UNESCO World Heritage site "Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California" (Mexico)	UNESCO World Heritage Centre; CITES Secretariat	The UNESCO World Heritage site "Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California" in Mexico is the last habitat of the critically endangered vaquita ( <i>Phocoena sinus</i> ). At the request of the CITES Standing Committee, Mexico has prepared a CITES compliance action plan to address this issue. Parallel to that, with support from the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and IUCN, Mexico has been developing corrective measures under the WHC as well as indicators that could guide decisions on a future removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Regular consultations between the CITES Secretariat and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre ensure coordination and mutual support in addressing the protection of the vaquita and its habitat.
Use of the Belem work programme on indicators for measuring progress achieved towards the 2030 adaptation target	EU (European Commission)	In the context of the two-year UAE–Belém work programme (2023-2025), the EU is committed to aligning its work on indicators with other global frameworks, such as the GBF and its monitoring framework. The contributor pointed out that the UAE–Belém work programme provides a concrete opportunity with a clear timeframe and milestones for the EU to align science-based indicators, metrics, and targets to increase consistency of and streamline reporting on interlinked objectives across the three Rio conventions. This work is to be undertaken in line with existing scientific and technological advice bodies and science-policy interfaces of the three Rio conventions (IPCC, IPBES, SPI).
Whole-of-society, whole-of-government approach in engagement	National Environment Management Authority of Uganda	The case study enumerates concrete examples of initiatives taken by Uganda to foster synergies at the national level for the implementation of multiple MEAs through a whole-of-society, whole-of-government approach. These include the development and implementation of cross-cutting legislation, integrated reporting under Minamata, and a joint project for the implementation of BRS and Minamata conventions, and the CBD.

### XIX. Annex 5 – Views of participants on the conference

During the final session, the facilitator asked participants to reflect on the conference and to provide feedback on what surprised them, what they missed, and what they loved about the conference. While recognising that these are the personal reflections of individuals, the observations have potential value in the planning of future meetings and have therefore been summarised below.

<b>Surprised</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity to better <b><i>understand what other MEAs are doing</i></b></li> <li>• The <b><i>concrete proposals for action</i></b> discussed</li> <li>• More <b><i>support for local and subnational</i></b> government than was expected</li> <li>• Some discussions sounded like <b><i>reinventing the wheel</i></b></li> <li>• The <b><i>impetus for cooperation</i></b> provided by the Framework and its targets</li> <li>• Our <b><i>progress still seems very slow</i></b> given the level of agreement on need</li> <li>• The number of <b><i>MEAs and relevant stakeholders</i></b> invited and actively participating</li> <li>• Significant <b><i>call for mindset change</i></b>, yet there was little real discussion on this</li> <li>• The <b><i>regional MEAs not well integrated</i></b> in the Bern process to date</li> <li>• The number of <b><i>good ideas and different point of views</i></b> that were shared</li> <li>• The apparent <b><i>willingness of all MEAs involved</i></b> to move forward on synergies</li> <li>• Good spirits, positive energy, <b><i>genuinely constructive and positive engagement</i></b></li> <li>• That we have <b><i>many MEAs doing related things</i></b> with similar goals but in isolation</li> <li>• Supporting <b><i>local action</i></b> as a priority wasn't the principal focus</li> <li>• Diversity of participants, and <b><i>diversity</i></b> of views</li> <li>• Involvement of MEAs <b><i>beyond the biodiversity cluster</i></b></li> <li>• The broad <b><i>range of topics discussed</i></b> and the level of in-depth discussion</li> <li>• The <b><i>amount of agreement</i></b> on what needs to be done</li> <li>• Apparent <b><i>disconnect</i></b> between national offices and secretariats</li> </ul>
<b>Missed</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More <b><i>time to reflect</i></b> – the pace of the meeting was quite relentless</li> <li>• Meeting was <b><i>too short to substantively address</i></b> all of the issues</li> <li>• More discussion on <b><i>building stronger linkages</i></b> and motivating day-to-day collaboration</li> <li>• More discussion on <b><i>concrete joint actions</i></b> to achieve different targets in the Framework</li> <li>• How to move forward with other MEAs in terms of <b><i>harmonizing terminologies</i></b></li> <li>• A focus on <b><i>practical priorities</i></b> at national level and among MEAs</li> <li>• More <b><i>discussion on themes or issues</i></b> given the opportunity of so many MEAs at the table</li> <li>• The space for the <b><i>MEAs to give a brief update</i></b> on their work, given so many new people</li> <li>• Need more <b><i>involvement of regional and thematic MEAs</i></b> in the Bern process</li> <li>• More <b><i>representation from parties</i></b></li> <li>• Engagement of other <b><i>international organisations</i></b> and processes in the conference</li> <li>• Understanding of <b><i>constraints</i></b> limiting action</li> <li>• A focus on the most <b><i>urgent and practical</i></b> next steps and actions to be taken</li> <li>• Clearer identification of <b><i>final take home message</i></b> and concrete recommendations</li> </ul>
<b>Loved</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b><i>informal nature</i></b> of the meeting allowing free discussion</li> <li>• Effectively <b><i>facilitated discussions</i></b> with approaches that enabled full participation</li> <li>• The <b><i>constructive spirit</i></b> in which discussions were held</li> <li>• Openness of participants from across MEAs to <b><i>sharing knowledge and experience</i></b></li> <li>• The <b><i>non-political nature</i></b> of the discussions</li> <li>• That so many <b><i>case studies</i></b> were presented on work already under way</li> <li>• The feeling of a <b><i>biodiversity family</i></b> emerging</li> </ul>

- The *walking tour* of Bern city centre