



**CBD**



## **Convention on Biological Diversity**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BRC/WS/1/INF/2  
10 February 2016

ENGLISH ONLY

---

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

### **CASE STUDIES**

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

1. The Executive Secretary is circulating herewith a compilation of case studies submitted by the following Parties to the biodiversity-related conventions: Bosnia and Herzegovina; Latvia; Moldova, Serbia and Ukraine, and by the Western European and Others Group (WEOG).
2. The submissions are being circulated in the form and language in which they were received by the Secretariat.

**Case study**  
**Bosnia and Herzegovina**

Template for case studies that may be shared prior to the workshop and presented during relevant sessions of the workshop:

6. Please provide a brief overview of the current level of cooperation in the implementation of the

biodiversity-related conventions in your country.

- To which biodiversity-related convention is your country a party to?
- Is the cooperation formal or informal (e.g. are there coordination mechanisms among national focal points/ responsible offices and other key stakeholders, national biodiversity committees, working groups etc.)
- What are the benefits of cooperation?

Bosnia and Herzegovina is a party to the following conventions:

- Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
- Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)
- Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Convention)
- Convention concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (WHC).

The cooperation in the implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions is occasional and cooperation arrangements are mainly informal. The consultation mechanisms are temporary and mainly focus on certain issues, such as preparing national reports to the conventions, preparation/revision of NBSAP and preparation for COPs.

The only formal cooperation mechanism in BiH is Memorandum of Understanding on establishment of environmental monitoring system signed by the entity governments and the Council of Ministers of BiH, which identifies relevant institutions for all components of the environment, including nature and biodiversity, but, unfortunately, it is not carried out properly.

6. Please describe one or two specific challenges that you have experienced in your country in order

to enhance cooperation in the implementation of two or more of the biodiversity-related conventions.

The main challenges for enhancing cooperation in the implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions is lack of infrastructural and institutional support for adequate cooperation and implementation of conventions, lack of capacities for coordination and cooperation for implementation of biodiversity-related conventions and lack of formal mechanism for enhanced cooperation.

The competencies in the field of nature and environmental protection are defined at the level of the state, entities (Federation of BiH and Republic of Srpska), Brcko District and 10 cantons. Thus designed system hinders the flow of information in horizontal and vertical directions, which is one of the main problems in this sector. The nature and environmental protection issues are primarily the issues of sectoral policies, which further complicate the process of planning, implementation and monitoring of all activities involving the protection of nature and environment.

The need to establish and strengthen the capacities has been recognized, particularly in terms of the state of the environment and implementation of the conventions. The role of the institutions in charge of the implementation of the conventions and related European directives and initiatives is not clearly defined.

Except the Focal Point, there are no capacities in BiH in charge of the implementation of the conventions. At the state level, there is no professional institution in charge of issues concerning the evaluation of natural values and heritage and for the development of a legislative and institutional framework for a sustainable development thereof. In Federation of BiH (entity level), there is no professional institution for carrying out professional tasks in the nature/biodiversity conservation. There is no single designated institution dealing with the issue of biodiversity and collecting, keeping and analyzing biodiversity-related data at the entity or state level. This field is regulated and monitored through various bodies and institutions that regulate biodiversity issues partially. Unfortunately, cooperation and flow of information among institutions are not at satisfying level. Collecting the statistical data on the environment and biodiversity is still not part of the entity/state data collection systems.

Stakeholders' participation in management and decision-making regarding the implementation of the conventions is insufficient.

6. Please describe what was done in order to overcome these challenges? What were the considerations in choosing an adequate response option to overcome the challenges?

Very little has been done in terms of enhancing cooperation in the implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions. Beside the lack of financial means and lack of high level support, the main reason is lack of capacities and lack of personnel resulting in insufficient inter-sectoral cooperation and effective flow of information and knowledge.

One of the positive examples of enhancement of inter-sectoral cooperation and synergies in the implementation of biodiversity-related conventions is KARST project „Mainstreaming Karst Peatlands Conservation into Key Economic Sectors“ implemented in period 2008-2013. The main objective of the project was to strengthen the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming the requirements for conservation of karst and peatland biodiversity into productive sectors (water use, mining) and spatial planning at federal and cantonal level. Beside the importance of conservation of biodiversity, the project is of importance for the implementation of Ramsar convention, as it was focused on one of the Ramsar sites identified in BiH (Livanjsko polje).

Establishment and functioning of Environmental Protection Fund of Federation of BiH and the Environmental Protection and Energy Efficiency Fund of Republic of Srpska contributed to enhancement of the institutional framework for improvement of biodiversity protection.

Also, it is important to mention the adoption of new Law on Nature Protection of Federation of BiH (2013) and Law on Nature Protection of Republic of Srpska that are harmonized with the respective EU Directives on Habitats and on Birds with respect to nature protection issues.

4. What was the outcome?

-

5. What are remaining challenges?

It is necessary to develop and strengthen the administrative structure at all levels as the current capacities for the implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions and the development of legislation in line with EU requirements are not sufficient.

It is necessary to put emphasis on linking the institutions and creating a functional framework aimed at implementing the conventions. It is necessary to precisely define the organizational structure of all conventions and to take a uniform approach (implementation structure that would be common to biodiversity-related conventions). It is necessary to prescribe the responsibilities and organizational structure of the NFPs.

It is necessary to further strengthen flow information and knowledge between NFPs and other stakeholders engaged in the implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions. This would allow the inclusion of timely and accurate information in decision-making processes.

6. What are potential activities/ response options at national/ regional/ global level to overcome these remaining challenges?

An opportunity to increase cooperation and collaboration among the biodiversity-related conventions at the national level could be establishment of National Biodiversity Committee, formal mechanism for cooperation and collaboration comprises of NFPs, representatives of relevant ministries and institutions dealing with nature/biodiversity issues that will have meeting on regularly basis, e.g. 4 times per year.

The national website of the CBD Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) should be used as a tool for sharing information on activities of each convention.

Activities at the regional level to increase cooperation among biodiversity-related activities could include better information sharing, regional meetings for NFPs of the biodiversity-related conventions, joint assessment of financial needs for implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions, developing regional funding proposals, development of Regional BSAP.

7. What are the general lessons learnt from this experience that you want to share with other countries that may be experiencing similar challenges?

-

## CASE STUDY

### LATVIA

Template for case studies that may be shared prior to the workshop and presented during relevant sessions of the workshop:

6. Please provide a brief overview of the current level of cooperation in the implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions in your country.
  - To which biodiversity-related convention is your country a party to?
  - Is the cooperation formal or informal (e.g. are there coordination mechanisms among national focal points/ responsible offices and other key stakeholders, national biodiversity committees, working groups etc.)
  - What are the benefits of cooperation?
2. Please describe one or two specific challenges that you have experienced in your country in order to enhance cooperation in the implementation of two or more of the biodiversity-related conventions.
3. Please describe what was done in order to overcome these challenges? What were the considerations in choosing an adequate response option to overcome the challenges?
4. What was the outcome?
5. What are remaining challenges?
6. What are potential activities/ response options at national/ regional/ global level to overcome these remaining challenges?

What are the general lessons learnt from this experience that you want to share with other countries that may be experiencing similar challenges?

---

1. Latvia is a party to almost all mentioned conventions. I did not have possibility to check about ITPGRFA, (I will provide this information tomorrow). We are party to all other conventions.

Cooperation between IPPC and other conventions is informal and in national level rather recently started. There is not yet coordination mechanism among responsible persons for those previously mentioned conventions, but we start to build it this year.

Latvia is also a party to Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA). Latvian law about it (that makes Treaty in force in Latvia) is from 7<sup>th</sup> May, 2004.

The benefits of cooperation would be a better result of similar duty accomplishment.

2. One specific challenge is invasive alien species. This is a challenge also in regional and international level. This is mostly challenge between CBD and IPPC convention as for one convention they are invasive alien species, but for another – pests and each convention has built specific system how to deal with them. Organisation of responsible bodies differs in all levels. Specific tasks are done by several responsible bodies. Synergy is not easy.

3. Cooperation has been started with firstly information exchange. Other things are still in process.

4. It would help a lot if in international level practical cooperation would start.

5. There are minimizing un minimizing challenges about information exchange, reporting and implementation aspects.

6. Reporting could be made jointly internationally to be able to report once for the same thing. Early warning system could be built jointly using nowadays technology offered options.

7. The importance of good cooperation is very important. Joint efforts in solving problems could help. Cooperation in international level would help to national level a lot. It would be cheaper to do things in national level if more things solved internationally. Wider knowledges in different fields helps to solve problems faster and easier.

-

**Case study on synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions  
(with contributions from Moldova, Serbia and Ukraine)**

6. Ukraine is a Party to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and the World Heritage Convention (WHC).

There is cooperation in Ukraine between biodiversity-related conventions on both formal and informal levels. However, there is no a kind of formal body or working group where all the biodiversity-related conventions are represented and which coordinate all the issues covered by those treaties. Rather, there is a number of working groups or councils which has specific tasks and take into consideration provisions of different biodiversity-related MEAs where appropriate. The examples of such groups in Ukraine are:

- Working group on nature protection established at the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine (MENRU) by relevant Ministerial order No. 321 of 16.10.2014. The main task of the group is harmonization of the Ukrainian legislation in line with Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds and Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and wild fauna and flora. The members of the Working groups include focal points and/or stakeholders and experts relevant to CBD, Ramsar, WHC, CITES and CMS.
- Coordination Council on Ramsar Convention established at the MENRU and responsible for coordination of activities for implementation of Ramsar Convention at the national level. The working group involves the focal points of Ramsar, WHC, CITES and CMS;
- Interagency working group on the conservation of carnivores established by the MENRU Order No. 304 of 08.07.2013 aimed at elaborating conservation and management measures for such carnivores as wolf, bear, lynx and wild cat. The working group involves focal point and experts for CBD, CITES and Convention on the Protection of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention).

Serbia has informed that the shining example (for the some kind of enhancing the cooperation in the implementation of biodiversity related conventions) is that the working group (for the revision of Strategy on Biological Diversity of Republic of Serbia for the period 2011-2018 with Action Plan) has been formed, including also the national focal points as members (among others).

In order to harmonize the National Strategy on Biodiversity with Strategic Plan UN Convention on Biological Diversity 2011-2020, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, the working group of the Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection attended the seminars and meetings, dedicated to revision of Strategy on Biological Diversity of Republic of Serbia for the period 2011-2018 with Action Plan and jointly worked.

Moldova has provided information on prohibition hunting for migratory waterfowl by Governmental Decision No. 495 of 08.12.2015 on carrying out hunting in the 2015–2016 season.

Also, by signing by the Association Agreement with the European Union, Moldova has committed to harmonize the national legislation with a number of EU

Directives, including Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds and Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. In particular we refer to the requirements of European legislation regarding the inclusion in national legislation of the following provisions:

- Establishing special conservation measures to protect migratory species those appear regularly on the territory of Moldova;
- Assessment of bird species requiring special conservation measures and migratory species those appear regularly on the territory of Moldova;
- Identification and designation of special protection areas for birds.

Also, by signing by the Association Agreement with the European Union, Moldova has committed to harmonize the national legislation with a number of EU Directives, including Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds and Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. In particular we refer to the requirements of European legislation regarding the inclusion in national legislation of the following provisions:

- Establishing special conservation measures to protect migratory species those appear regularly on the territory of Moldova;
- Assessment of bird species requiring special conservation measures and migratory species those appear regularly on the territory of Moldova;
- Identification and designation of special protection areas for birds.

Also, by signing by the Association Agreement with the European Union, Moldova has committed to harmonize the national legislation with a number of EU Directives, including Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds and Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. In particular we refer to the requirements of European legislation regarding the inclusion in national legislation of the following provisions:

- establishing special conservation measures to protect migratory species those appear regularly on the territory of Moldova;
- assessment of bird species requiring special conservation measures and migratory species those appear regularly on the territory of Moldova;
- identification and designation of special protection areas for birds.

The case of Moldova is an example on how the political document like Association Agreement has encouraged taking into account specific provisions relevant to the conservation of migratory species in biodiversity-related conventions like CMS.

In Ukraine, at the legal level, some coordination among the biodiversity related MEA can be considered while working out the National Action Plan on the Environmental Protection for 2010–2015 adopted by the Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine No. 577-r of 25.05.2011. The Plan is a comprehensive set of measures covering different environmental aspects including biodiversity conservation and includes specific actions relevant to CBD, Ramsar Convention, CITES, CMS and WHC.

New draft National Action Plan for 2016–2020 has been elaborated where the same approach is applied.



Benefits of cooperation among the biodiversity-related convention at the national level include increasing of effectiveness of their implementation, wise use and sharing of limited financial and human resources, networking of biodiversity experts.

6. One of challenges is that while a certain level of cooperation exists between some conventions focal points of which are working in the same governmental body (e.g. CBD, CITES, CMS, Ramsar Convention and WHC focal points are MENRU employees), other conventions, like IPPC in case of Ukraine, can be considered to be out of cooperation to some extent.
  6. A way to overcome the above challenge is taking IPPC considerations as well as issues relevant to other biodiversity related conventions while working on a new draft of National Action Plan on Environmental Protection for 2016–2020 and it was done by wide discussion of the draft among the all interested governmental bodies, stakeholders and public. Also, Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, including Aichi biodiversity targets, adopted by CBD COP10 where widely used as a framework document while compiling the new Action Plan.
4. The outcome of the work is that the National Action Plan on Environmental Protection for 2016–2020 has already been elaborated and expected to be adopted in the near future.
5. The remaining challenges are not sufficient level of cooperation between different institutions and governmental bodies on the matters related to cooperation of biodiversity-related convention and lack of specific national coordination mechanism to address this issue.
6. Potential activities / response options at national/regional/global level to overcome these remaining challenges can be:
- convene a number regional/national workshops on enhancement cooperation of biodiversity-related convention taking into account a specificity of a certain region or country with involvement of focal points and stakeholders;
  - develop the region and/or country specific guidelines;
  - invite countries if they found this appropriate to designate a biodiversity-related conventions focal point aimed at specific task to enhance cooperation between the conventions on the national level;
  - use other regional biodiversity related MEAs like Bern convention or instruments established under CMS (AEWA, ACCOBAMS, EUROBATS) as tools to enhance cooperation between global biodiversity-related conventions.
7. The general lessons learnt are:
- there should be understanding on the necessity of enhancement of cooperation between biodiversity-related convention at the national/regional level;
  - involvement of the focal points of biodiversity-related conventions in the work of related working groups is an asset;
  - inclusion of biodiversity-related conventions issues in the politic documents like Environmental National Action Plans and/or Strategies is important.



### **Case studies and comments on synergies from WEOG**

Please find comments, inputs and case studies in regard to discussions on synergies based on regional consultations within the WEOG region.

Please note that the examples do not represent an agreed position nor full list of views from the region or complete list of cases. This paper represents technical inputs to the discussions on synergies. The comments, inputs and case studies can serve as input for the discussions on synergies during the workshop.

#### **1) Overall comments from JUSCANZ Parties on synergies among biodiversity-related conventions**

Please note that these views may not be representative of all JUSCANZ Parties

- Synergies among the biodiversity- related conventions are necessary to avoid unnecessary duplication and enhance effectiveness of the implementation on the ground.
- It should be noted there are already some valuable materials available to assist countries with finding/ minimizing synergies (e.g., the Sourcebook of opportunities for enhancing cooperation among the Biodiversity-related Conventions at national and regional levels).
- It will be important to emphasise that finding synergies is a means to an end – and not an end itself.
- At a certain point, continued examination is likely to yield diminishing returns. This should be borne in mind when considering future pathways for this work.
- Although there are significant opportunities for streamlining in different areas between the biodiversity-related conventions, the identity and mandate of the conventions need to be minimizing, as they are all designed for specific purposes.
- The UNEP currently plays an important role – through national focal points, provision of some Secretariats, and through work of its technical experts in areas where their work coincides with convention implementation. Further UNEP engagement should be appropriate to the governance/decisions of relevant conventions, and contingent upon a firm evidence base of UNEP's effectiveness in its current role.
- There needs to be a greater focus on enhancing synergies among the Secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions. Secretariats have an essential task in monitoring their programmes of work against those in other areas, and alerting Parties to where there may be possible duplication and overlap.
- Reporting cycle and format: minimizing g and minimizing the format, cycle and criteria of reports across conventions would assist with minimizing reporting burden.
- Administration and budget effectiveness: one of the largest outcomes of our precedent for synergies in chemical conventions is a joint administration of related conventions in Geneva. The future agenda could consider ways to integrate administration to save on unnecessary costs and administration.

- Science-policy interface: with the establishment of IPBES to produce science-based assessments, convention forums should focus more on policy discussions.
- Resource mobilization: we are supposed to increase resources for biodiversity in the process of CBD by 2015 globally and maintain the increased resource level until 2020. Regarding this issue, developing countries have sometimes argued that we should not do double counting between CBD and other conventions when quantifying resource mobilization for biodiversity. In many cases, however, resources for biodiversity-related conventions are mutually supportive and overlapping (e.g., resource for wetland may support biodiversity and conservation of endangered species). Therefore, if developing countries restart such discussions, we should not hesitate to claim that double counting of resources are logically correct provided the nature of resource in the context of biodiversity-related conventions.

### **On the Elaboration of options for enhancing synergies among biodiversity-related conventions (the Options Paper)**

Some JUSCANZ Parties would like to see synergies being addressed foremost at the international level, while others would like to see synergies being pursued across all levels (national, regional, international).

Many of the options are activities that are currently underway (e.g., coordination of GEF funding, shared information management, mutually supportive decisions amongst MEAs, etc.). Where these activities are bearing fruit (i.e. in the form of increased efficiencies), they should continue. We see many of the options presented in the paper as a ‘menu’ available to Parties; the relative importance of the options depends on individual country circumstances and priorities, which are changeable.

We have identified the following points to provide further views on the Options paper:

- Options 2 “Reporting, monitoring and indicators” and 3 “IPBES and strengthening science-policy interface” are already being realized and Parties and Secretariats need to support and strengthen these efforts. Also 6 “Funding and resource efficiency” is partly realized and needs to be concluded.
- Options 1 “NBSAPs, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets” (closely linked to 5 “Capacity building”), 4 “Information management and awareness-raising” and 7 “Institutional collaboration” need further work but are extremely important in the long run.

Most of the options presented will require guidance at the global level, which may be undertaken by the Secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions in leading work on synergies, subject to availability of resources. The conventions need to be supported and strengthened by their respective COPs.

All options may be included in such a roadmap, but should be treated individually – due to varying level of detail, short-term feasibility and varying need of further background work. Analysis of the individual ways to progress synergies for each option should occur at the workshop. Additionally, Resolutions and Decisions are at the discretion of Parties to the respective conventions.

### **2) Overall comments from EU Parties on synergies among biodiversity-related conventions**

Communication: joined communication can strengthen the message and is easier for the receivers. E.g. there are various special days that call for more attention for biodiversity, such as World

Biodiversity Day and World Migratory Bird Day. At past occasions, various MEAs and/or their executive secretaries sent out their own message.

Marine litter: both CBD and CMS are working on this, but it is rather difficult to find out who is doing what and how (whether) the work is coordinated. E.g., agenda's, minutes or documentation for BLG meetings are not available on the web and neither are the operational conclusions of the discussions of the BLG.

Invasive alien species: a number of conventions are working on invasive alien species which is needed. However it needs to be made sure that the work and approach is aligned and one convention would take the lead on this work and provide recommendations to other conventions.

Finance: the financial management of MEAs is rather complex and there are examples of serious difficulties in the recent past. Streamlining the rules between MEAs would facilitate the work and the EU has repeatedly requested UNEP to work on such streamlining, in particular for the MEAs for which UNEP hosts the secretariat. Recent discussions at AEWA MOP6 may illustrate the case: the EU made various proposals for amending the proposed Resolutions. The proposals were only partially taken on board.

### **Proposed input to the workshop**

Workshop should have more focus on options for synergies at the global level and better cooperation between MEA Secretariats. The national and regional case studies are useful for underpinning the need for synergies at the global level

The workshop should deliver concrete recommendations to the different MEAs including proposals for streamlined recommendations to the MEA's and an action-orientated road map. This could include an action plan addressing milestones, timeline including deadlines, actors and role of actors etc.

It would add value that UNEP's Medium Term Strategy and Programme of Work align with/complement the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Such alignment will help to avoid duplication of activity and the Medium Term Strategy and Programme of Work should clearly set out where UNEP can add value.

SDGs: consideration should be given to how to make links with the environment-related SDGs within the UNEP's Medium Term Strategy and Programme of Work. Although the SDGs are referenced in point (iv) of the overarching considerations, it would be good to explore how SDG implementation at all levels could be incorporated within the synergies process.

Aichi targets: the targets should have a clear division of work between the conventions to maximize implementation and give credit to the "niche" each convention gives to them

Capacity building: there needs to be coherence with the capacity building activities of the various MEA Secretariats and that care needs to be taken to avoid duplication and ensure coherence of delivery.

NBSAPs: National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans could play an important role in reaching synergies, especially given the crucial role played by NBSAPs in providing a basis for access to GEF funding.

Reporting: a consistent framework for reporting/monitoring is very important. This framework should also be consistent with reporting for the SDGs (see above).

Information and knowledge management: rather than developing new tools and approaches it is first important to understand what exists already, encourage the use of those existing tools and approaches and (where appropriate) seek to understand why some tools and approaches have not been as effective as expected

Science: the role of the Committee of Scientific Advisory Bodies (CSAB) could be strengthened so as to have a clearer understanding of who is doing what and to have adequate coordination with IPBES.

Thematic issues and new emerging issues: these issues should be “coordinated” between the conventions (and guided by the Parties in a better way) to avoid discussing the same question (for example on invasive alien species) in all biodiversity related agreements.

### **3) Case studies from the WEOG region**

#### **Case study from Australia on synergies among biodiversity-related conventions at the national level**

In Australia, five of the National Focal Points (NFPs) for the biodiversity-related conventions (CBD, CMS, CITES, WHC, Ramsar) sit within the same organization, the Australian Government Department of the Environment. There are many informal correspondences between these NFPs on an as needed basis, plus some more formal meetings, or networks, where topics that cross over conventions are discussed.

The NFPs for conventions are located with the related national policy area to increase integration between international and national policy. For example, the Convention on Biological Diversity team is located with the lead on national biodiversity policy.

Australia is working to increase discussions among NFPs for the biodiversity-related conventions, including meeting prior to COPs.

At the national level, Australia is seeking other efficiencies between conventions, for example; efficiency in implementation, by mapping the various targets and goals of some biodiversity-related conventions against our National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). The implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions at a national level in Australia is driven by national priorities. However, greater coordinated and identification of common goals by the biodiversity-related Secretariats would benefit Australia in working to implement conventions without duplicating efforts.

Information collaboratively developed by the Secretariats of the biodiversity related conventions could consider:

- Wiser use of resources across conventions including collaborating on projects or research activities where appropriate

- Improved methods for information sharing across conventions Secretariats where applicable i.e. sharing submissions of information from Parties to avoid duplication
- Matchmaking facilities particularly with increased focus on support and capacity building of an inkind nature e.g. sharing knowledge and expertise in a particular topic between Parties. Note this is traditionally between developed-developing Parties but developing-developing and developed-developed cooperation is as important.

A key challenge is in developing a process or changing processes for policy development, programme design and implementation strategies where mainstreaming becomes the norm.

### **Case study from Switzerland**

6. Please provide a brief overview of the current level of cooperation in the implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions in your country.

- To which biodiversity-related convention is your country a party to?

Switzerland is party to all biodiversity-related conventions.

- Is the cooperation formal or informal (e.g. are there coordination mechanisms among national focal points/responsible offices and other key stakeholders, national biodiversity committees, working groups etc.)

There is both formal and informal cooperation. Formal cooperation takes place when for instance preparing laws and ordinances, as well as negotiation mandates. Informal cooperation takes place on scientific and technical matters and participation varies according to interests. Some specific fields have institutionalized regular informal cooperation, such as international development cooperation, forestry,

*What are the benefits of cooperation?*

It is important to distinguish cooperation from synergies. The sourcebooks of synergies has in detailed explored such benefits. Realizing a synergy means an actual change in the allocation of tasks and resource in order to increase efficiency and effectiveness.

6. *Please describe one or two specific challenges that you have experienced in your country in order to enhance cooperation in the implementation of two or more of the biodiversity-related conventions.*

A lack of coordination and synergy at the global level can lead to conflicts at national level. Unclear competences of MEA Secretariats can lead to difficult situations for those implementing these MEAs on a national level and can make it more difficult to find a compromise on the national level. E.g. you could be forced to have a duplication of efforts on a national level because e.g. of different IT systems in a MEA secretariat. Since these challenges are internal, it is not possible for us to give a concrete example but they are related to ITPGRFA/Nagoya protocol or forest issues.

6. *Please describe what was done in order to overcome these challenges? What were the considerations in choosing an adequate response option to overcome the challenges?*

Communication, meetings, discussion on higher political level.

4. *What was the outcome?*

Common ground was found but the department in charge can implement their solution.

*5. What are remaining challenges?*

Ongoing discussions at the global level with the Secretariats improving communication.

*6. What are potential activities/response options at national/regional/global level to overcome these remaining challenges?*

In particular decisions should be taken by the respective COPs to promote synergies in the various thematic areas (such as Reporting, Indicators, Resource mobilization, Strategic plan and action plan, etc) in order that the various Secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions – within their respective specific competence and mandate – support consistent and effective coordinated actions among them at various levels (Global, regional, national level). Monitoring of such coordination should be established by the Parties. A clear allocation of tasks to each of the Secretariats, identification of common goals.

**Case study from Finland – National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans as an instrument for mainstreaming**

In 2010, Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) adopted a new Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. This Plan provides a comprehensive global framework for achieving the vision of ‘*Living in Harmony with Nature*’, including 20 headline Aichi Biodiversity Targets. An important action for Parties is to translate and incorporate the new commitments into national level policies – through the development or revision of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs). Finland revised its NBSAP in line with the Strategic Plan in 2012.

In December 2012, the Government of Finland adopted a resolution on the 2012–2020 strategy for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Finland. Entitled ‘Saving Nature for People’, this strategy has the key target of halting biodiversity loss in Finland by 2020. A Mid-term report on the implementation of the NBSAP will be given to the Government in February-March 2016.

<http://www.ymparisto.fi/default.asp?contentid=426956&lan=en&clan=en>

**Bringing biodiversity into the mainstream**

Finland is committed to the objectives of the CBD, including the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources. Finland is also committed to intensify efforts to fulfil main objectives in order to halt the loss of biodiversity globally, regionally and at national level by 2020.

The strategy’s five objectives focus on the mainstreaming of biodiversity issues across society, the broad participation in the work to advance biodiversity, a decision-making process based on robust research data, and Finland’s responsibility, as a member of the international community, for global biodiversity. The strategy also outlines policies linking the indigenous peoples, Saami community’s traditional knowledge to the protection of biodiversity. The Finnish biodiversity strategy places economic and cultural values related to biodiversity at the heart of decision-making.



The national biodiversity indicator collection at [www.biodiversity.fi](http://www.biodiversity.fi) has been an important tool for measuring the status and trends of biodiversity work in Finland. The evaluation of the first NBSAP for 1997-2005 represented the first time that the state and development of Finland's biodiversity was assessed by using indicators. The set of national biodiversity indicators has subsequently been expanded and improved through on-going cooperation involving governmental research institutes and organizations and environmental NGOs.

Finland strongly supports the use of and development of the indicative list of indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity in line with decision XI/3. Many of the resolutions made at COP 10 in Nagoya emphasized the need to safeguard the functioning of ecosystems and ecosystem services as well as biodiversity. Ecosystem services are the benefits obtained by people from nature. Here, we would like to see more progress in promoting the further harmonization of global indicators and their use between the CBD and other conventions, regional agreements and processes and promote further collaboration, through effective means. It is important to agree on indicators that are applicable to a variety of conventions in a synergistic manner.

Decision-making related to biodiversity is greatly dependent on scientific research, data storage and management, and monitoring, since many issues involve complex cause and effect relationships. The work of the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) is an important way to ensure that a suitable knowledge base is available to support policy decisions on biodiversity at the national and international levels. Finland stresses the importance of the upcoming work, in contributing to assessments of the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

#### **Adequacy of observations, and data systems, for monitoring biodiversity**

Achieving and maintaining a good reporting ability requires continuous inventory, monitoring, and data management. Various observation databases have been created as technical conditions have improved. The challenge is that the information is scattered in many existing databases. For reporting and monitoring a lot of work is required for managing and improving the adequacy especially on the international and regional level. The information needs for TK, ecosystem services and awareness building among other things needs a systematic way and approach to be successful.

Mainstreaming biodiversity is a stepwise process of integrating biodiversity and ecosystem services into national, regional and international policies, budgets, strategies regulations, plans, and actions. This has been receiving an increasing attention as a key to achieve conservation goals and sustainable development<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mainstreaming is the integration of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in both cross-sectoral plans such as sustainable development, poverty reduction, climate change adaptation/mitigation, trade and international cooperation, and in sector-specific plans such as agriculture, fisheries, forestry, mining, energy, tourism, transport and others ([www.cbd.int](http://www.cbd.int))

Integrating biodiversity is not about creating parallel processes and/or systems, but about integrating biodiversity into existing ones. This approach can be exercised within government, as well as on the UN level and needs to involve different levels of governments; national, provincial, as well as donors, universities and other relevant sectors. Sharing of ownership and responsibility of the *Aichi biodiversity targets* gives opportunity of increasing the human, financial and technical capacity to implement national and international policies.

### **Promoting synergies within the cluster of biodiversity-related MEAs**

We have to make better use of and develop the existing mechanisms under the conventions instead of creating new ones. We are well aware that countries report on the weakened implementation of the MEAs, due to overloaded agendas, duplication of tasks, failed national coordination, overlapping and intricate reporting procedures. Despite the wide range of coordination mechanisms, no overarching mechanism exists that brings the Parties of the MEAs together to identify joint solutions for common issues or shared concerns (ref. UNEP WCMC report 2012: Promoting synergies within the cluster of biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements).

In 2014, The Ministry of the Environment of Finland commissioned a study from UNEP-WCMC to analyze how the decisions of the biodiversity-related MEAs support CBD's Strategic Framework 2010-2020 and its 20 Aichi targets. The study was made to assist Parties in revising their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) so that it would address the relevant decisions of all six biodiversity-related MEAs.

Altogether, 1234 decisions of six biodiversity-related MEAs were analyzed and it resulted in a 300-paged matrix of decisions grouped under the 20 Aichi targets. The analysis showed the overwhelming complexity of decision-making hampers coherent implementation at the national level. The study was published in December 2015. In addition, the matrix was summarized into a 15-paged checklist to assist in revising the NBSAPs to make it relevant for the entire biodiversity cluster <http://nbsapforum.net/uploads/1646.pdf> and [http://wcmc.io/MEA-Aichi\\_Target\\_mapping](http://wcmc.io/MEA-Aichi_Target_mapping)

Mainstreaming biodiversity is catalytic within the implementation process of the Strategic Plan, globally, and NBSAP, at the national and local levels. Achievement of national targets will require that enabling conditions and political will – institutional, financial, policies and public awareness to be in place. Implementation of the related Aichi Target 2 is important for improving and creating the necessary enabling conditions.

Hence, it is fundamental to understand the close link between mainstreaming, the SDG's, Paris Agreement, given the costs in investing in biodiversity, which is usually lower than economic returns can be shared among various sectors in society. Outreach and communication is important for long term policy formulation and consistency.

### **Case study from Œuvre (Paris, 22/01/2016 – NOTE DES AUTORITÉS FRANÇAISES)**

Objet : Le Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial (FFEM) : un outil de synergie entre les conventions relatives à la biodiversité. Atelier de la Convention sur la diversité biologique sur les synergies entre les conventions relatives à la biodiversité du 8 au 11/02/2016 à Genève.

Le Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial (FFEM) : un outil de synergie entre les conventions relatives à la biodiversité.

Depuis 20 ans, le Fonds français pour l'environnement mondial (FFEM)<sup>1</sup> a pour mission la protection de l'environnement mondial au service de la politique française de développement et de solidarité internationale ; il concrétise et illustre les engagements de la France dans les accords multilatéraux sur l'environnement. Dans son cadre de programmation stratégique 2015-2018, le FFEM affirme clairement sa volonté de promouvoir les synergies entre les conventions relatives à la biodiversité, à travers cinq thématiques prioritaires : financements innovants de la biodiversité ; gestion intégrée et résilience des zones littorales et marines ; agriculture et forêts durables ; territoires urbains durables et transition énergétique, ainsi qu'à travers deux objectifs transversaux : la consommation et la production durables et les processus innovants.

#### Exemples de projets

Partenariat Gestion exemplaire de territoires littoraux, insulaires et marins en Méditerranée

Projet CZZ1888 (2013) : Contribution FFEM 1,95 M€ sur 4 ans

Objectif : Contribuer à faire des espaces sensibles littoraux, marins et insulaires des modèles de Gestion Intégrée des Zones Côtières et de financement durable au bénéfice des populations locales et des écosystèmes marins et côtiers de la Méditerranée.

Partenaires : WWF, MEDPAN, Conservatoire du Littoral

Synergies entre les conventions : Barcelone, Ramsar, Changement climatique (résilience, atténuation), CDB (diversité filienne, marine et côtière)

Lien :

[http://www.ffem.fr/site/ffem/accueil-FFEM/projets/projets\\_ffem-par-secteur/Projetsbiodiversite/2013\\_CZZ1888-Programme-GIZC\\_marin-Mediterranee](http://www.ffem.fr/site/ffem/accueil-FFEM/projets/projets_ffem-par-secteur/Projetsbiodiversite/2013_CZZ1888-Programme-GIZC_marin-Mediterranee)

Le FFEM est un outil de l'aide extérieure française comptabilisé en aide publique au développement. Cette aide est déliée et le FFEM recherche des effets de levier avec d'autres instruments de financement du développement, tant français qu'internationaux (le FEM notamment), publics ou privés.

Gestion de la biodiversité marine et côtière par le renforcement des initiatives de conservation et de suivi dans les aires marines protégées d'Afrique de l'Ouest.

Projet CZZ1382 (2008) : Contribution FFEM 1,6 M€ sur 4 ans

Pays : Mauritanie, Sénégal, Gambie, Guinée Bissau, Guinée, Sierra Leone, Cap Vert

Objectif : Renforcer le réseau des aires marines protégées (AMP) en Afrique de l'Ouest avec des objectifs de développement et de préservation de l'environnement mondial, avec : sécurisation des revenus tirés des activités de pêche des pays, protection des mangroves, réduction de la déforestation, développement de modèles d'AMP performantes, mise en œuvre de modèles économiques de filières durables finançant le fonctionnement des AMP.

Partenaire : MAVA

Synergies entre les conventions : CDB, changement climatique (atténuation, résilience), réserve de Biosphère (MAB Unesco), Ramsar, AEWa

Lien : [http://www.ffem.fr/site/ffem/accueil-FFEM/projets/projets\\_ffem-par-secteur/Projets-eaux-internationales/2008\\_CZZ1382-Multipays-Gestion-de-la-biodiversite-marine-et-cotiere-par-le-renforcement-des-initiatives-de-conservation-et-de-suivi-dans-les-aires-marines-protegees-d-Afrique-de-l-Ouest](http://www.ffem.fr/site/ffem/accueil-FFEM/projets/projets_ffem-par-secteur/Projets-eaux-internationales/2008_CZZ1382-Multipays-Gestion-de-la-biodiversite-marine-et-cotiere-par-le-renforcement-des-initiatives-de-conservation-et-de-suivi-dans-les-aires-marines-protegees-d-Afrique-de-l-Ouest).

Appui à la mise en oeuvre d'un plan global de dépollution et de protection de la lagune de Nador.

Projet CMA1127 (2008) : Contribution FFEM 0,5 M€ sur 3 ans

Pays : Royaume du Maroc

Objectif : La lagune de Nador, située sur la côte méditerranéenne du Royaume du Maroc, est l'une des plus importantes lagunes de la Méditerranée par sa taille (15000 ha) et sa biodiversité (site RAMSAR depuis 2005 et SIBE marocain). Le projet vise à contribuer à la reconquête de la qualité des milieux, à leur dépollution, à leur protection et à leur gestion, dans une perspective de développement économique de la zone.

Partenaires : ONEP (Office National pour l'Eau Potable), AFD

Synergies entre les conventions : Ramsar, CDB

Lien : [http://www.ffem.fr/site/ffem/accueil/projets/projets\\_ffem-par-secteur/Projets-eaux-internationales/CMA1127-Nador](http://www.ffem.fr/site/ffem/accueil/projets/projets_ffem-par-secteur/Projets-eaux-internationales/CMA1127-Nador)

Programme Petites Initiatives.

Objectif : Créé en 2006, le Programme de Petites Initiatives (PPI) du Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial (FFEM) a pour objectif de soutenir les organisations de la société civile des pays africains actives dans la protection de la biodiversité et la lutte contre le changement climatique, à travers le financement de projets de petite taille.

Synergies entre les conventions : dans le cadre du PPI, de nombreux projets participent à la lutte anti-braconnage (CITES) et à la conservation d'espèces migratrices (CMS), comme par exemple l'ONG Juristrale en République Démocratique du Congo qui lutte contre le trafic d'ivoire ou l'association KUDATUBE qui œuvre pour la protection des tortues marines sur le littoral camerounais.

Lien : <http://www.ffem.fr/accueil-FFEM/PPI> .

### **Traduction de courtoisie. Courtesy translation.**

The French Facility for Global Environment: a tool enhancing synergies among biodiversity-related conventions

For 20 years, the mission of the French Facility for Global Environment (FFEM)<sup>2</sup> is to protect the global environment in support of the French development and international solidarity policy; it embodies and illustrates France's commitments in the multilateral environmental agreements. Throughout its Strategic Programming Framework (SPF) 2015-2018, the FFEM affirms clearly its ambition to promote synergies among biodiversity-related conventions, by prioritizing its operations into five topic areas: innovative financing of biodiversity; integrated management and resilience of

coastal and marine areas; sustainable agriculture and forests; sustainable urban territories; energy transition; and into two overarching objectives: sustainable consumption and production as well as innovative processes.

#### Examples of projects

Partnership for exemplary management of coastal, marine and island territories in the Mediterranean

FFEM's contribution : €1,95 M. on 4 years (2013-2016)

Objective: Support pilot sites, marine and coastal protected areas or island, with the aim to strengthen the management and protection of these sites by using Integrated Coastal Zones models and sustainable financing for the benefit of local Mediterranean communities and marine and coastal ecosystems.

Partners : WWF, MEDPAN, Conservatoire du Littoral

Synergies between conventions : Barcelona, Ramsar, climate change (resilience, attenuation), CBD

Link : [http://www.ffem.fr/op/edit/lang/en/accueil-FFEM/projets/projets\\_ffem-par-secteur/Projetsbiodiversite/2013\\_CZZ1888-Programme-GIZC\\_marin-Mediterranee](http://www.ffem.fr/op/edit/lang/en/accueil-FFEM/projets/projets_ffem-par-secteur/Projetsbiodiversite/2013_CZZ1888-Programme-GIZC_marin-Mediterranee)

Management of marine and coastal biodiversity by strengthening conservation efforts and monitoring in protected West African marine areas

FFEM's contribution : €1,6 M. on 5 years (2008-2012)

Countries : Mauritania, Senegal, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Guinea Conakry, Sierra Leone, Cape Verde

Objective: Strengthening the network of marine protected areas (MPAs) in West Africa, aiming at contributing to local development and to global environment protection: secures revenue derived from fishing activities in the countries, protection of mangroves, reduction of deforestation, development of high-yield performance MPAs models, and implementation of economic models for sustainable networks financing the functionality of MPAs.

Partner: MAVA

Synergies between conventions: CBD, climate change (attenuation, resilience), Biosphere reserves (MAB UNESCO), Ramsar, AEWA

Link:

[http://www.ffem.fr/jahia/webdav/site/ffem/shared/ELEMENTS\\_COMMUNS/U\\_ADMINISTRATEUR/5-PUBLICATIONS/Biodiversite/AMP/Brochure\\_AMP\\_FFEM-Gb\\_vfinal.pdf.pdf?bcsi\\_scan\\_76859af71b923077=1&bcsi\\_scan\\_1fe59ba8c561fa18=0&bcsi\\_scan\\_filename=Brochure\\_AMP\\_FFEM-Gb\\_vfinal.pdf.pdf](http://www.ffem.fr/jahia/webdav/site/ffem/shared/ELEMENTS_COMMUNS/U_ADMINISTRATEUR/5-PUBLICATIONS/Biodiversite/AMP/Brochure_AMP_FFEM-Gb_vfinal.pdf.pdf?bcsi_scan_76859af71b923077=1&bcsi_scan_1fe59ba8c561fa18=0&bcsi_scan_filename=Brochure_AMP_FFEM-Gb_vfinal.pdf.pdf)

The FFEM is an instrument for French foreign assistance and comes wholly under the ODA accounting system. This aid is not tied and the FFEM seeks synergies with other public or private organisations involved in financing development or environmental projects, both in France and abroad, and particularly the Global Environment Facility.

Support to the application of an overall plan for depollution and protection of the Nador lagoon

FFEM's contribution : 0.5 M€ on 3 years (2008-2010)

Country: Kingdom of Morocco

Objective: The Nador lagoon, on the Morocco's Mediterranean coast, is one of the largest in the Mediterranean (15 000 ha) and among the most important in terms of biodiversity (RAMSAR site since 2005 and Moroccan SIBE site). This project aims to help depollute and restore the quality of the lagoon's habitats and to protect and manage them with a view to the area's economic development.

Partners : ONEP (Office National pour l'Eau Potable), AFD

Synergies between conventions: Ramsar, CBD

Link : [http://www.ffem.fr/lang/en/site/ffem/accueil/projets/projets\\_ffem-par-secteur/Projets-eaux-internationales/Projets\\_eaux-internationales/Projets-eaux-internationales-gestion-pollutions-marines](http://www.ffem.fr/lang/en/site/ffem/accueil/projets/projets_ffem-par-secteur/Projets-eaux-internationales/Projets_eaux-internationales/Projets-eaux-internationales-gestion-pollutions-marines)

Small-scale initiatives programme

Objective: the Small-Scale Initiatives (SSI) programme was set up in 2006 to support African civil society groups actively involved in biodiversity protection and climate change actions.

Synergies between conventions: As part of the SSI, numbers of projects participate to the fight against poaching (CITES) and to the conservation of migratory species (CMS). For examples, the NGO Juristrale in Democratic Republic of Congo is fighting against illegal trade in ivory and the NGO KUDATUBE works to protect marine turtles along the Cameroonian coast.

Link : <http://www.ffem.fr/lang/en/accueil-FFEM/PPI>

---