



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/11/19  
21 August 2012

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

### CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Eleventh meeting

Hyderabad, India, 8-19 October 2012

Item 6.2 of the provisional agenda\*

### **SYNTHESIS OF VIEWS ON THE NEED FOR AND POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENT OF ADDITIONAL MECHANISMS TO ENABLE PARTIES TO MEET THEIR COMMITMENTS UNDER THE CONVENTION AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020**

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. In paragraph 15 of decision X/2 (The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets), the Conference of the Parties decided to consider, at its eleventh meeting, the need for and possible development of additional mechanisms to enable Parties to meet their commitments under the Convention and the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.
2. This note has been prepared by the Executive Secretary to assist the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties in examining the need for and possible development of additional mechanisms to enable Parties to meet their commitments under the Convention and the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.
3. In preparation for this meeting, Parties, other Governments, international organizations, indigenous and local communities and relevant stakeholders were invited to provide by 1 June 2012 their views to the Executive Secretary in Notification 2012-046 (March 2012).
4. In response to the notification, the Executive Secretary had received as of 1 August 2012 submissions from Canada, the European Union (including individual inputs from Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, United Kingdom and France as an annex), Norway, Greenpeace and Pew Environment Group. All submissions were made available in an information document (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/3).
5. Section II of this note contains a synthesis of the views received. Section III suggests possible issues for consideration by the Conference of the Parties.

---

\* UNEP/CBD/COP/11/1.

/...

## II. SYNTHESIS OF VIEWS RECEIVED

7. The views received made several suggestions in relation to the need for and possible development of additional mechanisms to enable Parties to meet their commitments under the Convention and the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. These are synthesized below.

### *The role of Parties and the Secretariat*

8. Norway highlighted two factors in relation to the issue. First, Parties are responsible for the best possible implementation of the Strategic Plan and that the critical elements of work must be undertaken at the national level. Second, the role of the Secretariat is to stimulate and facilitate this work within its mandate.

### *Making better use of existing mechanisms*

9. Canada suggested that the Convention's existing mechanisms provide a sufficient basis to enable Parties to meet their commitments under the Convention and to implement the Strategic Plan. Proposals for new bodies and initiatives, particularly if they necessitate additional resources, must be carefully formulated to ensure that they are within the mandate of the Convention, that they yield clear outputs, do not create unreasonable resource demands or cause duplication, and have a high probability of providing value for the time and money invested.

10. The European Union noted that it is important to have the necessary mechanisms in place to enable Parties to meet their commitments under the Convention and the Strategic Plan particularly in the areas of capacity-building, awareness-raising, monitoring and financing. However, it noted that both within the Convention and outside, a number of existing mechanisms are already available that could be built upon before considering the development of new mechanisms. It noted that the approach taken by the Ad hoc Working Group on the Implementation of the Convention (WGRI) at its fourth meeting has made a good start in connecting different supporting instruments under the Convention to increase their efficiency.

11. In relation to existing mechanisms outside the Convention, the European Union made reference to paragraph 16 of decision X/2 which it noted, among other things, invites relevant international agencies, working at the country-level, to facilitate activities to support the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan. It added that enhanced focus of those global processes on national implementation could provide support to Parties to meet their biodiversity commitments. Finally it suggested that the Conference of the Parties should review the results of relevant activities related to paragraph 16 of decision X/2.

12. Finland suggested making better use of and developing the existing mechanisms under the Convention instead of creating new mechanisms.

### *Establishment of a review procedure*

13. Norway pointed out the relevance of paragraph 16 (a) of decision IX/8.<sup>1</sup> It suggested that a review mechanism had very good potential and should be further developed. Experiences from the OECD environmental review procedure and relevant review mechanisms under other conventions should be used. The review process would not compare implementation among Parties or grade national implementation, but would further improve implementation. It was also suggested that the review-mechanism could also include means for identifying capacity-building needs in developing countries and be used as supporting material in this regard. Norway further suggested that a regional approach would be positive for this work and review teams could be complemented with selected delegates from the region with knowledge on both biodiversity and the political situation of the Party being reviewed.

---

<sup>1</sup>“16. Requests the Executive Secretary, in cooperation with partner organizations to facilitate: (a) The continued exchange of best practices and lessons learned from the preparation, updating and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, through appropriate forums and mechanisms such as the clearing-house mechanism and, subject to available resources, strengthened cooperation with regional processes, South-South cooperation and voluntary peer-review;”

*Increased synergies with other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) and international agencies*

14. Canada suggested that encouraging synergies amongst biodiversity-related conventions and other relevant organizations would be a mechanism that could aid Parties in meeting their commitments and implementing the Strategic Plan.

15. Finland, noting weakened implementation of MEAs due to overloaded agendas, duplication of tasks, failed national coordination and overlapping and intricate reporting procedures, stated that there was no existing overarching mechanism bringing Parties of MEAs together to identify joint solutions. It called for a Party-driven process for enhanced synergies between biodiversity-related MEAs with the aim of making national implementation more coherent and effective. It suggested that such a process, which could be initiated by the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties, would move the synergies agenda forward and would identify joint solutions for common programmatic issues such as implementing the Strategic Plan, revising and preparing national biodiversity strategies and action plans, national reporting, administration, capacity-building and science-policy interface.

*Increased synergies with the private sector*

16. Canada made reference to increased synergies with the private sector. Noting the minimal resources required to undertake it, Canada suggested that it could be supportive of additional mechanisms to encourage private sector engagement.

*Increased sectoral representation in CBD workshops by shifting emphasis to national-level work*

17. Norway acknowledged the one challenge in CBD regional workshops on national biodiversity strategies and action plans and the implementation of the Strategic Plan is that normally one representative participates from each Party. It recognized that several sectors must be involved in implementation at national level and suggested stronger focus on national work should be highlighted.

*Additional mechanisms for capacity-building to support implementation*

18. Canada, noting the minimal resources required to undertake it, suggested that it could be supportive of additional workshop activities in relation to capacity-building on implementation priorities.

19. Norway suggested that knowledge-based implementation should be an aim for all Parties. It noted the possibilities presented by the development of the capacity-building component of the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) to address knowledge gaps in the science-policy interface at local/national and regional/global levels. Suggesting some of the requirements to open up these possibilities including for example mapping and a prioritization of country and regional-specific need, a consideration of how IPBES and the Convention on Biological Diversity could interact/cooperate in this matter and consideration of which approach(es) to use, it also suggested the establishment of a network for virtual web-based and real-time project based partnership activities under IPBES could help sustain and institutionalize capacity-building efforts.

*Other views*

20. Greenpeace and the Pew Environment Group noted the ongoing work within the United Nations General Assembly of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Informal Working Group to study issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction and in particular the initiation of a process in relation to the legal framework for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity beyond the limits national jurisdiction, that will identify gaps and ways forward, including through the implementation of existing instruments and the possible development of a multilateral agreement under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

21. Greenpeace suggested that the Convention could play an important role in supporting the development of such a multilateral agreement given its expertise on biodiversity. It also suggested that the Conference of the Parties at its eleventh meeting should urge the United Nations General Assembly to take urgent action to ensure the legal framework for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction is effectively addressed through the development of an

international agreement. Pew Environment Group suggested that the Conference of the Parties at its eleventh meeting call for an international conference in 2013 to develop such an international agreement. Among other things, both organizations suggested the full reflection of the three aims of the Convention on Biological Diversity in the outcomes of the process. They called for the completion of negotiations by December 2015.

### III. ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

22. The Conference of the Parties may wish to consider the views expressed and synthesized above. Furthermore, as it considers the need for and possible development of additional mechanisms to enable Parties to meet their commitments under the Convention and the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, the Conference of the Parties may wish to keep in mind various draft recommendations from the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) resulting from its sixteenth meeting and the recommendations resulting from the Working Group on Review of Implementation at its fourth meeting that may already address some or all of the views expressed. These include:

- WGR I recommendation 4/1 (Implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets);
- WGR I recommendation 4/6 (Cooperation with other conventions: the biodiversity-related conventions and the Rio conventions); and
- WGR I recommendation 4/7 (Engagement with business); and
- SBSTTA recommendation XVI/1 (Ways and means to improve the effectiveness of the subsidiary body and options for collaboration with the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity ecosystem services).

-----