



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/INF/50
5 April 2016*

ENGLISH ONLY

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION

First meeting

Montreal, Canada, 2-6 May 2016

REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP OF THE “FRIENDS OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY” ON MECHANISMS TO SUPPORT REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION BOGIS-BOSSEY, SWITZERLAND, 21-23 MARCH 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) convened a workshop of the Friends of the Convention on Biological Diversity on 21 to 23 March 2016 in Bogis-Bossey, Switzerland. The workshop was hosted through the generous financial support of the Government of Switzerland.
2. The workshop brought together 45 participants and provided a unique opportunity for representatives from governments, organizations, conventions, non-governmental organizations, indigenous peoples and local communities as well as experts to contribute their views, experiences and processes in enhancing review of implementation.
3. The workshop was held in preparation for the first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI) and focused on enhancing mechanisms to support review of implementation. The objective of the workshop was to explore, in an informal setting, possible approaches to enhance review of implementation of the Convention. The workshop drew from the experiences of review mechanisms of: other biodiversity-related conventions, protocols and, relevant international processes, such as UNFCCC, OECD and WTO; as well as national experiences to identify ways for strengthening implementation. The workshop also discussed the key elements of review mechanisms, including the voluntary peer review (VPR) of the NBSAPs, considering these elements against existing processes under the Convention as well as exploring the merits of establishing new processes.
4. The workshop provided an opportunity for an informal exchange in a workshop setting using the Chatham House Rule. It was structured according to an agenda provided, along with a briefing note sent to participants prior to the workshop. This report seeks to summarize the discussions, views and perspectives of the participants to facilitate discussions at SBI and thereafter.
5. The detailed agenda of the meeting is contained in annex I to the present report. A list of participants is provided in annex II.

* Second reissue for technical reasons on 27 April 2016.

Overall goal of the meeting

6. The objective of the workshop was to discuss, in an informal setting, “What existing or new mechanisms within the Convention could be used to strengthen its implementation by enhancing review”. The expected output was a report compiling views and perspectives of the participants on how to enhance the review of implementation to facilitate subsequent discussions at SBI and afterwards.

General methodology

7. The meeting was carried out in the spirit of the Chatham House Rule allowing participants to freely express their opinions without attribution to the identity or affiliation of the speakers. The meeting was managed by a professional facilitator through interactive panel discussions, followed by targeted group work that allowed for critical reflection.

8. The objective of the first session was to increase awareness of experiences to date with review mechanisms implemented under other international processes, through a better understanding of the process and costs involved in each process, and the contribution that such performance reviews make towards the achievement of the overall outcomes. This session served as a reference point for discussions of review mechanisms for implementation within CBD. The invited panellists were requested to provide a brief presentation on the relevant review process.

9. Following the discussion on experiences under other international processes, the second session aimed to shine the spotlight on review mechanisms that are closely related to the Convention and that are currently being implemented under other biodiversity-related conventions and protocols. These presentations enhanced the participants’ understanding of the process and costs involved in review processes.

10. The second half of the session on review mechanisms under the biodiversity-related conventions and protocols consisted of a panel on the Voluntary Peer Review (VPR) of NBSAPs. Presentations were delivered on the experience gained in conducting the VPR process under the CBD, as mandated by COP 12. The presentations and discussions addressed the overall biodiversity policy process, in particular the need for a VPR to focus on a limited number of key policy areas and issues.

11. The third session on national reporting was held in recognition that the effectiveness of a review mechanism depends to a large extent on the quality and quantity of the information available at the national level. This session sought to provide participants with a better understanding of the ways in which implementation can be strengthened, particularly with regards to national level reporting.

12. The last two sessions, sessions four and five, provided an opportunity for participants to hold an in-depth discussion, based on the knowledge shared and acquired from the preceding workshop sessions and supporting documentation, on the options for a review system best suited to the CBD. The fourth session focused discussing ideas, options and opportunities for a multi-dimensional review of implementation within CBD. The fifth and final session summarized the ideas and options that emerged during the two and a half day workshop.

Existing mandates and mechanisms under the CBD for review of implementation

13. The Executive Secretary, Mr. Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, delivered remarks on the existing mandates and mechanisms under the CBD for review of implementation that can be summarized as follows:

(a) CBD Article 23 gives the COP the mandate to: “4. The Conference of the Parties shall keep under review the implementation of this Convention, and, for this purpose, shall...”

(b) CBD Article 25 gives SBSTTA the mandate to: “2(b) Prepare scientific and technical assessments of the effects of types of measures taken in accordance with the provisions of this Convention”.

(c) CBD Article 26 establishes that “Each Contracting Party shall, at intervals to be determined by the Conference of the Parties, present to the Conference of the Parties, reports on measures which it has taken for the implementation of the provisions of this Convention and their effectiveness in meeting the objectives of this Convention”.

(d) COP Decision X/2 urged Parties and other Governments to monitor and review the implementation of their national biodiversity strategies and action plans in accordance with the Strategic Plan and their national targets and decided that the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook shall be prepared to provide mid-term review of progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

(e) COP Decision XII/26 established the SBI and requested it to: “support the Conference of the Parties in reviewing progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, taking into account also the multi-year programme of work of the Conference of the Parties to 2020”.

(f) COP Decision XII/29 requested “the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, to develop a methodology for a voluntary peer-review process and to report to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, for its consideration”.

(g) The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit sharing, have established Compliance Committees and procedures for review.

(h) Additionally the NBSAP Forum was launched at COP 11 to provide assistance to Parties for the review/update of NBSAPs (the forum also provides informal voluntary peer review of draft updated NBSAPs, country by country).

(i) The GEF as the Financial Mechanism of the Convention and its Protocols produces impact evaluations of projects supported by GEF funding (e.g. the recent report on protected areas supported by GEF published in 2015).

(j) Finally, the CBD Secretariat often promotes reviews of implementation efforts through thematic regional workshops. This is done through a two phased strategy which inter alia includes developing baseline data for countries in the form of information dossiers for all countries; and securing information on the status of national actions/commitments including a road map of priority action to be undertaken in next five years. Details of regional workshops related to Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 and 6 are provided in [UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/43](https://www.cbd.int/doc/INF/20/INF/43) and [UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/6](https://www.cbd.int/doc/INF/20/INF/6).

II. DISCUSSION HIGHLIGHTS

14. Discussions indicated in the workshop summary below are reflective of diverse opinions expressed through expert presentations and discussions and do not represent an agreement by all participants.

A. Review mechanisms under other international processes, biodiversity related conventions and protocols

15. A number of presentations were made on relevant review mechanisms in various intergovernmental and international fora. The highlights of these presentations (<https://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=IMPWS-2016-01>) and the follow-up discussion is provided below.

(a) WTO:

- (i) WTO is a legal agreement and has a dispute settlement body. The objective of the WTO Trade Policy Review (TPR) is to ensure compliance and minimize disputes.
- (ii) The Trade Policy Review Mechanism (TPRM) works principally through the various committees or WTO bodies.

- (iii) The raw material for this monitoring comes through comprehensive factual reports prepared by the secretariat and concerns raised by Members.
- (iv) There are varying level of reviews depending upon the country's share in international trade. For example, the European Union, the United States, China and Japan require routine reviews every two years while the next 16 largest trading entities are reviewed every four ears and the rest of membership is reviewed every six years.
- (v) Between the periodical reviews, annual reports by the Secretariat reports on trade related developments highlighting policy changes based on information provided by members.
- (vi) All information received and collected by the Secretariat is systematically sent for verification by the concerned member. This step is fundamental to the transparency, accuracy and credibility of the monitoring exercise.
- (vii) Enhanced surveillance and regular monitoring of trade policies and practices are important in ensuing compliance with trade commitments and helping reduce trade disputes.
- (viii) The TPRM has guaranteed a minimum level of policy transparency and facilitated country comparisons.
- (ix) The TPRM also helps to highlight external factors that may have an important bearing on international trade and vice versa.
- (x) Domestically, the TPRM's preparatory process provides a unique opportunity for institutional coordination, policy coherence, public awareness and training exercise for many members.
- (xi) The TPRM reduces the informational disadvantage of small and developing countries by making information about foreign trade practices a public good. For LDCs, there is also more support from the Secretariat through follow-up workshops.
- (xii) The Secretariat has more than 40 staff members supporting the TPRM.

(b) OECD:

- (i) The Environmental Performance Review (EPR) was launched in 1992 to assist countries in assessing progress made towards meeting their national and international commitments while stimulating greater accountability to other countries and the public.
- (ii) Three to four EPRs are conducted each year and consist of information collection through a questionnaire, a review mission, the preparation of a report by the Secretariat and a peer review discussion in Paris.
- (iii) Country review missions last 4 to 7 days and consist of 6 to 9 members, including experts from two countries generally in addition to secretariat staff.
- (iv) The review process takes approximately 12 to 16 months.
- (v) Reports consist of 5 chapters and each chapter takes 8 weeks minimum (20-30 pages per chapter). Each report includes two thematically focussed chapters, such as biodiversity, climate change, water, waste etc. At the end of the report, there is a section on assessments and recommendations.
- (vi) EPRs have helped improve individual and collective environmental performance of OECD members and partners.

- (vii) The OECD also conducts so-called National Policy Dialogues (NPDs), such as Water Policy Dialogues, which could also provide insights for the CBD review mechanism. NPDs are policy platforms where stakeholders meet to advance policy reforms.

(c) UNFCCC:

- (i) The Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) system under the UNFCCC aims to track the implementation of the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol by Parties and to identify capacity building needs especially of developing country Parties. Reporting and review have been in place for almost two decades.
- (ii) The MRV system helps to enhance transparency and accountability of Parties' climate action and support and build trust and confidence among Parties. It also helps to improve Parties' reporting overtime and share best practices among Parties.
- (iii) The current MRV involves the international assessment and review (IAR) process for developed country Parties, and the international consultation and analysis (ICA) process for developing country Parties. Under these processes, individual Parties submit their reports biennially which will then be reviewed by international expert review teams either in-country or in a centralized setting. These review reports serve as the main inputs to the multilateral consideration process for individual Parties under the IAR and ICA.
- (iv) The new transparency arrangements under the Paris Agreement, built on the existing MRV system, will provide inputs to global stock take to assess the collective progress towards achieving the long-term goals.
- (v) The resources involved in operating the MRV system include: coordination of reviews by the UNFCCC secretariat; compilation of reports, hosting of in-country reviews, and the provision of review experts by Parties; time allocated for multilateral consideration at the sessions under the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI).
- (vi) As an example, SBI allocates four and a half days for multilateral assessment under the first round of IAR in addition to time and resources allocated for the question and answer process prior to the sessions.
- (vii) For the smooth operation of the MRV system, a well-functioning national system needs to be in place to fulfil the MRV requirements, the efficiency of the MRV process needs to be improved to balance its costs and benefits, and well-targeted training programmes need to be developed to help with the implementation of the MRV.

(d) INTOSAI:

- (i) The Working Group on Environmental Auditing (WGEA), under the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI) aims to improve the use of audit in the field of environmental protection policies, by assisting audit institutions through exchange of information and experience, training and through guidelines and other informative material.
- (ii) The audits include, opinion on the fairness of financial statement, compliance of relevant environmental laws, standards and policies and environment-related performance.
- (iii) The SAIs can audit the implementation of certain and specific international environmental agreements or treaties in their specific countries.
- (iv) Audit conducted by SAIs are not specifically focused on the implementation of CBD, but instead related to CBD targets, including audit on the implementation of CBD commitments, the harmonization between national regulations and CBD commitments,

and the implementation of CBD-related regulations and the fairness of the reporting, effectiveness of monitoring process and validity of reporting evidence.

- (v) The environmental audit conducted by SAI assists governments in formulating legislation/policies/programs, evaluating capacity, improving the function of policies and programs, and generating indicators, system and reporting.
- (vi) The effectiveness of the INTOSAI is measured based on how much a government has implemented the recommendations. In terms of level of implementation, from the INTOSAI perspective, the governments generally want to implement the recommendations.

(e) NEPAD:

- (i) Established a biennial reporting and review process to monitor progress on the implementation of the Africa Union Malabo development agenda 2063 through in-country capacity strengthening process.
- (ii) The process has three main component of agreeing on a national agenda based on the Malabo targets and goals; tracking & reporting progress against agreed indicators and review progress, assess implementation of partner commitments through technical committees and general assembly discussions.
- (iii) NEPAD established a results framework and the secretariat supports to a country level data management process.

(f) CITES:

- (i) The objective is to review the achievement of Strategic Vision 2008 extended to 2010 objectives established by the Conference of the Parties.
- (ii) Indicators and criteria have been developed for Parties to provide reports to CITES.
- (iii) General review obligations under the Treaty include species included in Appendix I or II being affected adversely by trade or provisions of the Convention
- (iv) Periodic review on governance systems is done by Parties through systematic inventory of policy-related information and activities for the management and conservation of CITES-listed species and take stock of main policy achievements and failures and suggest concrete solutions
- (v) Level of protection afforded to particular species (Periodic Review) is done through scientific subsidiary bodies. These bodies also do biological sustainability of trade being allowed (Review of Significant Trade)
- (vi) Adequacy of implementing legislation (National Legislation Project) and monitoring the fulfilment of reporting obligations (Reporting) is done through the Secretariat

(g) CMS:

- (i) The objective is to review non-compliance of a Party with the obligation to prevent adverse or potentially adverse human-induced effect on AEWA-listed species or habitat.
- (ii) The review body is the AEWA Standing Committee (SC) which receives information about non-compliance. It then submits response to Party concerned, which is requested to respond. In agreement with the Party, SC may request a site visit to assess impact based on which recommend actions to Party to prevent or mitigate impact.

(h) Nagoya Protocol:

- (i) Article 30 of the Nagoya Protocol mandated development of procedures and mechanisms to promote compliance with the Protocol and address cases of non-compliance
- (ii) Procedures and mechanisms were adopted by COP-MOP 1
- (iii) The decision established a Compliance Committee consisting of 15 members nominated by Parties (3/region) and 2 ILC representatives who serve as observers
- (iv) The Compliance Committee can receive submissions relating to issues of compliance from a Party with respect to itself, a Party with respect to another Party and COP-MOP;
- (v) Compliance Committee can also examine a situation where a Party fails to submit a national report or where information indicates that a Party is faced with compliance difficulties. Such information may be received through a national report or from the ABS Clearing-House or from the Secretariat based on information provided by a directly affected ILC;
- (vi) Committee may also examine system issues of general non-compliance

(i) Cartagena Protocol:

- (i) Article 35 of the Cartagena Protocol requires the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP) to undertake, five years after the entry into force of the Protocol and at least every five years thereafter, an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Protocol, including an assessment of its procedures and annexes.
- (ii) The COP-MOP decided, in its decision BS-VII/3, that the third assessment and review of effectiveness of the Protocol be combined with the mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan at the eighth meeting of the COP-MOP;
- (iii) The third national reporting format recognized the intended role of the information contained therein in facilitating the conduct of both the mid-term review of the implementation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol as well as the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol;
- (iv) The relevant subsidiary body entrusted with the task of reviewing the implementation of the Protocol, is to consider contributions from the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building, to review the information gathered and analysed by the Executive Secretary;
- (v) The COP-MOP also requested the Compliance Committee to provide an input into the third assessment and review of the Protocol and the mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan in the form of an evaluation of the status of implementation of the Protocol in meeting its objectives

(j) Experiences from the pilot voluntary peer review mechanism:

- (i) The objective of the voluntary peer-review process (VPR) is to help Parties to improve their individual and collective capacities to more effectively implement the Convention. This done through assessment of NBSAP development and implementation in the context of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011- 2020 and produce specific recommendations for the Parties under review;
- (ii) The review addresses the overall biodiversity policy process, in particular as laid down in the NBSAP and conducts an in-depth analysis of a limited number of key policy areas and issues.

- (iii) Two test cases of VPR have taken place, one in Ethiopia and another in India. The Voluntary Peer Review test cases provided opportunities for peer learning and helped create greater transparency and accountability to the public and other Parties.
- (iv) The specific aim of the test peer review was to assess NBSAP development and implementation in the context of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and produce recommendations for the SBI.
- (v) The test review that resulted in a methodology for the Voluntary Peer-Review (VPR) requires broad participation of relevant government institutions and stakeholders in the review process.
- (vi) The review team for the test cases was selected based on their experience in such reviews and for their expertise related to the subject and the country to be reviewed.
- (vii) The country under review is asked to provide a response but is free to decide on actions to follow-up the review report.
- (viii) The in-country visit and review was limited in term of time and consultations in the pilot phase, but there were sufficient opportunities for peer learning for Parties directly involved. There was an added value of external reviewers working on similar challenges in different countries to discuss common problems.
- (ix) Among the challenges faced in test review, one substantive barrier for implementation of the NBSAP is lack of information on the extent to which it has been mainstreamed within the countries.
- (x) The experience gained in the test reviews has been integrated in the development of a methodology for such reviews. This methodology is now submitted to the first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation for their consideration.
- (xi) The general objective of such peer reviews is highlighted as below with the aim of improving implementation of the NBSAPs:
- (xii) Three specific objectives:
 - To assess NBSAP development and implementation in the context of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and produce recommendations;
 - Opportunities for peer learning for Parties directly involved and other Parties;
 - Transparency and accountability for NBSAP development and implementation
- (xiii) The guiding principles would be:
 - Open to all CBD Parties;
 - Peer means CBD Party;
 - Common methodological framework (continuity), but flexibility to select focus on key issues of the Party under review;
 - Country under review is asked for response and is free to decide itself on appropriate follow-up the review report;
 - Aims for broad participation of relevant Government institutions and stakeholders in the review process;
 - The review is undertaken on the basis of mutual trust between the review team and the Party under review;

- Secretariat to highlight common lessons about what works well and what works less well, and to share this more broadly
 - Candidates would be selected following an open invitation to all CBD Parties; Requirements would be:
 - Evidence of high level government support;
 - National report submitted;
 - Latest NBSAP adopted as a policy document; or advanced draft of a NBSAP, or policy equivalents, under revision;
 - Willingness to contribute to in-country costs of the review.
 - The Secretariat, in consultation with the Bureau, would select the Parties to be reviewed, taking into account regional balance. No other selection criteria were (yet) foreseen.
 - Secretariat would form balanced review teams taking into account experience with peer review and expertise related to the characteristics of the Party under review (biodiversity, governance system and language). Teams would consist of between 4-6 reviewers, plus Secretariat support. There would be a team leader to coordinate and lead the work. Reviewers would have to contribute actively, participate also in the in-country visit. The Secretariat would provide logistic support, prepare materials for the desk study, support for the in-country visit; and assist with the preparation and development of the review report as appropriate and agreed. The Party under review would provide relevant documents and information; help with in-country visit; comment on the draft report; provide a written response to the final report; and provide post-review feedback on the value of the review process.
 - The Desk-study would also help determining the scope and to prepare issues to be addressed in the in-country visit. In-country visit: programme to be determined by review team. The report and response from the Party under review would both be published on the CHM. An evaluation to be made available to SBI.
- (xiv) Further work on methodology can be done after SBI1 and further voluntary peer reviews could take place after COP13, but this would need to be specified in the relevant COP decision.

B. Key elements of review mechanisms under the Convention

- (a) A review system can have multiple purposes and can be undertaken at different levels and scales with varying human resource and financial costs.
- (b) Having a clear purpose for the review was agreed as a critical aspect in designing any additional review mechanism under the Convention.
- (c) The purposes of a review mechanism can range from assessment, mutual learning, gaining new perspectives, encouraging transparency and policy coherence in national actions, helping improve performance, enhancing progress, undertaking a global stock take to hold countries accountable to each other.
- (d) There can be multiple types of reviews to collectively achieve an assessment of implementation.

- (i) Global reviews of the status of biodiversity or in the progress in achieving the biodiversity targets can be done using the Global Biodiversity Outlook or similar global assessments under other international bodies.
- (ii) A review of how Parties are fulfilling their obligations in the convention (such as timely submission of reports, appointing focal points, making contributions to the core budget of the convention etc.) is another review.
- (iii) Collaborative reviews looking at regional, thematic or national progress using approaches such as the VPR or the regional workshops on various themes described earlier in paragraph 13 (x).
- (iv) And lastly, periodical review of progress made by each party in the achievement of national commitments needs to be done based on national reports, GEF monitoring and evaluation reports etc.
- (e) The review can additionally aim to provide more visibility to the good practices and achievements of Parties in implementation and the planned plenary consultation on review of implementation at the first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation is one way to catalyse it.
- (f) A review mechanism needs to focus on the assessment of performance and the identification of obstacles in the implementation of the Convention.
- (g) Reporting can contribute to review mechanisms through the collection of data and information for assessment, but is not the only mechanism for review.
 - (i) One obstacle to reporting is that few biodiversity targets have clear benchmarks, which has rendered the reporting and subsequent review of progress towards these targets a challenging exercise. Reviews based on reports are also only as robust as the reports upon which they rely.
 - (h) It is important to have reviews that are independent (e.g. by third parties or peers) and not only based on self-assessment to identify the real gaps in implementation.
 - (i) Any review process should take into account the engagement of, and information provided by, civil society and other stakeholders, resources required, frequency of reviews and the need to establish synergies in light of reporting fatigue.
 - (j) The review process must also allow sufficient time and opportunities for discussing the findings with third parties, in order to allow for sufficient reflection and suggestions for resulting actions.
 - (k) The involvement of civil society and various stakeholders in the review process and reporting is critical. In the case of the Ramsar Convention, national reports are consulted under the national wetlands committee, but there are other bodies where consultations with NGOs/ILCs are made.
 - (l) Any review process should take into account the financial resources required as well as its cost effectiveness and return on investment. Review processes can be resource intensive in terms of experts (travel cost, hiring process, etc.), costs to the country being reviewed, and duration of process. Large amounts of data are already compiled and available and by various agencies and ministries, and it is important to establish synergies to ensure cost-effectiveness of a review process.
 - (m) An outcome of a review can be to provide a set of recommendations and a guide to assist the country with implementation and to enable other countries that are facing similar challenges and obstacles to learn from the information and analysis undertaken by the review.
 - (n) Follow-up to review findings was discussed as a critical aspect of any review mechanism.
 - (o) Consideration of establishing new review mechanisms under the Convention needs to first take into account:

- (i) Clear understanding of the problem that needs to be addressed through a review mechanism:
 - (ii) Identification of gaps in existing in the current review system, and why they cannot be addressed through strengthening existing mechanisms; and
 - (iii) Availability of human and financial resources within the CBD Secretariat and across Parties and stakeholders. The frequency of any additional review mechanism must take into account additional reporting obligations and the capacity, cost and time needed to undertake the review.
 - (iv) Review should be part of a cycle that is preceded by having a national commitment to implement the convention and providing a well prepared report.
- (p) One of the gaps identified is a lack of reviews of Parties' progress towards the strategic plan at CBD level, based on national reports and NBSAPs.

C. How reviews can strengthen implementation

(a) A review process can provide multiple benefits, ranging from providing a global overview of implementation, mutual learning, transparency and accountability to advance domestic implementation. However, based on the review mechanisms in other international processes described earlier, detailed reviews need to be conducted by all Parties, which is very time-consuming. Allocating half an hour to review each party in a Plenary is not sufficient as it is not possible to have meaningful dialogue in that short timeframe. National water policy dialogues were cited as a good example to conduct reviews for enhancing implementation. The peer review of NBSAPs needs to be discussed in order to understand its impact in enhancing implementation.

(b) National Policy Dialogues (NPDs) conducted by OECD was mentioned as one example that enhances implementation. NPDs are driven by the demand from the host countries and are usually chaired by heads of respective government agencies. The NPDs provide opportunities to transfer best practices and knowledge from European Union Member States and a number of international organizations to beneficiary countries and help develop sustainable policies in relevant sectors to enhance implementation. A variety of stakeholders participate in the meetings, such as ministries and government agencies and institutions, as well as nongovernmental organizations, the business community, parliamentary bodies. Participants also include several international organizations and European Union Member States.

D. Importance of alignment of plans and reporting

(a) The importance of alignment of plans and reporting, within the Convention and also across other relevant agreements and conventions, in supporting implementation was emphasized throughout discussions.

(b) The effectiveness of any review mechanisms depends to a large extent on the quality and quantity of information available, and where information resulting from reviews can be shared this increases the available body of information.

(c) National plans must have very clear goals and commitments to meet Convention requirements, and where possible and appropriate the alignment of national and international targets, such as in NBSAPs, can enhance reporting. This can become more effective when it also aligns with other international commitments, such as the Sustainable Development Goals.

(d) National biodiversity action needs to be mainstreamed across relevant Ministries, as Environment Ministers alone are unable to meet Convention commitments. The new 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development may help with this process.

- (e) There is a burden of additional reporting obligations and a level of fatigue emerging from the amount of meetings and reports published. This issue emphasised the importance of establishing synergies with other reporting and reviewing processes.
- (f) Some of the lessons learned from the presentations on experiences from national reporting are:
- (i) Promote synergies among Conventions, in particular with regard to the coordination for the implementation of national and international elements of strategies and action plans;
 - (ii) Establish a national reporting system and a review team at the subnational level.
 - (iii) Enhance institutional capacities and improve coordination mechanism;
 - (iv) Potential for consolidated reporting regarding general information for country information about legislative and policy frameworks, strategies and planning, compliance and enforcement measures as well as regarding cooperation;
 - (v) Importance of prioritization among targets, in particular measurable targets;
 - (vi) Expand knowledge management and documentation of lessons learned regarding national monitoring and reporting.
 - (vii) Countries must expand baseline analysis and establish a multi-stakeholder dialogue approach in order to enhance effectiveness of monitoring and reporting

E. Transparency: Ways to present and share results

- (a) Transparency and accountability were identified as key elements of review processes in order to ensure rigour and acceptance of the results.
- (b) A review process should be inclusive and ensure the participation of civil society, NGOs, indigenous peoples and women's groups, among others.
- (c) Review mechanisms are an important opportunity for the exchange of information, lessons and solutions among Parties (technical and scientific cooperation, Article 18). Therefore, the review should highlight major challenges and invite others to exchange views on how to overcome challenges, identify commonalities and invite Parties with and without challenges to discuss.
- (d) The format and approach for the presentation of review results play important roles in the exchange of information and on the overall impact of the review on implementation.
- (e) Review outcomes should be posted on the Convention website to enhance transparency and provide easy access to the results.
- (f) Presentations by Parties at the SBI or other CBD meetings on the implementation of the Strategic Plan could also build capacity and mutual learning, particularly if draft reports were shared in advance and Parties could be requested to submit questions in advance to optimize use of time in presentations. The results could be webcast on the CBD webpage, including the presentation and Q&A period to reach larger audiences. This would reduce the time needed at SBI meeting for presentations by countries.
- (g) The results of the review process can also be presented using a regional approach, for example, through regional workshops that enable meaningful dialogue and exchange of information between countries with similar obstacles. A communication strategy could aid in ensuring results from all Convention review mechanisms are properly disseminated and support enhanced implementation.
- (h) The resource implications for the establishment of these communication approaches needs to be considered.

Annex I

AGENDA

| <i>Day and time</i> | <i>Items</i> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Monday, 21 March 2016 | |
| 9 – 9:30 a.m. | <i>Registration</i> |
| 9:30 – 10:40 a.m. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening remarks, <i>Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, CBD Secretariat</i> • Welcome, <i>Norbert Bärlocher, Switzerland</i> • Remarks, <i>Mette Gervin Damsgaard, COP Bureau Member and Representative of COP President</i> • Presentation of the agenda and discussion of expected outcomes, <i>Facilitator (all)</i> • Ice-breaking and group-forming exercise, <i>Facilitator (all)</i> • Overview of the SBI document on enhancing mechanisms to support review of implementation, <i>Ravi Sharma, CBD Secretariat</i> |
| <p>I. Review mechanisms under other international processes and their effectiveness</p> <p>The objective of this session is to increase awareness of experiences to date with review mechanisms that are being implemented under other international processes, through better understanding of the process and costs involved in each, and the contribution that such performance reviews make towards achievement of the overall outcomes. This session will serve as a reference point for discussion of review mechanisms for implementation within CBD.</p> | |
| 10:40 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. | <p>Panel 1: Experiences from review mechanisms under other international processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WTO Trade Policy Review Mechanism: <i>Atanas Paparizov, Permanent Mission of Bulgaria to the WTO</i> • UNFCCC MRV and country review process, <i>Xuehong Wang, UNFCCC</i> • OECD Environmental Performance Review, <i>Katia Karousakis, OECD</i> • International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions Biodiversity Audits: <i>Sapto Amal Damandari, INTOSAI WGEA</i> • <i>The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)</i>, <i>Ravi Sharma</i> • Open discussion, <i>Facilitator (all)</i> |
| 12:30 – 1:30 p.m. | <i>Lunch break</i> |
| <p>II. Review mechanisms under the biodiversity-related conventions and protocols</p> <p>Having discussed experience under other international processes, the objective of this session is to shine the spotlight on review mechanisms that are more directly related and that are currently being implemented under the biodiversity related conventions and protocols, through better understanding of the process and costs involved in each and the contribution that they make towards achievement of the outcomes of the conventions and protocols.</p> | |
| 10:40 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. | <p>Panel 2: Experiences from existing processes within the biodiversity related Conventions and protocols</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiences from existing processes within CMS, <i>Clara Nobbe</i> • Experiences from existing processes within CITES, <i>David Morgan</i> • Experiences from existing processes within Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols, <i>Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias</i> • Open discussion, <i>All</i> |
| 2:30 – 3 p.m. | <i>Break</i> |
| 3 – 3:40 p.m. | <p>Panel 3: Experiences from the Voluntary Peer-Review (VPR) process of the NBSAPs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiences from the European Commission: <i>Anne Theo Seinen, EC</i> • Experiences from Switzerland: <i>Andreas Obrecht, Switzerland</i> • Open discussion, <i>All</i> |
| 3:40 – 5:45 p.m. | Break-out groups' exercise to map preliminary issues and options for review of implementation |
| 6 p.m. | Dinner hosted by the Government of Switzerland |

| <i>Day and time</i> | <i>Items</i> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Tuesday, 22 March 2016 | |
| III. Strengthening implementation at the national level, including reporting | |
| The effectiveness of review mechanisms depend to a large extent on the quality and quantity of the information available. The objective of this session is to gain a better understanding of the ways in which implementation is being strengthened at the national level, particularly with regards to reporting, which in turn will enrich the dialogue on the review mechanisms. | |
| 9 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. | Panel 4: Experiences from national reporting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiences from Cambodia, <i>Somaly Chan</i> • Experiences from Switzerland, <i>Eric Wiedmer</i> • Experiences from GEF, <i>Mark Zimsky</i> • Experiences from UNDP, <i>Caroline Petersen</i> • Open discussion, <i>All</i> |
| 10:30 – 11 a.m. | <i>Break</i> |
| IV. Elements for review of implementation within CBD | |
| The objective of this session is to provide the Friends of CBD with the opportunity for an in-depth discussion on the ideas, options and opportunities for a multi-dimensional review of implementation within CBD, based on all they have discussed during previous sessions and on the options presented in the supporting documentation. | |
| 11 a.m. – 12 p.m. | Break-out group exercise to map preliminary issues and options for review of implementation |
| 12 – 12.30 p.m. | Break-out groups report back and present visual maps to plenary, <i>Facilitator (all)</i> |
| 12.30 – 1.30 p.m. | <i>Lunch</i> |
| 1:30 – 2:45 p.m. | Panel 5: Ideas, options and opportunities for enhancing mechanisms for review of implementation within CBD: Past Presidents of COP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brazil, <i>Ana Cristina Fialho de Barros</i> • Germany, <i>Axel Benemann</i> • Japan, <i>Fumiko Nakao</i> • Mexico, <i>Hesiquio Benitez</i> • Slovakia, <i>Eva Viestova</i> <p>The participants will share and discuss with the plenary their insights into the discussions so far and their relation to the suggestions outlined in the Background Document on “Further Options”, <i>Facilitator (all)</i></p> |
| 2:45 – 4 p.m. | Break-out groups on the elements of review system under the Convention: Purpose, presentation of results, follow-up |
| 4 – 4:30 p.m. | <i>Break</i> |
| 4:30 – 5:30 p.m. | Reporting by the break-out groups and discussions, <i>Facilitator (all)</i> |
| Wednesday, 23 March 2016 | |
| V. Concluding session | |
| The objective of this final session is to summarize the ideas and options that have emerged during the dialogue over the past two days with regards to enhancing mechanisms to support review of implementation of the convention by CBD, in the light of the forthcoming SBI meeting. | |
| 9 – 9:15 a.m. | Warm-up exercise |
| 9:15 – 9.45 a.m. | Report back by Working Groups on Purpose and Follow-Up and Presentation elements of the proposed CBD review mechanism system. Discussion in Plenary |
| 10 – 10.30 a.m. | <i>Break</i> |
| 10:30 – 11:10 a.m. | Review of Bogis-Bossey Journey. Summary of ideas and option from Dialogue Workshop Elements as basis for the workshop report for SBI, <i>Facilitator (all)</i> |
| 11.10 – 11.30 | Closing Remarks, <i>Norbert Bärlocher, Switzerland; Hesiquio Benitez, COP 13 Presidency; and Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, CBD Secretariat</i> |

Annex II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

| | | | |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Africa | | Dr. Samuel Ndayiragije Dr. Moustafa Fouda Mr. Salisu Dahiru Dr. El Khitma Mohammed Mr. Mike Ipanga | Burundi Egypt Nigeria Sudan Democratic Republic of the Congo |
| Asia-Pacific | COP Bureau | Ms. Somaly Chan Ms. Ratna Kusuma Sari Ms. Fumiko Nakao Ms. Javzan Vandansuren Mr. Yousef Hafedh | Cambodia Indonesia (COP 2 Presidency) Japan (COP 10 Presidency) Mongolia Saudi Arabia |
| Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) | COP Bureau | Ms. Elvana Ramaj Ms. Natalya Minchenko Ms. Eva Viestova | Albania Belarus Slovakia (COP 4 Presidency) |
| Latin American and Caribbean (GRULAC) | COP Bureau | Ms. Alarica Grant Ms. Ana Cristina Fialho de Barros Mr. Hector Conde Almeida Ms. Joni Jackson Mr. Hesiquio Benitez Mr. Randolph Edmead | Bahamas (COP 1 Presidency) Brazil (COP 8 Presidency) Cuba Jamaica Mexico (Incoming COP 13 Presidency) Saint Kitts and Nevis |
| Western European and Others Group (WEOG) | COP Bureau COP Bureau SBSTTA Chair | Ms. Tia Stevens Mr. Anne Theo Seinen Ms. Mette Damsgaard Mr. Axel Benemann Mr. Andrew Bignell Mr. Simon Parker | Australia European Commission Denmark Germany (COP 9 Presidency) New Zealand United Kingdom |
| Indigenous and local communities (ILCs) | | Ms. Yolanda Teran Ms. Lucy Mullenkei | Andes Chinchasyu Organization–Ecuador Indigenous Information Network–Kenya |
| Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) | | Mr. Friedrich Wulf Ms. Susan Brown Mr. Sapto Amal Damandari | Pro Natura – FoE Switzerland WWF International INTOSAI WGEA |
| Organizations | | Mr. John Scanlon/Mr. David Morgan Ms. Clara Nobbe Mr. Mark Zimsky Ms. Anne Larigauderie Mr. Jingyuan Xia Ms. Sonia Pena Moreno Ms. Ania Grobicki Ms. Caroline Peterson Mr. Jan Dusik/Mr. Thierry Lucas Mr. Jerry Harrison Ms. Xuehong Wang | CITES CMS GEF IPBES IPPC IUCN RAMSAR UNDP UNEP UNEP-WCMC UNFCCC |
| Experts | | Ms. Katia Karousakis Mr. Atanas Paporizov | OECD Bulgarian Ambassador to WTO |
| Host | COP Bureau | Mr. Andreas Obrecht Mr. Norbert Bärlocher | Switzerland Switzerland |
| Facilitator | | Ms. Pippa Heylings | |
| CBD Secretariat | | Mr. Bráulio Dias Mr. Ravi Sharma Mr. David Cooper Ms. Lydia Zemke | |

Annex III

MAIN FEATURES OF THE REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION IN OTHER FORUMS

| Forum | Length of review cycle | Reviewing body | Background documentation and report | In-country visit | Duration of review session | Outcome | Measures based on/contained in outcome |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| UNFCCC IAR | | SBI (plenary body) | Prepared by technical expert teams | Yes | One hour per Party | Technical report and record of the multilateral assessment | |
| WTO trade policy review | 2-6 years, Determined by share of world trade | Trade Policy Review Body (plenary body) | Prepared by Secretariat | Yes | 2 sessions of half day per member | Secretariat report, policy statement by member, conclusions of the chairperson | |
| United Nations Human Rights Council Universal Policy Review | Four years | Universal Periodic Review Working Group (limited membership body) | Compiled by Secretariat, three states serve as rapporteurs during review session | | Three hours 30 minutes per member | Report adopted by Human Rights Council | Recommendations; funds available to support implementation |
| NEPAD African Peer Review Mechanism | Ongoing | Committee of Participating Heads of State and Government (plenary body) | Compiled by Secretariat, country review mission team prepares report | Yes | | Report | Development of a programme of action |
| OECD Environmental Performance Review | Eight to ten years | Working Party on Environmental Performance (plenary body) | Prepared by a review team (6-9 members), including Secretariat staff and experts from reviewing countries | Yes | One day | Report, assessment and recommendations endorsed by Working Party | Recommendations |
| Cartagena Protocol Compliance Committee | Ad hoc | Compliance committee (limited membership body) | Prepared by Secretariat | No | No fixed time | Recommendation to COP-MOP | Can include advice and/or assistance |
| Montreal Protocol Implementation Committee | Ad hoc | Implementation committee (limited membership body) | Prepared by Secretariat | No | No fixed time | Recommendation to COP-MOP | Can include advice and/or assistance |

Annex IV

PRESENTATIONS FOR SESSIONS I TO IV

Please refer to the workshop webpage for presentations delivered in sessions I to IV:
<https://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=IMPWS-2016-01>.
