



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/8
31 March 2016

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION

First meeting

Montreal, Canada, 2-6 May 2016

Item 10 of the provisional agenda*

GUIDANCE TO THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In decision III/8, the Conference of the Parties adopted the Memorandum of Understanding between the Conference of the Parties and the Council of the Global Environment Facility. Accordingly, the subsequent meetings of the Conference of the Parties have taken the financial mechanism as a standing agenda item to keep under review, and provide guidance to promote, the implementation of relevant provisions of decision III/8, in particular as they relate to the provision of guidance, reporting from the financial mechanism, review of the effectiveness, determination of funding requirements and inter-secretariat cooperation.

2. In decision XII/30, the Conference of the Parties requested the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its first meeting to consider the implementation of several subject matters of the Memorandum of Understanding. The present note has been prepared for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its first meeting and is structured in accordance with the requests contained in decision XII/30 as well as the provisions of decision III/8. Section II provides a follow-up to the previous decisions on guidance to the financial mechanism, including options on how best to utilize the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Convention's Protocols to set priorities for the financial mechanism within the context of the four-year framework of programming priorities. Section III provides updates on reporting from the Global Environment Facility. Section IV provides information on the review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism. Section V describes the activities and report related to the second assessment of funding needs. Section VI gives information on inter-secretariat cooperation.

3. There are two addenda to the present note: the preliminary draft report of the Council of the Global Environment Facility (UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/8/Add.1); and the executive summary of the report on a full assessment of the funds needed for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols for the seventh replenishment period of the Global Environment Facility (UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/8/Add.2). The full report is available as an information document. In addition, several other working documents prepared for the consideration of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation are also of direct relevance to the present

* UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/1Rev.1.

agenda item, including documents UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2 (Progress in the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and towards the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets), and UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/5 (Strategic actions to enhance implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020). Parties may wish to consider all these working documents in a holistic manner.

II. GUIDANCE FROM THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

4. In accordance with Article 21 of the Convention, the Conference of the Parties will determine the policy, strategy, programme priorities and eligibility criteria for access to, and utilization of, financial resources available through the financial mechanism, and this provision is captured in section 2 of the above-mentioned memorandum of understanding. Accordingly, the Conference of the Parties at every meeting has adopted guidance to the financial mechanism on what is to be financed. Having reviewed all the previous guidance to the financial mechanism, the Conference of the Parties adopted, in decision X/24, consolidated guidance to the financial mechanism, including programme priorities. In paragraph 4 of decision X/24, the Conference of the Parties decided that guidance to the financial mechanism, for a specific replenishment period, consists of a consolidated list of programme priorities that defines what is to be financed, and an outcome-oriented framework, taking into account the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including its Aichi Biodiversity Targets and associated indicators.

A. Enhancing programmatic synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions

5. In section A of decision XII/30, the Conference of the Parties invited the governing bodies of the various biodiversity-related conventions: (a) to provide elements of advice, as appropriate, concerning the funding of the national priorities referred to in the paragraph above, within their respective mandates and in accordance with the mandate of the Global Environment Facility, and the Memorandum of Understanding between the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and the Council of the Global Environment Facility, that may be referred to the Global Environment Facility through the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity; (b) to request their respective secretariats to transmit such advice in a timely manner to the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity to include any advice received into the documentation for the appropriate agenda item, for consideration by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its next meeting.

6. In response, the Executive Secretary transmitted section A of decision XII/30 to the secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions, including the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar), World Heritage Convention (WHC), The International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA), the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), and also organized bilateral teleconferences as well as meetings of the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions to promote and facilitate response of the biodiversity-related conventions. A dedicated webpage (<https://www.cbd.int/financial/blg.shtml>) has also been established to promote the sharing of funding information on the biodiversity-related conventions.

7. The programmatic synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions can be observed in the submissions of response to the questionnaire circulated by the team of five experts for purposes of preparing a report on the full assessment of funding necessary and available for the implementation of the Convention for the period July 2018 to June 2022. Table 1 demonstrates a very high percentage of biodiversity projects envisaged for GEF-7 that are also marked as addressing other multilateral environmental conventions, particularly United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

(42%) and United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (37%). About one fifth of the envisaged biodiversity projects would also address Convention on Wetlands, Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, and International Plant Protection Convention. Over one tenth of the envisaged biodiversity projects would cover the objectives of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and World Heritage Convention. A small share of the envisaged biodiversity projects would be linked to Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, Minamata Convention on Mercury, and Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer.

Table 1. Programmatic synergies with biodiversity-related conventions during GEF-7

<i>Convention</i>	<i>Percentage of number of envisaged projects</i>	<i>Percentage of biodiversity project funding</i>	<i>Share of co-financing</i>
Convention with GEF as financial mechanism			
United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)	42%	27%	60%
United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)	37%	20%	62%
Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	5%	0.22%	63%
Minamata Convention on Mercury (MCM)	4%	0.07%	50%
Montreal Protocol on Substances That Deplete the Ozone Layer (MP)	3%	0.07%	50%
Convention that may benefit from GEF funding			
Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar)	21%	22%	68%
Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)	20%	37%	57%
International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)	20%	11%	40%
Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)	16%	17%	62%
The International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA)	13%	4%	74%
World Heritage Convention (WHC)	12%	7%	65%
Average share of co-financing			66%

8. The submissions in response to section A of decision XII/30 received so far have been available online at <https://www.cbd.int/financial/blg.shtml>, including the decision of the Standing Committee to the Convention on Migratory Species at its 44th meeting (StC44) with regard to developing elements of advice for the Global Environment Facility concerning the funding of the national priorities for CMS aligned with the implementation of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, outcomes of the 66th meeting of the Standing Committee to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES SC66, Geneva, 11-15 January 2016), and outcomes of the sixth session of the Governing Body of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture relevant to the Convention on Biological Diversity. The Executive Secretary will continue to follow up with the secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions in accordance with section A of decision XII/30 and to include any advice received from the biodiversity-related conventions into relevant documentation.

B. Consolidated list of programme priorities

9. Since the first consolidation of the list of programme priorities at its tenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties has adopted additional guidance to the financial mechanism in several decisions, including decision X/25, section D of decision XI/5, and sections C, D and E of decision XII/30. In paragraph 5 of decision XII/30, the Conference of the Parties decided, with a view to further streamlining guidance to the Global Environment Facility, to review proposed new guidance to avoid or reduce repetitiveness, to consolidate previous guidance where appropriate and to prioritize guidance in the context of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Accordingly, the Executive Secretary will prepare, in consultation with the Global Environment Facility, a draft consolidated list of guidance to the financial mechanism, up to the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting.

C. Ways to best utilize the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Convention's Protocols to set priorities for the financial mechanism within the context of the four-year framework of programming priorities for GEF-7

10. In paragraph 10 of decision XII/30, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to explore and report on ways in which the Conference of the Parties can best utilize the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Convention's Protocols to set priorities for the financial mechanism within the context of the four-year framework of programming priorities for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund and to submit the report to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation for consideration at its first meeting. In this respect, two approaches may be explored: (a) a "top-down" approach in the light of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Convention's Protocols, taking into account global progress towards the various Aichi Targets; and (b) a bottom-up approach based on country submissions.

11. The team of five experts in charge of preparing a report on the full assessment of funding necessary and available for the implementation of the Convention for the period July 2018 to June 2022 received 383 projects envisaged for GEF-7 from 45 recipient countries. Table 2 describes the pattern of the nationally envisaged projects for GEF-7 funding, in terms of both the number of projects and the funding amounts of the projects. While more submissions from additional countries would provide insight into nationally driven prioritization, the existing information already provides reasonable indication of priorities being set by recipient countries.

Table 2. Distribution of nationally envisaged projects for GEF-7 funding

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Envisaged projects for GEF-7</i>		<i>Envisaged for GEF funding</i>		<i>Total project funding</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>Million \$</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>Million \$</i>	<i>% of total</i>
Public education and awareness (Aichi Target 1)	30	7.8%	106.69	5.2%	210.72	3.4%
Traditional knowledge and customary use (Article 8(j) and related provisions, Aichi Target 18)	19	5%	38.91	1.9%	138.72	2.2%
Incentive measures (Aichi Target 3)	6	1.6%	7.86	0.4%	13.48	0.2%
Sustainable tourism	12	3.1%	127.85	6.2%	442.98	7.2%

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Envisaged projects for GEF-7</i>		<i>Envisaged for GEF funding</i>		<i>Total project funding</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>Million \$</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>Million \$</i>	<i>% of total</i>
Research and training (Article 12) and knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied (Aichi Target 19); Global Taxonomy Initiative; development and application of indicators and monitoring (Article 7)	31	8.1%	116.84	5.7%	290.09	4.7%
A. Biodiversity conservation on land and in coastal areas (mainly current GEF-6 Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy)	80	20.9%	661.10	32%	2,405.49	39%
Protected Area Networks and general Species conservation (Aichi Target 11 and 12)	46	12.0%	540.94	26%	2,118.41	34%
Terrestrial PA systems: natural habitats and forests, mountains, drylands (Aichi Targets 5, 11, 12)	17	4.4%	285.49	14%	1,293.33	21%
Marine and coastal biodiversity and PA systems (Aichi target 11 and 12) and sustainable fisheries in coastal areas (Aichi Targets 4, 6, 7)	8	2.1%	32.90	1.6%	102.50	1.7%
Coral reefs (Aichi Targets 10, 14, 15) and sustainable fisheries (Aichi Targets 4, 6, 7)	8	2.1%	11.93	0.6%	45.50	0.7%
PAs for island biological diversity (Aichi Targets 11 and 12)	4	1.0%	148.77	7.2%	360.55	5.8%
Conservation of threatened species (Aichi Target 12)	19	5.0%	280.74	14%	1,161.18	19%
Addressing invasive alien species (Aichi Target 9)	18	4.7%	228.12	11%	873.10	14%
B. Marine Biodiversity in international waters (mainly current GEF-6 International Waters Focal Area Strategy)	12	3.1%	21.55	1.0%	70.56	1.1%
Marine protected areas beyond national jurisdiction (Aichi Target 11)	4	1.0%	2.60	0.1%	6.56	0.1%
Sustainable fisheries on high seas and sustainable use (Aichi Targets 4, 6; 7)	7	1.8%	13.95	0.7%	44.00	0.7%
Transboundary Inland water systems (Aichi Targets 11, 12, 14)	2	0.5%	8.50	0.4%	25.00	0.4%
C. Restoration of Natural Habitats, Ecosystems and their services (for Climate change mitigation and ecosystem resilience)	31	8.1%	359.56	17%	1,395.74	22%
Restore Natural habitats (Aichi Target 5)	14	3.7%	156.52	7.6%	506.57	8.2%

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Envisaged projects for GEF-7</i>		<i>Envisaged for GEF funding</i>		<i>Total project funding</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>Million \$</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>Million \$</i>	<i>% of total</i>
Avoid forest loss, degradation and fragmentation of forests (Aichi Target 5)	14	3.7%	138.23	6.7%	455.56	7.4%
Restore essential forest ecosystems and their services (Aichi Target 15)	10	2.6%	268.07	13%	1,202.74	19%
Restore essential freshwater ecosystems and their services (Aichi Target 14)	8	2.1%	31.75	1.5%	94.10	1.5%
D. Sustainable use of biodiversity, production and consumption	41	10.7%	88.99	4.3%	236.74	3.8%
Genetic diversity of plants and animals (Aichi Target 13)	24	6.3%	36.42	1.8%	110.80	1.8%
Sustainable production and consumption (Aichi Target 4)	23	6.0%	67.47	3.3%	169.64	2.7%
Pollution reduction to biodiversity safe levels from agriculture, freshwater systems etc. (Aichi Target 8)	13	3.4%	36.64	1.8%	84.58	1.4%
Activities according to decision XI/5, annex, appendix 1; ABS protocol implementation, national reporting, awareness raising, and capacity improvement	17	4.4%	28.54	1.4%	80.52	1.3%
Implementation of national biosafety frameworks, national reporting, capacity-building and improvement; ratification and implementation of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress	18	4.7%	27.50	1.3%	77.30	1.2%
H. Capacity-Building and cooperation	57	14.9%	145.62	7.0%	423.56	6.8%
National reporting	11	2.9%	46.52	2.2%	102.99	1.7%
Country-specific resource mobilization strategies (Aichi Target 20)	7	1.8%	44.38	2.1%	55.95	0.9%
South-South cooperation	10	2.6%	22.86	1.1%	97.80	1.6%
Biodiversity planning, integration and synergies (Aichi Target 2)	26	6.8%	53.24	2.6%	168.04	2.7%
Technical and scientific cooperation, transfer of technology (Article 16) and clearing-house mechanism (Article 18)	21	5.5%	41.92	2.0%	137.03	2.2%
Total	383		2,067.85		6,195.28	

12. The number of envisaged projects indicates a continued concentration of national interests in protected area networks and general species conservation (Aichi Targets 11 and 12), monitoring and knowledge development and sharing (Aichi Targets 7, 12 and 19), public education and awareness (Aichi Target 1), and biodiversity planning, integration and synergies (Aichi Target 2). Only a very limited number of the projects would cover incentive measures (Aichi Target 3) and country-specific resource mobilization strategies (Aichi Target 20). Almost an equal number of projects are envisaged to address the two Protocols and invasive alien species (Aichi Target 9). The number of projects envisaged to reduce

pollution to biodiversity-safe levels from agriculture, freshwater systems, etc. (Aichi Target 8) is also visible in the submissions although this issue has not been elaborated on in necessary detail in the previous guidance to the financial mechanism.

13. According to the submissions, the majority of needed project funding is intended for protected area networks and general species conservation (Aichi Targets 11 and 12), terrestrial protected areas systems: natural habitats and forests, mountains, drylands (Aichi Targets 5, 11, and 12), conservation of threatened species (Aichi Target 12), restoration of essential forest ecosystems and their services (Aichi Target 15), addressing invasive alien species (Aichi Target 9), restoration of natural habitats (Aichi Target 5), and island biological diversity (Aichi Targets 11 and 12). Although there are a good number of capacity-building and cooperation projects, the funding envisaged for these purposes only accounts for 7% of the total funding. The two Protocols together only need about 2.5% of the project funding, and incentive measures (Aichi Target 3) would require less than 0.4% of the total amount. The submissions also indicate a lower level of co-financing for the envisaged projects addressing country-specific resource mobilization strategies (Aichi Target 20), incentive measures (Aichi Target 3), public education and awareness (Aichi Target 1), national reporting, and pollution reduction to biodiversity safe levels from agriculture, freshwater systems, etc. (Aichi Target 8). Further submissions from more recipient countries can be very helpful in assisting with utilizing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Convention's Protocols to set priorities for the financial mechanism within the context of the four-year framework of programming priorities for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund.

14. However, the Conference of the Parties may also take into account, from a global perspective, the progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, with a view to enhancing support for those Targets that are lagging behind in particular.

15. The Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its first meeting may wish to request the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with the Global Environment Facility, and relevant Parties, taking into account the global assessment of progress and the need to prioritize activities to fill gaps, as well as a Party's individual responses to the questionnaire from the Expert Team, to prepare a draft four-year framework of programming priorities for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund for consideration of the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

III. REPORTING

16. In accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding, the Council of the Global Environment Facility has the obligation to prepare and submit a report for each ordinary meeting of the Conference of the Parties. In paragraph 8(e) of decision XII/30, the Conference of the Parties invited the Global Environment Facility to make available a preliminary draft of its report to the Conference of the Parties, particularly focusing on the response of the Global Environment Facility to previous guidance from the Conference of the Parties, to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation prior to the meeting of the Conference of the Parties at which the report will be formally considered, with a view to promoting effective and timely consideration of the information provided in the report.

17. For the preliminary report of the Global Environment Facility, see UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/8/Add.1.

IV. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

18. As provided for in Article 21, paragraph 3, of the Convention, the Conference of the Parties reviews periodically the effectiveness of the financial mechanism in implementing the Convention and communicates to the Council relevant decisions taken by the Conference of the Parties as a result of such

review, to improve the effectiveness of the financial mechanism in assisting developing country Parties to implement the Convention. The fourth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism was completed by the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting with a series of actions taken to further improve the effectiveness of the financial mechanism.

19. In the annex to decision X/24, the Conference of the Parties agreed that the review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism would be conducted every four years and this review should coincide with the meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Accordingly, the fifth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism needs to be conducted by the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. In this regard, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its first meeting may wish to consider recommending to the Conference of the Parties terms of reference for the fifth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism.

V. DETERMINATION OF FUNDING REQUIREMENTS

20. In decision XII/30, paragraph 11, the Conference of the Parties decided, in anticipation of the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, to undertake, at its thirteenth meeting, the second determination of funding requirements for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols, in line with the terms of reference contained in the annex to the decision. The terms of reference call for a full assessment of the amount of funds needed for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols for the seventh replenishment period of the trust fund of the Global Environment Facility and set out the procedures for implementation.

21. With support from the Bureau of the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the Executive Secretary established the team of five experts nominated by Governments and non-governmental organizations: Mr. Carlos Manuel Rodriguez (Costa Rica) and Mr. Appukuttan Nair Damodaran (India) from developing country Parties; Ms. Maria Schultz (Sweden) and Mr. Yasushi Hibi (Japan) from developed country Parties; and Mr. Günter Mitlacher (GEF-CSO Network) from international non-governmental organizations. The representative of the Global Environment Facility, Mr. Mark Zimsky, has participated in the assessment as an observer. Financial support for the team of five experts has been received from the Government of Japan through the Japan Biodiversity Fund and the European Commission.

22. The team of five experts held two face-to-face meetings, in Montreal, Canada, in October 2015, and in New Delhi, in February 2016, respectively, in addition to several teleconferences. The team examined various assessment methods and sources of information and decided to adopt a bottom-up approach to the second assessment of funding needs through a questionnaire requested in decision XII/30. Relevant information is available fully at <https://www.cbd.int/financial/gef7needs.shtml>, and responses to the questionnaire were received from 45 countries, as shown in table 3.

Table 3. Countries responding to the questionnaire of the expert team

<i>Region</i>	<i>Country</i>
Africa (Ms. Maria Schultz and Mr. Yasushi Hibi)	Benin, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Eritrea, Guinea-Bissau, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Rwanda, São Tomé and Príncipe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sudan, Uganda, Zimbabwe (18) (36 Parties not yet responded)
Asia and the Pacific (Mr. Appukuttan Nair Damodaran)	China, India, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Nepal, Philippines, State of Palestine, Syrian Arab Republic, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Viet Nam (12) (36 Parties not yet responded)
Latin America and the Caribbean (Mr. Carlos Manuel Rodriguez)	Barbados, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, Suriname (9) (24 Parties not yet responded)
Eastern Europe (Mr. Günter Mitlacher)	Albania, Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Republic of Moldova, Serbia (6) (6 Parties not yet responded)

23. The 45 responses suggested 381 biodiversity project ideas/concepts, for a total of \$2.05 billion, envisaged for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund. On the basis of the responses, the expert team prepared the draft executive summary of the full assessment of funding necessary and available for the implementation of the Convention for the period July 2018 to June 2022, (see UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/8/Add.2). The draft report of the expert team contains a series of preliminary conclusions as regards the responses of GEF-recipient countries.

24. The expert team notes that the methodology of this second assessment on GEF funding needs as set out in the terms of reference appears adequate to deliver transparent, reliable, and replicable data and information. However, the quality of the assessment results relies heavily on inputs from GEF-recipient countries and can only be improved if countries engage further, systematically and seriously in the task. The expert team indicates that the limited number of responses (45 out of 147 Parties) do not constitute a sufficiently robust or reliable data basis on which to assess the funding needs for the GEF-7 period, and more countries should strive to complete their questionnaire so that it can be included in the final report for the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its first meeting may wish to urge relevant Parties to take prompt action, by 31 August 2016, to respond to the questionnaire, and request the Executive Secretary and the Global Environment Facility to undertake efforts to facilitate the submission of such responses from developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition.

25. The expert team also notes that the timeframe for the assessment was extremely tight given the fact that the assessment was predominantly completed by the members of the expert team on a voluntary basis in addition to their regular activities and with limited resources. Recalling paragraph 5 of decision III/8, which describes the process of determining funding requirements for the GEF replenishment, and given the experience of completing two needs assessments, one with a “top-down” and one with a “bottom-up” approach, the expert team recommends establishing a funding needs assessment panel and a formalized and structured process that includes strategic resource planning to assess the financial requirements for GEF replenishments. The expert team mentions the example of the procedures and bodies of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol. The Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its first meeting may wish to request the Executive Secretary to propose options for such a panel, in consultation with the Global Environment Facility, for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting.

VI. INTER-SECRETARIAT COOPERATION AND RECIPROCAL REPRESENTATION

26. According to the Memorandum of Understanding, the Secretariat of the Convention and the Secretariat of Global Environment Facility communicate and cooperate with each other and consult on a regular basis to facilitate the effectiveness of the financial mechanism in order to assist developing country Parties in implementing the Convention. On a reciprocal basis, representatives of GEF will be invited to attend meetings of the Conference of the Parties and representatives of the Convention will be invited to attend meetings of GEF. In order to meet the requirements of accountability to the Conference of the Parties, reports submitted by the Council will cover all GEF-financed activities carried out for the purpose of the Convention, whether decisions on such activities are made by the Council or by the GEF implementing and/or executing agencies, and the Council will make such arrangements as might be necessary with the implementing agencies regarding disclosure of information. In paragraph 9 of decision XII/30, the Conference of the Parties encouraged the Executive Secretary and the Chief Executive Officer of the Global Environment Facility to continue to strengthen inter-secretariat cooperation and collaborate with the Independent Evaluation Office of the Global Environment Facility and the Global Environment Facility agencies.

27. With financial support from the Japan Biodiversity Fund, the Executive Secretary and the GEF Secretariat collaborated to organize a series of joint CBD and GEF workshops on implementation of the Convention and its Protocols, as contained in table 4.¹ The joint workshops provided opportunities for national focal points of CBD, GEF and relevant conventions to receive updated information on developments in implementing the Convention and its Protocols as well as programming opportunities to implement the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 through the GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategy and other programming windows during GEF-6. The Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its first meeting may wish to consider encouraging the two secretariats to explore similar opportunities to promote national and regional implementation of the Convention and its Protocols and relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties.

Table 4. Joint CBD and GEF workshops on implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity

<i>Subregional workshop</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Venue</i>
Central Asia and Eastern Europe	September 2015	Minsk, Belarus
Middle East and North Africa	September 2015	Dead Sea, Jordan
Eastern Africa	July 2015	Lake Victoria, Uganda
Eastern Europe	June 2015	Tbilisi, Georgia
Western Africa	May 2015	Libreville, Gabon
Caribbean	May 2015	Freeport, Bahamas
Western Africa	April 2015	Sal, Cabo Verde
South America	April 2015	Asunción, Paraguay
Asia	March 2015	Colombo, Sri Lanka
Central America	March 2015	Managua, Nicaragua
Southern Africa	February 2015	Windhoek, Namibia

28. In decision III/8, the Conference of the Parties referred to information from the GEF implementing and/or executing agencies. The Executive Secretary organized the IDB Dialogue on International Financing for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, held on 21 and 22 May 2015, as a

¹ Available at <https://www.cbd.int/financial/2015gefworkshops.shtml>.

global platform for key stakeholders and funding partners to share funding information, experiences and perspectives, including pertinent funding programmes and initiatives and associated good practices and lessons learned, and on how to track and report biodiversity-related funding. Funding information from some 20 major donors and funding institutions has been updated and made available at <https://www.cbd.int/financial/ibd2015.shtml> and nearly 7,000 page views were executed by a wide range of stakeholders in that two-day period. A total of 11 GEF agencies participated in the electronic forum, including the African Development Bank (AFDB), Conservation International (CI), the Development Bank of Latin America (CAF), the Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the World Bank, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF).

VII. SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS²

29. The Subsidiary Body on Implementation may wish to adopt a recommendation along the following lines:

The Subsidiary Body on Implementation,

Recalling the Memorandum of Understanding between the Conference of the Parties and the Council of the Global Environment Facility,³

Also recalling decisions X/24, X/25, XI/5 and XII/30,

Taking note of the submissions from the biodiversity-related conventions in accordance with decision XII, section A, the preliminary report of the Global Environment Facility,⁴ and the report of the expert team on a full assessment of the funds needed for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility,⁵

1. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to undertake the following, for consideration by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its thirteenth meeting:

(a) To prepare, in collaboration with the Global Environment Facility, a draft four-year framework of programme priorities for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, using the responses to the questionnaire on GEF-7 funding needs from recipient country Parties and the report of the expert team;⁵

(b) To prepare, in consultation with the Independent Evaluation Office of the Global Environment Facility, draft terms of reference for the fifth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism;

3. *Notes* the progress made by the expert team in preparing the report on a full assessment of the funds needed for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols for the seventh replenishment period of the Global Environment Facility;⁵

² This recommendation is complementary to those under agenda items 5 and 9 (regarding financial reporting).

³ Decision III/8, annex.

⁴ UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/8/Add.1.

⁵ UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/8/Add.2.

4. *Extends its appreciation* to those Parties that responded to the questionnaire circulated by the expert team and *urges* recipient Parties that have not done so to submit their response by 31 October 2016;

5. *Encourages* the expert team to take into account the comments emanating from the first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and further submissions from recipients and to finalize the assessment report, including terms of reference for the proposed standing panel for funding needs assessments, in time for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting;

6. *Recommends* that the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting adopt a decision that addresses the following elements:

- (a) Consolidated guidance to the financial mechanism, including programme priorities;
 - (b) Additional guidance to the financial mechanism, including advice received from the biodiversity-related conventions in line with decision XII/30 (A);
 - (c) Endorsement of the report on assessment of needs for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund and an invitation to the Global Environment Facility to give due consideration in the process of replenishment for GEF-7 to all aspects of the Expert Team's needs assessment report on the levels of funding for biodiversity, and report back on its responses;
 - (d) Adoption of a four-year framework of programme priorities for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund and request the Global Environment Facility to report on its implementation;
 - (e) Consideration of the report of the Council of the Global Environment Facility;
 - (f) Adoption of terms of reference for the fifth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism;
 - (g) Adoption of the terms of reference proposed by the expert team for a standing panel for funding needs assessments;
 - (h) Consideration of the organization of joint workshops by the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Global Environment Facility to promote national and regional implementation of the Convention and its Protocols, and encouragement of the two secretariats to continue collaboration on providing support for national and regional implementation.
-