



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/INF/18
16 May 2014

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

Fifth meeting

Montreal, 16-20 June 2014

Item 13 of the provisional agenda*

COMPILATION OF VIEWS ON WAYS AND MEANS TO IMPROVE THE EFFICIENCY OF STRUCTURES AND PROCESSES UNDER THE CONVENTION AND ITS PROTOCOLS

Note by the Executive Secretary

INTRODUCTION

1. The present note provides a compilation of views submitted to the Secretariat on ways and means to improve the efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols that were provided in response to the notification 2013-120 (Ref. No. SCBD/OES/OJ/moc/82999) issued on 19 December 2013, pursuant to decision XI/10. These submissions have contributed to the preparation of the note by the Executive Secretary on improving the efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/12).
2. Submissions were received from Australia, Cambodia, China, the European Union and its member States, Guatemala, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, and Thailand, and from the Secretariat of the East African Community and the Inuit Circumpolar Council, Canada.
3. The submissions have been reproduced in the form and languages in which they were provided to the Secretariat.

* UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/1.

SUBMISSIONS

A. *Submissions from Parties*

Australia

CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY (CBD) NOTIFICATION 2013-120

Improving the efficiency of structures and processes under the
Convention and its Protocols

Submission by Australia

NOTE: All information provided in this response has been drawn from Australian Government agency inputs only. No consultation with other stakeholders has taken place.

Improving the efficiency of structures and processes under the
Convention and its Protocols

Parties are invited to submit views and suggestions on ways and means to improve the efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols in preparation for the fifth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on the Review of Implementation of the Convention, including, *inter alia*:

- (a) The organization of inter-sessional work, including the periodicity of meetings of SBSTTA and inter-sessional open-ended working groups;
- (b) The organization of the meetings of the Conference of the Parties and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit-Sharing.

Australia supports changes to the operations of the Convention which aim to increase the efficiency and/or effectiveness of the implementation of the Convention. Australia is also supportive of enhancing synergies across the three Rio conventions as well as amongst biodiversity-related conventions which increase effectiveness and efficiency and reduce duplication across related issues while respecting the mandates of each convention. Any changes to the operations of the Convention or its Protocols should be made within existing financial budgets and seek to minimise resourcing burdens on Parties.

Frequency of Meetings

The periodicity of meetings should be appropriate to the maturity of the Convention and facilitate progress in implementation of the objectives of the Convention and its work programme.

/...

The COP agreed to maintain the current periodicity of its meetings until 2020, with future meetings occurring on a biennial basis from 2014 (Decision X/10)..

- : Biennial COPs may allow sufficient time for Parties to implement decisions while not losing momentum.
- : Two SBSTTA meetings of one week each between each COP, not occurring back to back with a COP, allows sufficient time for the SBSTTA to complete its work and feed into the COP.

Notwithstanding this, there may be merit in considering holding the COP every three years.

- : Triennial meetings allow Parties increased time to implement, monitor, evaluate and report on national or regional actions made in accordance with decisions of the COP.
- : A three-year COP cycle would be commensurate with the COP's extensive work programme and focus on shifting to an implementation phase.
- : Cost savings from holding triennial COP meetings could be used to support developing appropriate mechanisms and processes to support the shift in focus of the convention toward implementation, along with other governance reforms.
- : Options for potential mechanisms and processes to support triennial COPs could include:
 - An expanded Bureau;
 - An expanded WGRI;
 - Establishment of a new forum to discuss key policy issues and hold preliminary discussions of draft decisions ahead of the CoP allowing SBSTTA and WGRI to focus more on its core advisory functions; and/or
 - Increased coordination, implementation, monitoring and reporting at a regional level.

Further to agreement on the periodicity of COP meetings, a review of the periodicity of COPs every four years (or six in the case of triennial meetings) as opposed to the current review every two would reduce the administrative workload at COPs.

Current Processes and Format

The CBD agenda and work program of activities is extensive.

One of the key challenges for COP 12 will be to manage the diverse work program within the time constraints in a manner which does not overburden Parties or the Secretariat. The amount of work involved for each COP can be extensive due to the number of issues on the agenda for discussion and associated volume of documents generated. This may present resource challenges for many parties, particularly those with limited staff engaged at the national level on the CBD and those with smaller delegations at COPs.

There have been a number of positive actions by the COP to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the COP and its Protocols. This is reflected in, for instance, past decisions to review and, if appropriate, retire decisions, and to introduce criteria for identifying new and emerging issues related to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity for the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) (Decision IX/29).

Options for continued improvements in the efficiency and effective of the operations of the Convention bodies could include:

1. Releasing papers for major meetings well in advance (at least 6 weeks prior to the meeting). Papers include provisional and annotated agendas, information for participants, detailed schedule, information on speakers and topics, and any other documents to support the meeting and meeting discussions.

Early release of papers would facilitate preparations by delegates in the lead up to the meetings to ensure that their interventions and national positions are relevant to the topics raised in discussion.

This may require a review of the Rules of Procedure to impose tighter deadlines for submission of papers and other measures such as comments will not be considered past certain timeframes to allow the timely release of papers. The Secretariat could make available limited hard copies of the papers to support delegations that have internet access issues.

2. Providing draft decisions for consideration well in advance of meetings (or potentially to a newly established forum, or a pre-COP meeting specifically to review draft decisions). The precise mechanism and process for how best to provide conclusions and recommendations for consideration in advance will need to ensure transparency and allow national governments to give appropriate consideration to the potential requirements of the recommendations.

The absence of proposed conclusions and recommendations for consideration means less guidance for delegates, including in the preparation of national positions and interventions. It can also make it difficult to identify in advance the key issues that needed to be addressed at the meeting and conduct the appropriate level of consultation at the national level in preparation for the meeting. Further, the absence of draft decisions can result in open-ended discussions and fewer outcomes, reducing the overall efficiency of the meeting. On the other hand, open-ended discussions may prove useful to raise and air issues without the need to enter negotiations or establish final positions, thus facilitating open debate.

Consideration should be given to establishing processes that achieve a suitable balance between identifying and discussing issues, seeking advice, and reaching decisions, across the cycle between COPs.

To the extent possible, issues should be raised or addressed ahead of the CoP and consideration should be given to establishing processes to achieve this. As stated earlier, savings made through moving to triennial meetings could be used to fund such processes.

3. Ensuring the plenary is used for high-level information sharing and key decisions to facilitate efficient and effective use of plenary time. The high-level segment should continue to be used to discuss controversial and difficult issues, and as the key decision-making body.

Other mechanisms – such as working groups, friends of the chair groups, contact groups and panels – should be used as necessary to facilitate more detailed discussion, information sharing and negotiation of draft positions/outcomes for plenary agreement where necessary.

While working groups are an important mechanism for reaching preliminary agreement on an issue between interested parties, this should not be seen as final agreement on an issue which is reserved for the plenary. The practice at times of gavelling through Resolutions and decisions in the plenary based on working group discussions disadvantages smaller delegations that may not have had the opportunity to participate in working group discussions, and is contrary to the intended role of working groups and the plenary. Providing due consideration in plenary of resolutions and decisions allows all Parties the opportunity to consider the implications of recommendations before a decision is made.

4. Secretariat providing strong guidance prior to meetings and strong facilitation of meetings. Effective Secretariat support and meeting chairing is critical to ensuring that presentations and meetings proceed effectively and efficiently (including appropriately passing through non-

contentious issues), and that discussions are relevant to and progress the agenda item and adhere to strict timing schedules.

The Secretariat also has a critical role in providing clear guidance to Parties on issues, particularly the work programme, rules and procedures of the Convention and previous decisions. The number of issues for discussion, and associated working groups, should be strictly prioritised and contained to the extent possible to core and priority issues to enable smaller delegations maximum opportunity to participate in discussions of national relevance to them.

5. Reviewing outstanding work program within the Convention bodies with a view of winding up work items which are no longer relevant. The resultant work program could be prioritised, and tighter governance and reporting arrangements established. This would allow for better tracking of the progress of current items on the work programs and enable due consideration of the implications of including new work tasks to the existing work program.

SBSTTA

As the work of the CBD has grown, the SBSTTA has taken on an increasing amount of the preparatory work and negotiations in the lead up to COPs.

There has been much discussion over the years on the role of SBSTTA to ensure that it focuses on its mandate to provide scientific and technical input required for decision-making by the COP. Consideration should be given to establishing processes that allow the SBSTTA to focus on its core mandate, while still addressing other priority issues ahead of the CoP. The adoption of a pre-COP meeting, expanded role of the Bureau, expanded role of WGRI, expanded role of regional implementation, monitoring and reporting, or establishment of a new body to provide advice on important policy issues outside the current mandate of SBSTTA and WGRI, as noted above, are some of the options that could be considered to achieve this goal. Any new procedures will need to be funded from existing resources. This may be supported through savings achieved from a move to triennial meetings of the COP.

Regardless, SBSTTA should focus on its role as an advisory body. Any advice it provides should not be seen as final agreement on an issue and there should remain an opportunity for the COP to further consider aspects of recommendations beyond the remit of SBSTTA before a decision is made. SBSTTA 17 effectively used contact groups to identify interested parties on particular issues and resolve these issues through the contact group, which allowed issues to be more efficiently passed through the SBSTTA plenary. This is a useful process to more efficiently progress through the agenda. However this may be useful only in non-decision making bodies and should not be transferred to the COP, where decisions should be made only by the entire COP.

Opportunities to strengthen SBSTTA may come from focusing on a specific set of priority issues and ensuring strong linkages with the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). SBSTTA could be given the authority to approach IPBES directly as long as the subject is within SBSTTA's mandate.

If COP meetings move toward branding of themes for meetings, the SBSTTA agenda should be streamlined to align with the needs of the COP.

Cambodia**Comments on Annex I: Indicative List of Structure and Processes under the Convention and its Protocols**

Following comments are made to the proposed indicative list as suggested by the CBD Secretariat:

- 1) Under I.A.2, under the SBSTTA-article 25, every meeting or forum of the SBSTTA should be allowed representatives of stakeholders of Protocol on Biosafety to take part in the discussion. Quite often officers in charge of biodiversity do not have idea of what is going on with reference to the Protocol;
- 2) COP Bureau Members (I.C.1): should there be an expansion of Bureau members in terms of familiarity of the Protocol to sit in the Bureau. Current Bureau members paid too much attention biodiversity rather on biosafety. This also refers to I.C.2 on SBSTTA Bureau members.
- 3) Under H.4, developing NBSAP should be allowed to get involvement from the Protocol stakeholders in terms of article 19, and 25; and
- 4) Under II.G, all expert meeting should be allowed to get involved from Parties, with financial capacity, who expressed their interest despite their involvement in the online discussion is not active;

China**Comments from China to improve the efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols****A. Open-ended meetings**

1. **Pre-session documents:** Rule 10 of the Rules of Procedures of the COP provides that provisional agenda and working documents should be published 6 weeks before the meeting concerned. However, it occurred in many times that some documents were not published in time as requested, which impeded the parties to be well prepared for the meeting. China suggests that efficiency be improved to ensure timely publication of working documents.

4. **Number of working groups:** The existing working groups established under the CBD are on Review of Implementation of the Convention (WGRI), Protected Areas, and Article 8(j). The working group on Protected Areas has not organized a meeting in recent years. Considering in-situ conservation is one of the most important measures for biodiversity conservation, while the work related to traditional topics under the CBD such as protected area progressed slowly, we therefore recommend that the CBD should review and update the TOR of the WG on Protected Areas so that the relevant work can be resumed at the earliest stage.

9. **Contact groups/friends of chair groups:** Meetings should be organized in plenary and the number of contact groups should be minimized. Friends of chair groups may only be established when it is deemed

necessary so that parties attending the meeting can get fully involved in discussions and have a better understanding of the general progress.

11. Number and type of recommendations and decisions: COP-10 adopted the Biodiversity Strategic Plan (2011-2020) in 2010, identifying the targets for implementation of the CBD--- the Aichi Targets. At present, the Convention should transfer its priority from developing plans and targets to implementation. The number of decisions should be reduced so that parties can fully focus on implementing the existing decisions. And new decisions should focus on supporting the implementation of the Biodiversity Strategic Plan and capacity building of parties.

12. High-level segment: China supports convening high-level meetings in parallel to meetings of the COP to attract attention from the high-level of governments and the international community to biodiversity conservation.

B. Committees and Expert Groups

The current state is acceptable to China.

C. Reports

1. Frequency: For every four years

2. Type of Submission: both are acceptable.

3. Focus on process or outcomes: Given that biodiversity conservation is a long-term work and its effect may lag behind, reporting at the global and national level should focus not only on outcomes, but also on the process and new issues as well.

4. Use of Indicators: On the basis of the list of indicators for the Biodiversity Strategic Plan (2011-2020) in the COP-11 decision, the CBD should further improve the indicator system by proposing a complete list of indicators for global assessment with detailed explanation and a list of indicators for national reporting with guidelines so that national assessment will be more consistent and comparable, contributing to development of the global report.

5. Type of Assessment: mainly self-assessment

D. Online meetings

Based on past experiences of online meetings, being hard to get connected or unstable signals were major problems. Many developing countries could not take part in such meetings due to lack of facilities. We hope that the Secretariat will pay more attention to the issue and will make improvement.

European Union and its Members States
--

Submission by the EU and its Member States on**CBD NOTIFICATION No. 2013-120****"Improving the efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols"****1. Introduction**

The EU and its Member States would like to thank the Secretariat for Notification No. 2013-120 inviting the Parties to provide views and suggestions on ways and means to improve the efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention and its protocols with a view to the development of a proposal for discussion at the upcoming 5th meeting of the WGRI, as requested by the Parties through Decision XI/10.

The EU and its Member States believe that there is a lot of scope for improving the efficiency of the Convention and its protocols with a view to achieving their objectives in a more coherent, efficient and cost-effective way.

Such improvement is not only desirable, but also very much needed to address the challenges to be faced in the coming years. On the one hand, the EU and its Member States have already expressed several times the conviction that the overall focus of the CBD during this decade needs to be on the implementation of the Strategic Plan 2010-2020 and its Aichi Targets, in particular at the national and regional levels. On the other hand, it is obvious that the upcoming entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization and its related governance structure will add complexity and put additional demand/pressure on the CBD Secretariat, and on the way we operate collectively and individually as Parties to the Convention and its Protocols. Therefore, it is important to increase synergies between the CBD and its two Protocols as similar requests are made to the Parties under these three instruments. In particular, it is important to approach issues such as capacity building, clearing house, awareness raising, and resource mobilization in a more holistic way. This should be reflected in the way these issues are dealt with inter-sessionally, as well as during the meetings of COPs and COP/MOPs. It should also be taken into due consideration when planning relevant activities for the implementation of the Convention and the two Protocols, for example through more encompassing capacity building efforts on the ground. The Aichi Targets provide an adequate framework for this internal synergy process.

2. Main considerations and Issues

Against this backdrop, we look forward to receiving a proposal by the Secretariat and to a constructive discussion with other Parties on this subject. To this end, we would like to put forward the following initial elements:

2.1 Periodicity and duration of the COP and MOPs, and of the intersessional activities

First of all, the EU and its Member States would like to acknowledge that through the decision XI/10 the COP has decided to maintain the current biennial periodicity of its meetings until 2020.

While we supported this decision at COP11, the EU and its Member States remain willing to seriously discuss other options concerning the future frequency of the meetings of the COP, as well as new modalities for the organization of work of the COP, and of the COP/MOPs of the two protocols to the Convention. The objective of any proposed change should be to enhance implementation of the CBD and its Protocols and achieve better cost-effectiveness, while at the same time maintaining political momentum and the ability of the Convention and its Protocols to continue setting the political agenda and therefore be able to take decisions as appropriate.

Both the COPs and the CBD subsidiary bodies will continue to play an important role in keeping implementation under review including the review of national target settings, updating NBSAPs and implementation of the Resource Mobilization Strategy. Furthermore, the COPs with their high-level segments and other events taking place concurrently are also crucial for raising awareness and political attention to biodiversity related issues.

In this respect, we would like to recall the document COP/10/10/Add.1 and the list of options provided by the Secretariat in Figure 1 of that document. The EU and its Member States would like to suggest that in its proposal on "Improving the efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols" the Secretariat update the analysis in question, with a focus on providing various options on how the COP and two MOPs of the Protocols could be organized in a more efficient and cost-effective way.

In this respect, it should be recalled that article 29 of the Cartagena Protocol and art. 26 of the Nagoya Protocol provide that their respective COP/MOPs are held, respectively, "in conjunction with" and "concurrently" with the COP, unless otherwise decided by the COP/MOP. Bearing this in mind, and with a view to pursue the objectives above, the EU and its Member States would seriously consider options for holding the COP and the two COP/MOPs simultaneously over a maximum period of two weeks. This is the case under the UNFCCC, where the COP/MOPs for the Kyoto Protocol (Article 13.6) are also held at the same time and place as the COP meetings and alongside meetings of the subsidiary bodies and ad-hoc working groups. The practical arrangements used in the context of the UNFCCC could serve as an inspiration to develop similar arrangements under the CBD. Such an option would contribute to realize reduction in costs, have more focused agendas, avoid duplication of work and deal more coherently with horizontal/overarching issues in a coordinated matter (e.g. budgetary and institutional issues, organizational matters, multi-year programming, the role of the Clearing-House mechanisms, etc.), thereby fully exploiting synergies. It would also provide the Protocols with the necessary political visibility within the context of the Convention in order to ensure support for their implementation.

In case COP/MOP of Cartagena agrees to hold its 8th meeting concurrently with COP13, and that COP/MOP1 of the Nagoya Protocol takes place during COP12, this matter should also be re-considered at COP14, as by then the Convention may have had an opportunity to experience the concurrent holding of 1 COP and 2 MOPs. In any event, it is important to make best use of the opportunities at COP12 in case of a concurrent meeting of the COP and the COP/MOP1 of the Nagoya Protocol. The EU and its Member States would therefore appreciate receiving a detailed agenda for the COP and the COP/MOP as requested by the ICNP3 recommendation on the COP/MOP1 Agenda. This would imply both joint and individual sessions whereby certain topics are dealt with jointly (e.g. budget, GEF, capacity building, etc.) while others would be dealt with in separate sessions. We would also appreciate a clarification by the Secretariat how this can take place with due respect for the political autonomy and mandate of each of these instruments and their distinct sets of Parties.

As regards periodicity and length of subsidiary bodies meetings, the EU and its Member States would support, at this stage, the current practice of 2 SBSTTA meetings and one meeting of the Working Group

on the Review of Implementation and the Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions between COPs, each of one week's duration. However the requirements for SBSTTA meetings should be kept under review particularly with regard to their efficiency in preparing for the COP and as the interaction with IPBES becomes better defined. The time between the meetings of the subsidiary body and of the COP is important to make progress by having the opportunity to refine requests to the Secretariat in order to prepare COP better and enable Parties to better prepare their positions for COP, thus facilitating decision making. Furthermore, while the EU and its Member States have previously been open to explore the possibility of holding SBSTTA meetings back to back with COPs (in a similar manner as is done under the UNFCCC), the fact that there are now two CBD Protocols to hold their MOPs in conjunction with/concurrently with COPs, we believe, would make this option complicated in terms of organisation and unsatisfactory for countries with small delegations.

2.2 Organization of inter-sessional and intra-sessional processes

The EU and its Member States believe that better organization of inter-sessional and intra-sessional work is another potential area of improvement. There is certainly a need to have a more focused agenda of the work of the subsidiary bodies, and improve the use of available resources during the session. This could include issues such as ensuring that the documentation is distributed well in advance of every session and certainly before the stipulated deadline (since late distribution has become more frequent and remains a constraint for preparation of the meetings), but also considering effective options for promoting "paperless" meetings, using the experience already gained by the UN and other MEAs with the use of apps, on-demand printing services, etc. We also feel that work under the Nagoya Protocol should fully make use of the provisions of Art. 27 of the Protocol, which states that any subsidiary body established under the Convention may serve the Protocol. Existing subsidiary bodies should therefore include the consideration of agenda items related to the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. This applies, in particular, to items that remain closely linked to the overall work under the Convention.

Informal meetings convened during the inter-sessional period, subject to available resources, should also be planned better and more in advance in order to ensure that their contribution to inform and facilitate negotiations during the formal session is fully realized. This would also imply greater advance notice of the dates of and chosen participants in expert meetings, so as to ensure that all visa formalities can be completed in time and all regions can be properly represented at meetings.

While acknowledging that certain countries still face difficulties with reliable internet connection which could hamper their ability to fully make use of modern means of communication (e-mailing, video-conferencing, webinars, etc.), the EU and its Member States are of the view that, when feasible, better and wider use of these means should be promoted both with regard to meetings of the Bureaux and insofar as expert meetings are concerned. If necessary, capacity building actions should also focus on enhancing the capacity of authorities and officers in national focal points to use these techniques. When possible, physical meetings should be held back to back with other relevant events.

2.2.1 Organization and format of SBSTTA

While this matter is covered in more details in the replies that the EU and its Member States provide by filling in the questionnaire circulated with the notification 2013-124, we would nonetheless like to make here some general points concerning the experience with the format adopted for SBSTTA17, and the organization of future SBSTTA meetings.

Overall, the EU and its Member States would like to stress SBSTTA's mandate as a subsidiary advisory body to the COP. Its main purpose therefore lays in providing scientific, technical and technological

advice on the issues identified by COP in order to inform its deliberations. SBSTTA should thus focus on reviewing the existing science and turn it into policy relevant advice that COP can use. With this in mind, we believe that, while the format adopted at SBSTTA17 allowed for some high-quality discussion at the scientific and technical level and may be deemed, to some extent, adapted to the particular agenda of that meeting, we are not convinced that this format generally allows SBSTTA to fulfil its mandate to provide COP with the necessary advice and support its preparations in an efficient and cost-effective manner.

Whilst open discussions and panel presentations can be interesting, they do not ensure the required focus in the discussion, especially, if not supported by relevant meeting documentation, and do not facilitate the production of meaningful, evidence-based policy relevant recommendations to COP. Initial recommendations should continue to be developed by the Secretariat on the basis of the work of expert groups or submissions to ensure a neutrality of approach with results that can readily be taken forward during COP. A more general exchange of information could also be useful, but it should not be the main purpose of plenary discussions, and should be limited to side events and other events outside the official proceedings of SBSTTA. An appropriate mix of plenary and working group sessions, complemented or not (depending on the nature of topics and expected outcomes) with a small number of panel presentations, is required to advance the work of SBSTTA on recommendation and information to be forwarded to the COP. Furthermore, better advance preparation is needed and documents need to be made available more in advance of SBSTTA to enable proper analysis, discussion and preparation by Parties, which will facilitate discussions at SBSTTA itself. This also applies to the organization of expert groups.

Further consideration should be given to developing an effective relationship between SBSTTA and IPBES. On the one hand, IPBES should be fully informed of the scientific and technical needs of the CBD; on the other hand, SBSTTA should be in a position to make full use of the scientific and technical knowledge and tools generated by IPBES to formulate its advice, avoiding duplication between the two bodies.

2.3 Reporting and Information Tools

The European Union and its Member States believe that reporting and the use of information tools represent potential areas for improvement of the processes under the Convention and its Protocols. In this respect, the EU and its Member States strongly support an improved and more coherent reporting framework. We also welcome the recent developments undertaken by the Secretariat in relation to new tools. While reporting and information sharing are two different processes, based on two different articles of the Convention, and may require the use of different tools, duplication of efforts should be avoided and synergies maximized. Furthermore, we would also like to highlight that this is an important area for enhancing synergies with other biodiversity-related MEAs, the other Rio Conventions, UN agencies and with other assessment processes, including IPBES.

It is important to keep in mind that reporting should not be an end in itself. In all cases, the purpose of reporting should be very clear, in particular regarding how the reports will be used to support implementation of the Convention and its Protocols. The means of aggregating information from national reports to global levels need to be improved. We would like to express our concern with the multiplication of reporting tools and informatics platforms which has been observed recently, both in the context of the CBD and across different MEAs, with the result of duplicating work, inefficient use of resources, additional reporting burden for Parties and reduced efficacy in knowledge management.

For years, the EU has been supporting the development of a Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) Toolkit for the use of all contracting Parties to the Convention and the European Environment Agency (EEA) is cooperating with the Secretariat to actively contribute to its improvement and development. It is therefore essential for the EU that any new data portal, including the ones currently under development, is: a) fully integrated with the CBD CHM and the two specialised Clearing-Houses under the Protocols; b) fully compatible and share a central data repository with existing systems; c) focused on priority needs expressed by the Parties; d) user-focused. Parties should be involved in these developments through the CHM officers and CH Informal Advisory Committee (IAC), with regular reporting to CDB National Focal Points.

While the EU and its Member States can understand that there may be a need for having different user interfaces to retrieve information from the different applications for specific data (e.g. specific role of the ABS CH), generic information like legislation, national authorities, etc. should be common across the different platforms and also be directly searchable from the main site and not from each specific portal (e.g. national legislation/measures that have some relevance to ABS may also refer to Art. 8(j), protected areas, etc.).

With regard to the new CBD online reporting tool developed for the assessment of progress on the Aichi Targets, so far there has been no possibility for Parties to test it. The EU, building on work by some Member States and the European Environment Agency (EEA), has supported the first phase of development of a target crosslinking tool (TCT) to support European countries in organising their national information according to multiple targets. This tool is now available for testing. The Secretariat has been associated to these developments but unfortunately has not provided feedback. In line with the exchange of letters between the EEA and the CBD Secretariat in 2013, the EU and its Member States would therefore call on the Secretariat to continue the cooperation with the EU and other interested Parties, and facilitate the interoperability between the CBD online reporting system and the one being developed by the EEA.

Recently, the EU has been asked to provide a position on the Online Reporting System (ORS), a flexible electronic platform has been created to transform reporting under Multilateral Environment Agreements (MEAs). The EU and its Member States are strongly supporting synergies between MEAs and in particular with regard to the streamlining of reporting process, creating efficiencies, improving reporting rates and ultimately leading to better assessment and management of natural capital. We would welcome some clarification on the position of the Secretariat on the ORS and would also like some further discussion on how this system would relate to ongoing developments.

As regards the provisions of the **Cartagena Protocol** on assessment and review:

The EU and its Member States are satisfied with the use of the Biosafety Clearing house as the unique channel for transmission of the national reports. This should be continued.

At COP-MOP 6 it was decided to update the reporting format in light of the information gathered through the second national reports. In particular it was decided to improve the connection between the indicators set for the strategic plan 2011-2020 and the questions supplied in the reporting format, which do not fit in several cases. The COP-MOP 6 had decided to make a proposal to update the reporting format and the questions, to be discussed at COP-MOP 7. The EU and its Member States had agreed with the proposed approach, but with some recommendations as follows:

- Considers that while we are open to improvements of the reporting format it is essential to take a cautious approach to further revisions of the reporting format for the sake of continuity. Such revisions should, as far as possible, maintain the possibility for comparisons to be made with information already submitted (comparability backwards), and should not develop into full scale revisions.
- Considers that it might be relevant in the next rounds of reporting to introduce an adaptable format which provide Parties, who are in full compliance, with a more simplified format in order for those Parties not having to report the same information several times. The EU would like to underline that remaining Parties would still need to submit their second national report *before* using the simplified format as is also recommended by the Compliance Committee.

The EU and its Member States will review the draft proposal made by the CBD secretariat on reporting format based on the above comments made at COP-MOP 6, which remain relevant.

Insofar as the **Nagoya Protocol** is concerned, the reporting and monitoring mechanism under the instrument is currently being discussed. In this respect, the EU and its Member States would like to make some general points:

- We believe that both monitoring and reporting are intended to demonstrate whether implementation measures are effective, allowing the Secretariat to conduct a general analysis. The reporting should not be a standalone, bureaucratic exercise but it should serve the purpose of allowing for an effective, yet resource-saving way of monitoring of actions and measures taken by Parties in view of implementing the Nagoya Protocol.
- Effectiveness also means efficiency. We therefore firmly believe that we should avoid the burden of double reporting. The Nagoya Protocol already contains a certain number of specific obligations for the provision of information either to the ABS Clearing-House (Articles 13, 14, 17) or to the CoP/MoP (Articles 19 and 20). We believe that reporting under Article 29 should not include resubmission of information that has already been transmitted or uploaded by the Parties to the ABS Clearing-House. We believe it is important to ensure that the ABS Clearing-House remains a part of the Convention's Clearing-House, as required by Article 14 paragraph 1 of the Protocol. We should avoid creating parallel structures, while bearing in mind that the ABS Clearing-House will have distinct tasks and features that will need to be addressed in its modalities of operation. This implies that the ABS Clearing-House is accessed through the CBD Clearing-House on the CBD website and has the technical capacities – similar to those of the Biosafety Clearing-House – for the Parties to fulfil their reporting obligations under the Nagoya Protocol.
- Monitoring and reporting should also serve to support the synergies between the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, the CBD as such as well as other ABS-related measures and agreements.

3.4. Administrative issues in line with decision XI/31.

In the context of this submission, the EU and its Member States would also like to recall some important issues addressed in Decision XI/31 on the "Administration of the Convention and budget for the programme of work for the biennium 2013-2014" which are clearly connected with improving the efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols. This is particularly the case for paragraphs 24, 25, 26 and 29 of this decision, whereby the COP has decided that

- further operational efficiencies in the biennium 2013-2014 and in the organization of the COP and ABS COP/MOP should be sought and reported on at COP-12 and ABS COP/MOP-1 (paragraph 24) ;
- an in-depth functional review of the Secretariat, in consultation with the Executive Director of UNEP, with a view to updating its structure and the grading of posts to the Strategic Plan's focus on implementation by Parties and report to the Parties at the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties should be undertaken (paragraph 25);
- a report on the administration of the Convention, including such matters as staff lists, status of contributions, progress on the implementation of the work programme and financial expenditures, should be prepared and submitted to Parties every six months (paragraph 26);
- it is necessary to bear in mind the need for periodic review of classification of staff positions (paragraph 29).

We invite the secretariat to take these elements into due consideration in preparing its report.

2.5 Synergies amongst biodiversity-related Conventions

The issue of synergies amongst biodiversity-related Conventions, as well as amongst Rio Conventions is another area that could contribute to improving the efficiency of processes and structure of the Convention, and there is scope for learning from experiences under other processes (e.g. chemicals cluster of conventions). While some progress has been achieved, synergies with other MEAs, and the enhanced cooperation between CBD and relevant international agencies, organisations and institutions need to be further developed. We believe that this area should be duly explored in the Secretariat's proposal on ways to improve the efficiency of the Convention processes and structures.

In this respect, the EU and its Member States attach great importance to cooperation at all levels for achieving full implementation of the CBD and its Strategic Plan 2011-2020; we support arrangements to ensure that the Strategic Plan and its Aichi Targets are embraced beyond the CBD by all institutions, organizations and processes concerned. A more coherent and coordinated implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions at all levels (global, regional, national) is important to increase their effectiveness, avoid duplication or even adverse effects and enhance efficient use of human and financial resources. This was reaffirmed at the highest political level as stated in paragraph 89 of "The Future We Want" adopted at the Rio+20 Conference.

Consistent with and supportive of paragraph 89 of the Rio+20 Outcome Document, the EU and its Member States reaffirm their support to initiatives, including Party-driven ones, aimed at strengthening policy synergies between MEAs, including Biodiversity Conventions. The EU and its Member States call for further efforts and work from UNEP, UNESCO and FAO in this regard.

Decision X/20 in paragraph 10 already requested WGRI to determine the form and content of a process to enhance coordination, coherence and national level synergies among the biodiversity conventions, in

order to increase the involvement of Parties in the work of the Liaison Group of the Biodiversity-related Conventions and the Joint Liaison Group of the Rio Conventions. As we approach WGRI5, the Executive Secretary should follow-up on the request made by COP11 (Decision XI/6) in relation to this matter.

Some of the most important areas in relation to the synergies process include:

1. National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and national implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity: The EU and its Member States find it very important that Parties focus on coordination and cooperation at the national level. This is essential to further promote what is the overall aim of any type of cooperation between the conventions, namely coherent and synergistic implementation. In order to enhance national level synergies in the implementation of the conventions, it is essential to have a party-driven process. The revision and updating of NBSAPs by 2015 in light of Aichi Target 17 provide unique opportunities for enhanced communication and cooperation at the national level between focal points of related conventions and with all relevant sectors to promote implementation of the CBD and its Strategic Plan. This could lead to more cost-effective national action through better mainstreaming of biodiversity in relevant sectors as well as through allocating resources for NBSAP preparation and implementation in a way that it not only benefits CBD, but also the implementation of other relevant biodiversity related conventions.
2. Promoting coherent reporting framework and efficient information tools (see section above).
3. Enhancing synergies on programmatic issues through a party-driven approach (e.g. role of the Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets in programming of the work of the Convention);
4. Promoting scientific cooperation, including at the level of the respective scientific subsidiary bodies, and in relation to the work of the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES);
5. Continue enhancing synergies through the existing secretariat-level cooperation, but also consider ways and means to extend, in the medium to long term, through party-driven processes, synergies amongst the conventions on issues such as secretariats, budgets, joint administrative and communication functions, taking into account the example of the chemicals and waste cluster of conventions where significant progress has been made.

With a view to supporting the synergies process, in 2013, the European Commission decided to fund a project on "Improving the effectiveness of and cooperation among biodiversity-related conventions and exploring opportunities for further synergies". The project, which is being executed by UNEP in close cooperation with the various secretariats, seeks to improve the efficiency, enhance coordination and cooperation, promote policy coherence and explore the opportunities for further synergies at all levels of the six major biodiversity-related MEAs, i.e. CBD, CITES, CMS, the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA), the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and the World Heritage Convention (WHC). The project will work to identify opportunities and options for synergies at multiple levels (global, regional and national).

3. Concluding remarks

The EU and its Member States hope that the views expressed above will help to further the future work of the Secretariat and eventually discussions of these matters at WGR15 and COP12. We look forward to participating constructively in the follow-up discussions on the matter.

Guatemala

In response to the question: How to improve the efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols?

Supporting representatives from developing countries and from indigenous and local communities is important to improve efficiency by being inclusive. Maybe the best way to improve the efficiency of structures and processes, and of the implementation of the whole Convention is by aspects previously noted in some publications, like the Aichi Biodiversity Targets: integrating biodiversity values and those from the ecosystem services into the national accounting and reporting, taxing their use and subsidizing the protector and restorators of them.

The main loss of biodiversity in some countries is lead by geopolitical issues, because they are the principal users, and the ecosystem services are never valued, nor taxed. The political opportunities at Conventions room is the best way to boost biodiversity (ecosystem) sustainable use and conservation.

Japan

- (a) In existing arrangements SBSTTA Is held every year. SBSTTA held upcoming June is necessary in terms of mid-term review of Aichi targets, however, we should consider to hold SBSTTA every once every two years if there is no significant and urgent agenda.
- (b) Translation of documents consists a crucial parts of implementation of the Convention. Nevertheless, it would be a better idea to establish threshold of the volume of translations and limits the types of documents based on priority of the documents.
- (c) It would be grateful if secretariat provides concrete information what measures secretariat has taken after previous COP and possible measures to enhance efficiency of the secretariat.

Mexico

Lista Indicativa de Estructuras y Procesos bajo el Convenio y sus Protocolos			
Tema			Comentarios México
I Convention on Biological Diversity	A. Open-ended bodies established by the Convention:	1. Conference of the Parties (COP) (Article 23)	1. Mantener un número acotado de temas en cada COP. No es necesario revisar toda la agenda del CDB en cada reunión. 2. No meter nuevos temas, a menos que sea VERDADERAMENTE necesario. 3. el Segmento Ministerial debe cambiar para tener un formato mas efectivo, ya que se pierde tiempo de negociadores al acompañar a los ministros en una lista interminable de discursos que no están ligados con los temas centrales de la COP.
		2. Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) (Article 25)	<p>Se debe asegurar que el SBSTTA tenga un carácter más científico y técnico. Es por ello que se sugiere establecer un replanteamiento de los trabajos elaborados por este órgano con la finalidad de cumplir con las funciones establecidas en el artículo 25 del Convenio.</p> <p>Para que las recomendaciones realizadas a la COP se puedan establecer en compromisos contratos, será necesario que el SBSTTA no presente un gran número de recomendaciones que pueda traducirse en el posible no cumplimiento de las mismas.</p> <p>En lo que respecta a las evaluaciones, deberá establecer un mecanismo de coordinación para que tenga un papel tanto de usuario como proveedor de información a la recién establecida IPBES.</p>

		<p>3. 3. Secretariat (Article 24) – currently has seven Divisions: 3.1 Office of the Executive Secretary (OES) 3.2 Resource Management and Conference Services (RMCS) 3.3 Technical Support for Implementation (TSI) 3.4 Science, Assessment and Monitoring (SAM) 3.5 Mainstreaming, Partnerships and Outreach (MPO) 3.6 Biosafety Protocol (BP) 3.7 Nagoya Protocol (NP)</p>	
	<p>B. Some COP Decisions of relevance to the Operations of the Convention on Biological Diversity and Rules of</p>	<p>1. Decision I/1 – Rules of procedure for the Conference of the Parties</p>	
		<p>2. Decision V/20 – Operations of the Convention</p>	
		<p>3. Decision VI/28 – Multi-year programme of work of the Conference of the Parties up to</p>	
		<p>4. Decision VIII/10 – Operations of the Convention</p>	
		<p>5. Decision IX/29 – Operations of the Convention</p>	

	Procedures	<p>6. Decision X/11 – Science-policy interface on biodiversity ecosystem services and human well-being and consideration of the outcome of the intergovernmental meetings</p>	<p>La recién establecida IPBES podrá ser utilizada como una herramienta de apoyo para los objetivos y programas del Convenio. Por lo que se requiere realizar mecanismo de colaboración entre ambos organismos. Esto incluye elaboración de mecanismos para las solicitudes de información científica y técnica de la IPBES.</p> <p>Es necesario seguir promoviendo la comunicación y coordinación entre la IPBES y el CBD.</p>
		<p>7. Decision X/12 – Ways and means to improve the effectiveness of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice</p>	<p>Se sugiere que en la primera reunión del SBSTTA previo a la Conferencia de las Partes, se establezcan debates sobre a) necesidades y retos para implementar los compromisos ante el Convenio b) experiencias nacionales c) avances en los compromisos, en esta primera reunión se derivarían conclusiones y sólo en caso de ser necesario alguna recomendación específica. La segunda reunión, previo a la CoP, podría concentrarse en continuar con los debates sobre las conclusiones de la primera reunión para presentar el compilado de las recomendaciones para ponerlas a consideración de la CoP para que puedan adoptarse compromisos concretos y no sólo cartas de buenas intenciones.</p>

		8. Decision X/13 – New and emerging issues	<p>La Agenda del Convenio sobre la Diversidad Biológica es muy amplia, lo que lleva a una dispersión y atomización de esfuerzos. Por ello, no se deben incluir más temas, a menos que sea absolutamente necesario y por el contrario, se pudieran integrar agendas o eliminar aquellos que se considere han sido atendidos satisfactoriamente o perdido vigencia. La depuración de decisiones puede ayudar en esta tarea, así como la homologación o fusión de los programas de trabajo temáticos que después de revisiones, son muy similares en su estructura.</p> <p>Asimismo, es necesario tomar en cuenta otros procesos internacionales que también realizan trabajos que de manera directa o indirecta impactan sobre la biodiversidad, esto con la finalidad de no duplicar esfuerzos.</p>
		9. Decision X/14 – Retirement of decisions	Es necesario cambiar el procedimiento para consolidar las decisiones, de manera que sea temática, en lugar de temporal como se estableció anteriormente. De esa manera, se puede eliminar texto obsoleto y enmendarlas según sea necesario durante las COPs.
		10. Decision XI/10 – Periodicity of meetings	
	C. Bureaus as per Rules of Procedures	1. COP Bureau	
		2. SBSTTA Bureau	Dar cursos introductorios a los nuevos miembros del Bureau del SBSTTA para que se familiaricen con su funcionamiento y se involucren más y mejor en su trabajo en la organización de las reuniones del SBSTTA
		3. ICNP Bureau	
	D. Global Environment Facility (GEF) - Financial Mechanism	1. GEF Secretariat	
		2. GEF Focal Points	
		3. GEF Implementing agencies	
		4. Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (GEF-STAP)	

of the Convention	5. GEF Evaluation Office	
	E. Subsidiary bodies established by the Conference of the Parties pursuant to Article 23 of the Convention:	1. Ad Hoc Open-ended Inter-sessional Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions (WG8J)
2. Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on the Review of Implementation of the Convention (WGRI)		<p>Una de las labores importantes de WGRI debe ser buscar mejoras en la aplicación del Convenio, por lo que se requiere hacer mayores esfuerzos en lo referente a financiamiento y movilización de recursos en apoyo a las Metas de Aichi (creación de capacidades).</p> <p>El WGRI deberá enfocarse en realizar recomendaciones a la COP concretas que complementen lo establecido en el SBSTTA.</p>
3. Intergovernmental Committee on the Nagoya Protocol (ICNP)		
4. Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas (WGPA)		
F. Expert processes	1. Ad Hoc Technical Expert Groups	
	2. Liaison Groups	
	3. Other expert meetings	
	4. Peer review processes	<p>Para asegurar el carácter científico y técnico del SBSTTA, es importante que los documentos preparados en el proceso de Peer-review contengan elementos estrictamente científicos y técnicos. Hacer más claro que la función del peer review no es para fijar posiciones de país, ya que el objetivo central del proceso es técnico.</p>
	5. Online expert fora	

G. Information Tools:	1. Clearing-house Mechanism (CHM)	La información en materia de biodiversidad clara y de fácil acceso es importante para crear conciencia sobre la importancia de conservar y hacer uso sostenible de la biodiversidad, de esta manera, es importante que en el marco del CBD se realicen esfuerzos en creación de capacidad para que las Partes desarrollen las herramientas necesarias para la creación o mejora de su CHM nacional.
	2. Thematic Databases	
	3. Guidelines and tools	
	4. E-learning tools	
	5. Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO)	Al ser un documento de suma importancia debido a que establece el estatus de la biodiversidad a escala global, se deben realizar creación de capacidades para que las Partes puedan proporcionar información apropiada que sirva de base para la elaboración de este informe. El informe debe buscar un balance entre las aportaciones de países desarrollados y en desarrollo. Pues sus hallazgos y conclusiones pueden estar sezdados.
	6. Cities and Biodiversity Outlook (CBO)	
	7. International Day for Biological Diversity	
	8. Publications: CBD Technical Series, newsletters, thematic magazines, fact sheets	
	9. Side-events	Enfocarse en pocos side-events que sean seleccionados en función de los temas principales de las reuniones. Muchos eventos dispersan la atención de los delegados.
	10. Parallel summits (e.g. Cities and Biodiversity Summit)	
	11. Messages: Notifications, Statements, Press Releases	Reducir significativamente el número de notificaciones para que las Partes mantengan un buen nivel de atención, a veces duplican las solicitudes. Menos cantidad y más calidad.

	H. Strategic Plans:	1. Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its 20 Aichi Targets	El Plan Estratégico para el período 2011-2020 es un marco flexible para que las Partes lo adopten a escala nacional. Sin embargo, es importante recalcar que si bien el Plan contiene metas que incorporan los distintos temas referentes a la biodiversidad, las Metas en su mayoría son meramente aspiracionales y contienen una serie de factores que dificulta medir su avance. En necesario un grupo núcleo de indicadores que sean estandarizados y faciliten la medición por las Partes.
		2. Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC) and its 16 Targets	La GSPC es una herramienta importante para que las Partes adopten su propia Estrategia Nacional. México se basó en las metas establecidas en la GSPC para la elaboración de la Estrategia Mexicana para la Conservación Vegetal la cual fue publicada en el 2012.
		3. Capacity-building Strategy for the Global Taxonomy Initiative	
		4. National Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)	Las Estrategias y planes de acción en materia de biodiversidad son importantes para identificar los vacíos existentes para que por un lado, se atiendan las causas que provocan la pérdida de biodiversidad y por otro, se conserve y haga uso sustentable de la biodiversidad. Esto con el fin de poder realizar una planeación con acciones concretas y con indicadores que indiquen el avance de las metas establecidas en este documento. Si bien es cierto los retos en materia de biodiversidad deben contener acciones concretas pero también medibles para que se establezca de manera no sólo cualitativa sino también cuantitativa los logros y avances. Para el desarrollo de NBSAP es importante realizar talleres de creación de capacidad para que apoyen a las Partes en la elaboración de los mismos, sin embargo, se recomienda que no sean repetitivos y que se centren en las principales trabas a los que cada país se enfrenta.

		5. Sub-National Strategies and Action Plans	El conocimiento en materia de biodiversidad es importante para la toma de decisiones, por lo que los gobiernos locales o subnacionales deben contar con estrategias en materia de biodiversidad las cuales deberán establecerse sobre la base del conocimiento existente. El CBD debe de dar mayor apoyo a este tipo de iniciativas.
		6. Plan of Action for Cities, Subnational Governments and other Local Authorities	
		7. Seven Thematic Programmes	Es necesario identificar de manera concreta los trabajos establecidos en el marco de cada programa temático. Asimismo, se deberá dar un seguimiento más puntual a los Programas de Trabajo establecidos dentro de cada Programa Temático.
		8. Seventeen Cross-Cutting Issues and Initiatives	Son suficientes.
		9. United Nations Decade on Biodiversity	
	I. Support Mechanisms (Trust Funds)	1. General Trust Fund for the Convention on Biological Diversity (BY)	
		2. General Trust Fund for Additional Voluntary Contributions in Support of Approved Activities under the Convention on Biological Diversity (BE)	
		3. General Trust Fund for Additional Voluntary Contributions to Facilitate the Participation of Parties in the Process of the Convention on Biological Diversity (BZ)	
		4. General Trust Fund for Voluntary Contributions to Facilitate the Participation of Indigenous and Local Communities in the work of the Convention on Biological Diversity (VB)	
5. Japan Biodiversity Fund			

		6. LifeWeb Initiative	
		7. Regional/subregional capacity-building workshops	
		8. CHM Informal Advisory Committee	
	J. International Biodiversity -related Groups and Initiatives	1. Biodiversity Initiative under the Environment Management Group (EMG)	
		2. Aichi Targets Task Force	
		3. NBSAP Forum	
		4. South-South Cooperation Plan	
		5. Consortium of Scientific Partners	Necesita mejor liderazgo para aprovechar mejor las capacidades de las instituciones miembro
		6. Chairs of Scientific Advisory Bodies of Biodiversity-related Conventions	
		7. Biodiversity Liaison Group of the Secretariats of the Biodiversity-related Conventions (BLG)	
		8. Joint Liaison Group of the Secretariats of the Rio Conventions (JLG)	
		9. Inter-agency Liaison Group on Invasive Alien Species	
		10. Global Invasive Alien Species Information Partnership (GIASI Partnership)	
		11. Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF)	
12. Cooperative Partnership on Wildlife Management (CPW)			
13. Sustainable Oceans Initiative (SOI)			
14. Biodiversity Champions Campaign,			

		<p>15. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services(IPBES)</p>	<p>La recién establecida IPBES podrá ser utilizada como una herramienta de apoyo para los objetivos y programas del Convenio. Por lo que se requiere realizar un mecanismo de colaboración entre ambos organismos con el fin de no duplicar esfuerzos. Esto incluye elaboración de mecanismos para las solicitudes de información científica y técnica que se desee presentar ante la IPBES para su consideración.</p> <p>Se debe asegurar que el CBD esté representado en la Plataforma. Una opción es que se asista en calidad de observador en las sesiones plenarias.</p> <p>Como órgano científico y técnico, el SBSTTA deberá ser tanto de usuario como proveedor de información a la Plataforma. Uno de los puntos permanentes de la Agenda del SBSTTA deberá incluir el tema de colaboración con la Plataforma. Una vez definidos los principales temas de interés del SBSTTA, será importante que el Secretario Ejecutivo del CBD los transmita al Secretario Ejecutivo de la IPBES para su consideración.</p> <p>El Plan Estratégico 2011-2020, las Metas de Aichi pueden ser un marco de referencia para facilitar la colaboración entre ambas instancias. La elaboración del GBO podría ser otro tema de colaboración. Por otra parte, las evaluaciones elaboradas en el marco del CBD podrían contribuir al catálogo de evaluaciones de la IPBES.</p> <p>Por lo pronto, las labores realizadas por el CBD podrían apoyarse de de las evaluaciones que están por iniciarse, entre ellas a) especies invasoras, b) escenarios y modelaje de biodiversidad y servicios ecosistémicos, c) polinización y polinizadores asociados con la producción alimentaria entre otros y viceversa.</p>
		<p>16. Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)</p>	

		17. TEEB initiative	
		18. Business and biodiversity partnership	
		19. Natural Capital Initiative	
		20. Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI)	
		21. Global Island Partnership (GLISPA)	
		22. Global Partnership for Subnational and Local Action for Biodiversity	
		23. Networks of subnational governments: MediverCities (Mediterranean) and the Maritime Innovative Territories' International Network (MiTiN)	
		24. Rio Conventions Pavilion	
	K. National Focal Points	1. CBD Primary National Focal Point	
		2. SBSTTA Focal Point	
		3. GTI National Focal Point	
		4. GSPC Focal Point	
		5. POWPA Focal Point	
		6. CHM Focal Point	
		7. Traditional Knowledge Focal Point	
		8. Resource Mobilization Focal Point	
		9. ICNP ABS Focal Point	
	L. Reporting Processes	1. National Reporting	Es un instrumento importante de apoyo a la información para identificar el estado de la biodiversidad como para la revisión de los compromisos establecidos en el marco del CBD.
		2. Voluntary Thematic National Reports	
		3. National Reporting on Resource Mobilization	
		4. Online Reporting System	

II. Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	A. Open-ended bodies established by the Protocol:	1. Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP) (Article 29)	1. Entre más rápido los documentos previos a la reunión es mejor, esto permitirá a las Partes contar con más tiempo para que haya una discusión más enriquecedora. 2. Las reuniones abiertas fueron menos frecuentes, por lo que su duración podría extenderse. 3. El número de grupos de trabajo está bien, incrementarlos podría requerir mayor número de miembros por delegación.
		2. Secretariat (Article 31)	
	B. Bureau (as per Rules of Procedures)	1. COP-MOP Bureau	
		C. Information Tools	1. Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH)
	2. Publication: Biosafety Technical Series, newsletters, fact sheets		Necesarias y útiles
	3. Guidance and training tools		Necesarias y útiles
	4. E-learning tools (under development)		Necesarias y útiles
	5. Messages: notifications, statements and press releases		Necesarios y útiles
	D. Support Mechanisms	1. General Trust Fund for the Core Budget of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (BG)	
		2. Special Voluntary Trust Fund for Additional Voluntary Contributions in Support of Approved Activities of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (BH)	

		3. Special Voluntary Trust Fund for Additional Voluntary Contributions to Facilitate the Participation of Parties in the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (BI)	
		4. Regional/sub-regional capacity-building workshops	Necesarios y útiles
		5. Informal Advisory Committee on the Biosafety Clearing-House	
		6. Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety	Sería interesante para reactivar este grupo, con un número selecto de miembros expertos multidisciplinares y con obligaciones muy claras para tener mayor impacto en las reuniones. Una opción podría ser reuniones en línea.
		7. Roster of Biosafety Experts	El diagnóstico necesario del uso del listado y las razones detrás de cada hallazgo. Sólo se han encontrado dos registros en el "reporte de asignación".
	E. National Focal Points	1. Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety Focal Point	
		2. Biosafety Clearing-House Focal Point	Ver los comentarios del BCH.
		3. Emergency Measures (Article 17) Contact Point	
	F. Strategic Plans	1. Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety covering the period 2011-2020	
		2. Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	

	G. Expert Processes	1. Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment and Risk Management	Nominación y selección de los miembros deberán ser transparentes, basados en la experiencia probada del candidato en el tema del AHTEG y se debe dar prioridad a los expertos de las Partes frente a las No Partes (y otras organizaciones). Su participación como expertos y no como representantes de los países deben ser claras para los participantes, partes, organizadores, etc.
		2. Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socio-economic Considerations	Ver G1
		3. Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Assessment and Review	Ver G1
		4. Open-ended Online Expert Group on Risk Assessment and Risk Management	Ver G1
		5. Online Network of Laboratories for the Detection and Identification of Living Modified Organisms	Ver G1
	H. Reporting Processes	1. National Reporting	
		2. Compliance Committee	
III. Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	A. Open-ended bodies established by the Cartagena Protocol:	1. Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP) (Article 14)	
		2. Secretariat (Article 15)	

IV Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising	A. Open-ended bodies established by the Protocol:	1. Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing (COP-MOP) (Article 26)	1. Conseguir antes de junio el número de ratificaciones faltantes para poder realizar la primer COP-MOP 2. Concluir los puntos de la agenda y obtener un documento final sobre el cumplimiento del Protocolo.
	B. Information Tools	1. ABS Clearing-House	1. Continuar con el desarrollo de la fase piloto 2. Buscar creación de capacidad para que las Partes puedan subir información 3. Aclarar el funcionamiento del mismo a partir de las dudas y comentarios que surgieron en el ICNP3 4. Designación de una "autoridad publicadora" y a uno o varios usuarios nacionales autorizados; éstos últimos son quienes pueden incluir registros relacionados con los permisos y la legislación nacional; pero la única que puede validar esta información y publicarla en el Clearing House será la autoridad publicadora.
		2. Policy briefs and factsheets	Necesarios y útiles
	C. Support Mechanisms	1. Regional/subregional capacity-building workshops	Necesarios y útiles
		2. Informal Advisory Committee to the ABS Clearing-House	Es necesario y fundamental para el cumplimiento del Protocolo el establecimiento del Clearing House, y por lo tanto el comité asesor. El CH es fundamental para el intercambio de información entre las Partes del Protocolo de Nagoya y para la implementación de los artículos 15, 16, 17 y 18.
	D. National Focal Points	1. ABS National Focal Point	Determinar los puntos focales según las necesidades de cumplimiento del Protocolo y de la legislación nacional según las competencias de las dependencias involucradas

	E. Reporting Mechanisms	1. Procedures and mechanisms to promote compliance with the Protocol (Article 30)	1. Terminar el documento sobre cumplimiento en la COP MOP para poder implementar el artículo 30. Sobre este tema se tiene un documento de recomendación a la COP que cuenta aún con más de 100 corchetes, por lo que la COP tendría que trabajar sobre este documento (seguramente a través de un grupo de contacto).
	G. Assessment and review (Article 31)		Se puede sugerir en la COP MOP el diseño de una estrategia para evaluar la eficacia del Protocolo, con base en las experiencias y lecciones aprendidas en otros instrumentos

New Zealand

Indicative List of Structures and Processes under the Convention and its Protocols

I. Convention on Biological Diversity:

A. Open-ended bodies established by the Convention:

1. Conference of the Parties (COP) (Article 23)

Soon after each COP, it would be useful if the CBD Secretariat circulated a 2-year workplan that indicates the inter-sessional work coming out of the COP decisions, including expected inputs from Parties. Given the broad reach of the CBD's remit, this is essential to ensure nothing 'falls through the cracks' and that both the Parties and the Secretariat are as organized as possible. The workplan could show when specific inputs would be requested (essentially a notification schedule) and how they fit into the inter-sessional meeting timeline (WGRIs, SBSTTAs, etc.). This will help provide Parties with a clear indication of the process to be taken that will result in technical and scientific advice, and will assist Parties to plan their engagement.

It may be useful to initiate a process to streamline meetings and adjust the CBD meeting cycle. With the Convention and two Protocols, the meeting schedule is becoming burdensome, even for Parties that are relatively well-resourced. There are any number of possible permutations, but looking at a possible meeting cycle that is implemented alongside a number of other changes (outlined below), an example of a possible triennial cycle is:

Year 1 – WG8J, SBSTTA (and whatever Cartagena has and Nagoya will have)

Year 2 – Standing Committee / Preparatory Conference meeting

Year 3 - COP

2. Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA)

(Article 25)

See NZ response to the notification regarding SBSTTA-17.

3. Secretariat (Article 24) – currently has seven Divisions:

It would be useful to see some analysis of how the CBD Secretariat as a whole works across the Convention and the two Protocols (e.g., how personnel work across the three instruments; how administration of the instruments is divided and managed; how tasks like communication, data management, etc. are handled across the three instruments by Secretariat systems; etc.). This might help illuminate possible efficiency savings, particularly where there are commonalities and synergies.

E. Subsidiary bodies established by the Conference of the Parties pursuant to Article 23 of the Convention:

General comment on subsidiary bodies: A regular observation about the CBD governance structure is the absence of a body that transacts administrative and strategic business between COPs to ensure that momentum is maintained between COPs in support of implementation. Other MEAs have Standing Committees that operate as a 'Preparatory Conference' for the COPs. In some ways, WGRI performs this function. However, the reality is that it does not have the mandate to do so (as a Working Group) due to issues associated with representation. Standing Committees of other MEAs have been established via decisions of COPs: it may be possible and indeed advisable for the CBD COP to consider formally establishing a Standing Committee via COP decision, which would take on the functions of WGRI, as well as other related administrative and strategic matters. Any consideration of this possibility should be conducted in a wider review of the CBD's architecture to ensure that all the moving pieces are delivering on their mandates and interacting successfully together to support the successful implementation of the Convention.

G. Information Tools:

General comments on information tools:

-In our view, some analysis would be helpful to understand how CBD information tools are being used and how effective they are. For example, is there an understanding of what uptake there has been of CBD products (e.g. the technical series publications)? Do we know how Parties have used them, whether or not they have applied some of the policy options outlined in some of the publications, etc. There may be precedent in other MEAs (biodiversity and others) that could serve as a methodological template for this type of work. This analytical work will assist in the production of effective CBD information tools in the future.

Indicative List of Potential Elements for Improvement of Efficiency

A. Open-ended meetings

General comment about meetings: It would be useful if the CBD Secretariat established a system whereby meeting representatives can submit their statements via email message. For many representatives, using foreign USB sticks is a breach of security requirements. It is also bad practice in terms of virus risk for hardware and software. The CBD Secretariat could provide clear instructions on sending email messages (e.g. what needs to be in the subject line, file size, etc.) in the "Note for participants" or hand out a notice that sits on each delegation's desk.

1. Pre-session documents

Ensure these are uploaded on time. It would be helpful if there were a way for NFPs to get notifications when pre-session documents are uploaded, instead of having to check the website every day (this is onerous, particularly when papers are uploaded late). This could be a service that Parties sign onto, that allows them to specify the meetings for which updates are required.

B. Committees/Expert Groups

3. Frequency of meetings

Increased use of the online forums (and consequently, less in-person meetings) would be useful. There are AHTEGS and similar working groups operating in other MEAs that conduct all business electronically, and with robust outcomes.

Norway

Submission from Norway - Improving the efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols (notification: SCBD/OES/OJ/moc/82999)

We welcome this opportunity to provide our views on options for improving the efficiency of structures and processes under the convention. The timing for this work is appropriate; the convention has been in force since 1993, there are now 2 protocols and strategic plans for both the convention and the Cartagena-protocol. Our input is developed with the aim to strengthen and consolidate work under the CBD, and we are ready to discuss different options, and to listen to views from other Parties.

The CBD covers a broad range of topics, and the 2 protocols cover specific areas, but still with some common elements.

We are not addressing the work within the secretariat, but assume that the best possible organisation is developed. However, we positively note that the same experts in CHM for instance are used for both protocols in order to achieve the best possible and cost-effective results.

We will address three areas to be further explored to improve the efficiency under the CBD;

1. COP and COP/MOP meetings
2. Bodies under the COP
3. Review of implementation.

COP and COP/MOP meetings

There have been regular discussions on the frequency of COP-meetings, and the COP has decided to keep them every second year at least until 2020. Norway has been in favour of having the COP every second year and the key argument has been to keep up the political momentum. We do however believe that the COP and the COP/MOPs can be structured more effectively to ensure a greater political momentum which would stimulate national implementation.

The legal independence of the different CBD instruments must be secured regardless of chosen structure. It is also important to develop the ABS topic having in mind that the membership of the Nagoya protocol in the first years after entry into force might not be universal.

*Cartagena: from art. 29.6Subsequent ordinary meetings of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to this Protocol shall be held **in conjunction** with ordinary meetings of the Conference of the Parties, unless otherwise decided by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to this Protocol.*

Nagoya: art 26.6 6. The first meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to this Protocol shall be convened by the Secretariat and held concurrently with the first meeting of the

/...

*Conference of the Parties that is scheduled after the date of the entry into force of this Protocol. Subsequent ordinary meetings of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to this Protocol shall be **held concurrently** with ordinary meetings of the Conference of the Parties, unless otherwise decided by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to this Protocol*

The Convention and the Cartagena-protocol are both in an implementation phase based on their respective strategic plans, and it might be possible to carry out the necessary negotiations in somewhat shorter time than previously used.

We would like to discuss options for streamlining the COP and COP/MOPs, and if possible to run all the three meetings concurrently over a two-weeks period. The Nagoya protocol states this, and it would then primarily be a challenge to integrate the Cartagena-agenda into this timeslot. With reference to the text of the Cartagena Protocol (art 29.6) it is necessary that this is discussed in the Cartagena COP/MOP.

Our main objective for initiating this discussion is to strengthen, streamline and consolidate work under the CBD. Potential budgetary savings is not necessarily foreseen, and strengthened participation from developing countries should be one important result. At the same time we are aware of the possible challenges countries with small delegations may face in running all three COP-meetings at the same time.

In order to have an informed discussion on the possible rearrangement there is a need to prepare some additional information, and we do believe that the secretariat could contribute in providing relevant information on the following issues:

- Identification of common issues for all 3 instruments (opening session, reporting, administration, budget, elements of the GEF advice, High Level Segment etc)
- Tentative workload having two working groups in parallel + contact groups and friends of the chair groups
- Potential challenges facing developing countries with small delegations
- Budgetary implications
- Explore experiences in dealing with different legal entities in one main meeting for instance from the chemicals “super-COP” and the UNFCCC/Kyoto protocol

Norway does neither see the COP nor the COP/MOP as capacity-building meetings for implementation. We propose however optional implementation seminars for the 3 instruments on the Saturday after week one.

This proposed consolidation would require some discipline; we must steer towards a slimmer agenda, and having in mind that not all issues need to be addressed at each COP and COP/MOP. (For a tentative outline see annex 1)

Bodies under the COP

We do not see any major shift in the number of preparatory meetings for the COP, but in order to enhance the efficiency and synergy we have some comments, and are interested in open discussions on sequence, numbers and back-to-back options.

SBSTTA/WGRI

The division of tasks between SBSTTA and WGRI would benefit from some clarifications.. SBSTTA with its mandate from the Convention text, and WGRI with a first mandate from COPVII/30, para 23.

While SBSTTA (from article 25 of the Convention) is to give the COP and other subsidiary bodies “...*timely advise relating to the implementation of this convention...*” WGRI was mandated in COP/VII to “.... *to consider progress in the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan*” from COPX/2 para 19: The Conference of the Parties, with the support of other Convention bodies, *in particular the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention, will keep under review implementation of this Strategic Plan,..*”

We are also aware that the COP at each meeting decides the tasks of the upcoming bodies under the Convention, and we would recommend that we during the COP-meetings more clearly identifies where additional advice is needed based on the review of implementation. By assessing the upcoming national reports key issues should be identified.

The experiences from SBSTTA17 in addressing both “Facilitating the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets through scientific and technical means” and ”the effects of the types of measures taken in accordance with provisions of the convention” might have been too early as most Parties had not finalised their NR5 or NBSAP. In our view the deliberations and most probably the outcome of the meeting would have benefited from documents assessing actual NR5s and NBSAPs. The advice on implementation (SBSTTA) should in theory be based upon the review of implementation (WGRI).

With regard to SBSTTA17 we also refer to the separate notification, but we would like to comment that we were of the opinion that this SBSTTA for the main elements provided limited added advice to the COP or other subsidiary bodies.

It might be relevant for the WGRI through the COP to request the SBSTTA to look closer into the scientific technical review of implementation. The division of labour between the two subsidiary bodies seems a bit too static.

SBSTTA 18 is for instance to:

- “Review of the draft of the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook
- Review of the implementation of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation 2011-2020” ,

while WGRI5 is to:

- “Review of progress in updating and implementing national biodiversity strategies and action plans.”

Having in mind that developing national reports is a mandatory “shall” obligation in the Convention we might be lacking the (preliminary) assessment based on NR5 in the upcoming preparatory meetings although elements of the NR5s will be used by the GBO5.

There are two different bureaus in charge of SBSTTA and COP (with WGRI and other meetings), and we see the challenge for the secretariat in getting the optimal work-sharing between these two bodies. Enhanced collaboration and communication between the two bureaus should be organised, and the possibility of having some joint meetings should be taken into account in the planning process.

WG8j and its links to both the Convention and to the Nagoya protocol

The WG8j with its mandate on traditional knowledge is highly relevant for the development and implementation the Convention as well as the Nagoya Protocol. The organisation of the agenda and meetings under the WG8j might need to address this double-link.

Review of implementation - Voluntary peer-review for the CBD

Decisions IX/8 and XI/2 provide the basis for the establishment of a voluntary peer-review process under the CBD. In our view a review mechanism has a potential to improve implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan through mutual experience-sharing and capacity-building, for both developing and developed country parties to the CBD.

In the process of developing the peer-review-mechanism for the CBD it is important to learn from other international review-processes such as the OECD peer review process, UNFCCC (review of annex1 national communications), UNECE environmental performance reviews, UN Human Rights Council universal periodic review as well as existing national peer-review processes.

We would recommend a stepwise approach for the developments of the review mechanism, and aim for the start-up of a pilot phase with interested countries after COP12. The 5th National Report and the NBSAP would be central background information for the reviews, but also other relevant reports should be used.

It is our understanding, that the pilot phase will be a learning phase in which processes will undergo constant development and the Secretariat will have an important role in this process. Since the peer-review process will cover all areas of the strategic plan, the collaboration with other biodiversity-related MEAs will also be encouraged in this area.

Switzerland

Subject: "Improving the efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols"

Submission by Switzerland

15 February 2014

Follow-up to decision XI/10

Ref.: SCBD/OES/OJ/moc/82999 - NOTIFICATION No. 2013-120¹

General remarks

The Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity issued notification 2013-120 in order to seek the views of Parties, governments, international organizations, indigenous and local communities and other stakeholders on how to improve the efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols in preparation for the fifth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on the Review of Implementation of the Convention. In paragraph 2 of its [decision XI/10](#), the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary, in consultation with the Bureau, to prepare a proposal on improving the efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols. The proposal to be prepared by the Executive Secretary is to be submitted to the consideration of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on the Review of Implementation of the Convention at its fifth meeting, to be held in Montreal, Canada, on 16-20 June 2014.

Switzerland welcomes the opportunity to provide comments on these matters and encourages an in-depth discussion at WGRI-5 and CBD COP-12. Elements of this submission concern mainly the structures and processes of the Convention, while several points are also relevant for its protocols. To improve the efficiency of structures and processes, a set of measures is necessary, which, in order to be fully effective, should be developed with the understanding that structures and processes are interlinked to improve the efficiency of multilateral biodiversity governance. Hence ways to foster synergies, cooperation and collaboration among the biodiversity-related conventions, but also ways to enhance cooperation within the UN system on biodiversity related issues should be found. Furthermore measures to increase the efficiency of the CBD secretariat, the way parties to the CBD communicate and cooperate and the implementation capacities of parties should be developed under a broad vision.

1 The organization of intersessional work and periodicity of meetings

The biannual **periodicity** of the Conference of the Parties until 2020 (decision XI/2) allows the implementation of the decisions of the COP, but also gives sufficient time for preparing the next set of negotiations necessary to advance further the implementation of the Convention. Taking into account the increased strain on the secretariat and governments as well as the cost-implications an increase of the frequency of the COPs would have, this is not an option to be

¹ <http://www.cbd.int/doc/notifications/2013/ntf-2013-120-cbd-en.pdf>

pursued. Switzerland encourages that timing of the meetings under the conventions are also discussed by the Biodiversity-Liaison Group BLG in order to have a coordinated post-2020 plan of the meetings.

The conduction of annual meetings of **subsidiary bodies** is well established. But we identify room for improvement in the use of these meetings of subsidiary bodies, by better focusing discussions on the substance rather than going into detailed negotiations. The analysis of successful elements of SBSTTA-17 combined with experiences from the “traditional” SBSTTA might help. Ways should be found in order to have more discussions in smaller groups, for instance by considering a format similar to the one used for the Nairobi NBSAP workshop in 2013 (technical discussions in small groups, grouped language-wise). The role of subsidiary bodies in preparing the COPs needs to be maintained, they need to produce recommendations to the COP. The meeting of the subsidiary bodies should be seen as anchors in the intersessional process in which ongoing efforts by parties, secretariat and other organizations are catalysed and brought together. It might be worthwhile to have a close look at the *modus operandi* of SBSTTA ([Annex III of decision VIII/10](#)), especially section F and, in the light of the establishment of IPBES, G.

The Secretariat plays an important role in organizing and moving the intersessional work forward. The intersessional work is crucial for solid preparation of the Conferences of the Parties by the secretariat, but also by the parties. The system of the secretariat issuing notifications and consolidating the subsequent submissions by preparing documents for the meeting of the COP or the subsidiary bodies is well established; in some cases, the small number of returned submissions can make it difficult for the secretariat to prepare well balanced draft decisions. An analysis why the reply quota is sometimes low might help to address this problem. We encourage the Secretariat to further increase consistency in the preparations of the meetings under the CBD, for instance of the meetings of the Working Group on Article 8j) and the meetings of the Nagoya Protocol.

2 The organization of meetings under the Convention

We encourage the secretariat to evaluate the option to hold also the Cartagena Protocol Meeting of Parties simultaneously to the COP, as this mode will very likely have several advantages. This evaluation could include experience from the first Nagoya Protocol COP-MOP which is, according to Art. 26.6 of the Nagoya Protocol, to be held simultaneously with the COP. Some contact groups – for instance on budget or on the clearing-house – could discuss all three agreements together, therefore duplication of discussion is avoided, coherence enhanced and synergies fully exploited.

3 Synergies, coordination and cooperation

While remarkable efforts are undertaken by the secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions to enhance synergies, Switzerland is convinced that further efforts should be undertaken within countries, through the COPs and by the secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions themselves in order to exploit the full potential. This includes better coordination within the secretariats, for instance within the Secretariat of the CBD among the divisions responsible for the protocols and other divisions. The successful implementation of the

global Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 demands the full cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions, including:

- encouraging parties to exploit synergies and enhance coordination at the national level, in particular to implement the NBSAPs.
- placing biodiversity on the global agenda (joint communication strategies) and the post-2015 Development Agenda,
- cooperating strategically within the UN system (including the SDG discussions),
- further developing jointly global biodiversity indicators (including the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership),
- identifying and promoting synergies in biodiversity-related reporting,
- enhancing effectivity of biodiversity finance including the development of innovative finance mechanisms,
- promoting scientific cooperation, and data exchange especially in relation to IPBES.

The CBD Secretariat should (in line with decision XI/6) further seek ways for enhancing synergies among the biodiversity related conventions especially in the areas listed above. In this process, it would be worthwhile to learn from experiences under other processes (e.g. chemicals and waste conventions).

The CBD Secretariat should involve the other secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions in its deliberations and preparations for 2020 and post-2020. The achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets should be assessed by each biodiversity-related convention before CBD COP-15.

Cooperation on a technical level with UNEP, UNDP and the World Bank as well as the GEF should be strengthened, for instance in the development of programming documents and the implementation of the CBD COP guidance to the GEF. This should happen with the involvement of other secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions.

4 Reporting under the Convention

The fifth national report under the Convention is the second one based on a predominantly narrative framework. Switzerland wishes to share its experiences in elaborating the fourth and fifth national reports with the Secretariat of the Convention and the Conference of the Parties.

We encountered some obstacles when preparing the fifth national report regarding aligning national data to global indicators and related to the avoidance of lengthy duplications. The periodicity of the calculation of indicators varies by nature among indicators and between countries. However, with a period of five years since the last national report, an important share of information on the state and trends of biodiversity provided in the fourth national report proved to be still valid. Efforts were needed to not simply repeat the information already provided and to adjust the structure in consequence. However, there were some core information that need to be reiterated.

Other conventions organise their reporting differently. The Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), for instance, uses a reporting framework that gradually evolves according to the

decisions of the COP, with the Parties updating and complementing their previous report for the COP. The mixture of standing information to be updated regularly, allowed the development of a promising online reporting system. The Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention) has organised its reporting according to a concise format requesting table listed information. This update of data is required every two years. A narrative, more qualitative report is due every four years on a voluntary basis. This type of reporting has proved to be very efficient, both in enabling comparison between countries for internal purposes of the Convention as for the countries themselves since the update is simple.

Regarding the reporting under the CBD we would like to suggest a mixture of both examples mentioned above. For instance, data to be aggregated in global headline indicators (which should be further developed and complemented) could be submitted on a regular basis, whereas a broader narrative report could be submitted periodically according to the Convention's strategic plan. As mentioned under chapter 3 of this submission, this global headline indicators should be further developed, ideally by the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership and then by the proposed Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators. Furthermore reporting schedules should be discussed by the Biodiversity-Liaison Group BLG in order to have a coordinated post-2020 plan.

Regarding the Clearing-house mechanisms, duplication of work should be avoided by exploiting synergies among the clearing houses of both protocols and the convention. Exchange of information with other biodiversity-related conventions should be automated and facilitated.

Switzerland would also be in favour of the inclusion of the biodiversity finance reporting into the national report. The necessary finance indicators and reporting elements should be developed based on the lessons learned from the biodiversity finance reporting of 2009 and 2014. The inclusion of the finance reporting into the regular reporting towards the convention would generate synergies and reduce the number of additional reporting frameworks.

5 Voluntary peer-review for the CBD

Decisions IX/8 and XI/2 provide the basis for the establishment of a voluntary peer-review process under the CBD. A pilot phase should be started after COP-12. Switzerland is interested to participate in this pilot phase.

A voluntary peer review will be based on a set of principles and the understanding that the country under review will benefit the most from such a process: transparency, inclusiveness, comprehensiveness, mutual trust. Participating countries are expected to share these principles and the vision behind the voluntary peer-review. The intention is a mutual experience-sharing and capacity-building, for both developing and developed country parties to the CBD.

The ultimate objectives of such peer-reviews are to provide participating countries with information and advice which they might use when developing/updating and aligning their NBSAPs with the Strategic Plan or improve the implementation of their NBSAPs.

Other objectives of the peer-review or positive side effects will include;

- contribute to enhanced communication and understanding between participating countries facing similar biodiversity challenges,

- sharing of lessons learned and exchange of information and knowledge from other biodiversity-related processes among participating countries,
- potential for other CBD Parties to use the lessons learned and recommendations made available in the peer-review report and from the peer review process in general,
- knowledge gains for the SCBD which may allow it to improve its knowledge products
- helping national biodiversity institutions, NGO's and others in increasing the focus on biodiversity challenges on the national agenda,
- contribute to improving the standing and reputation of the CBD in the long-term and increase policy awareness on biodiversity issues.

National Reports to the CBD, and other relevant reports, will be central background information for the reviews.

It is our understanding, that the pilot phase will be a learning phase in which processes will undergo constant development and the Secretariat will have a important role in this process. Since the peer-review process will cover all areas of the strategic plan, the cooperation with other biodiversity-related MEAs will also be encouraged in this area.

Thailand

Thailand's Comments on the Upcoming WGRI-5 of Improving the efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention

- In order to enhance action under the Strategic Plan, the post 2015 development agenda would be focused on the issues that have not yet successfully implemented. Moreover, the support (both technical and financial) should be mobilized in order to strengthen CBD Parties' capacity to meet their obligations under the Aichi Targets and some certain areas yet to be achieved.
- Development of biodiversity assessment can be effective mechanisms in enhancing compliance of reporting obligations. The assessment could also be used as a basis for reporting under other biodiversity related conventions, enable more harmonization of their processes and eventually reduce the cost associated with the reporting obligations themselves. We would suggest the Secretariat to further explore ways and means to establish the mechanism for the Harmonization of biodiversity-related reporting in the future.

Duration of the meetings: Streamlining COP to maximize plenary negotiating time:

- Since COP often has several documents to be adopted, it would be advisable for streamlining COP to maximize plenary negotiating time. In order to allow a longer period for negotiations, it is advisable to increase the duration of the plenary by one day (but noting that there will be financial implications for such an increased duration)

Information Tools

- Side events are covering a range of issues. It is advisable that a specific section of the Clearing House Mechanism dedicated to proceedings/extracts from side-events would be developed in electronic formats. (by the organisers , in collaboration with the Secretariat).

Supporting Mechanisms

- Given that a number of activities under the Nagoya Protocol has significant implications to (the works of) the Convention on Biological Diversity and that in some Parties, the National Focal for the Nagoya Protocol and the CBD may not be the same person. It is advisable that a training module would be provided by the Secretariat. Training materials are being designed to enhance capacity of CBD National Focal Point to understand the legal, organizational and administrative issues related to Nagoya Protocol. The Secretariat would also prepared module dealing with an Introduction to the Protocol, the Role of the National Focal Point and preparation of National Report, as appropriate.
- Collaboration and cooperation will be crucial in the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization, to ensure the development of a coherent and functional international framework. It is crucial that a higher level of forum would be established in order that Ministers or high level officials involved in each party may wish to share their views on how to achieve this collaboration and describe the step taken.

International Biodiversity-related Groups and Initiatives.

- “SATOYAMA Initiative” may have been included under the list of International Biodiversity-related Groups and Initiatives.

Support Mechanisms (Trust Funds)

- The Secretariat may communicate with the UNEP to facilitate sending the second copy of the receipt of the General Trust Fund for the Convention on Biological Diversity (BY) and for the Cartagena Protocol contributed by Parties to the National Focal Point. (Normally the copy will be sent to the Focal Point through the Permanent Mission and it is a time-consuming process .)

B. Submissions from relevant organizations

Inuit Circumpolar Council, Canada
--

Views of the Inuit Circumpolar Council (CANADA)

Notification No. 2013-120 -Improving the Efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention

I. The CBD

COP

Preparations by Parties relating to its work programmes should involve indigenous and local communities at least 6 months before the upcoming COP. More involvement by indigenous peoples in the preparations require more capacity (personnel and financial) for this engagement. Information on positions by Parties on the articles that affect indigenous peoples should be shared with indigenous peoples well in advance of the COP so that Indigenous peoples can respond and effectively contribute to the CBD work relating to the implementation of its provisions.

SBSTTA

Indigenous and local communities should be funded to participate fully and effectively in this body through attendance and more importantly with the ability to consult with their constituencies and prepare and present papers of significance to the issues under consideration. SBSTTA is a key body in the influencing of the decisions of the Conference of the Parties. The traditional knowledge issue should be a main part of the core elements of future work within SBSTTA.

Secretariat

The present article 8(j) focal point within the secretariat requires expansion of staff. The existing staff should make more efforts to be fair in their dealings with all indigenous peoples.

Decisions

The rules of procedure

The rules of procedure as annexed to the decision focus is on the GEF. In this regard, attention should be made which takes into account the financial challenges facing indigenous peoples participation in developed countries where indigenous peoples remain on the margins.

New and Emerging Issues

2. *Noting* decision which sets out the criteria for new and emerging issues, and *recognizing* that the issues of ocean acidification, Arctic biodiversity, ocean noise, and ground level ozone meet the criteria set out by the Conference of the Parties for consideration as new and emerging issues and *further recognizing* that ocean acidification and ocean noise do not constitute new issues, requests the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice to:

(b) Take into account, in the implementation of the programs of work on protected areas and on marine and coastal biodiversity, the impact of ocean noise on marine protected areas and to consider the scientific information on underwater noise and its impacts on marine and coastal biodiversity and habitats that will be made available by the Executive Secretary prior to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

The Inuit Circumpolar Council is of the view that the Conference of the Parties at its 12th meeting adopted a work program which contains a focus on the Arctic ocean and the impacts on the arctic marine and coastal biodiversity.

3. *Invites* the Arctic Council to provide relevant information and assessments of Arctic biodiversity, in particular information generated through the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program (CBMP) of the Arctic Council's Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna Working Group, for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice;

The Inuit Circumpolar Council, which is a permanent participant of the Arctic Council supports this paragraph and urges arctic states to provide additional information when it becomes available. The Inuit circumpolar Council believes that the traditional knowledge of arctic indigenous peoples is a key component of the monitoring program and therefore should be a considered by SBSTTA.

Subsidiary Bodies established by the Intergovernmental Committee pursuant to Article 23 of the Convention

1. AD Hoc Open-ended Intercessional Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions (WG8J)

Ad hoc Opened working group on article 8(j)

The Inuit Circumpolar Council encourages the Parties (COP) to continue in its efforts to make space for the important efforts of this Working Group and encourages Parties to increase its funding for the full and effective participation of indigenous people in this working groups processes both on and off delegation.

Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising g from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity

Support Mechanisms

1. Regional/sub regional capacity-building workshops

The Inuit Circumpolar Council suggests that regional and sub regional capacity building workshops are expanded to developed countries and that the arctic region deserves attention and the capacity needs of arctic indigenous people.

D. National Focal Points

The Inuit Circumpolar Council perspective is for the national focal point be determined in part by the indigenous peoples within the respective country.

Secretariat of the East African Community (Arusha, Tanzania)

COMMENTS ON THE CBD ANNEX AND PROPOSED STRTUCTION

Section I

Currently, the work done by Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on the review of the implementation of the convention (WGRI) is not adequate enough. Therefore there is a need to establish Subsidiary Body on the Implementation (SBI) on the implementation of the convention. The SBI will help in the assessment and review of the convention implementation.

If established, SBI as to be included in Section A (Open ended bodies established by the convention) and Section C (Bureau as per Rules and Procedures).

Section II: Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Under section C (Information tool), there is a need to include Advanced Informed Agreement (AIA) procedures to ensure that countries are provided with the information necessary to make proper decisions before agreeing to import Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) or GMOs into their environment.
