

Second Consultation Workshop of the Biodiversity-related Conventions on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (Bern II)

Introduction

The following summary is based on the interventions made by participants in the videoconferences held on 18 and 22 January, and on submissions made to the online discussion forum which was open from 18-27 January.

We have a record of all submissions, and these will be summarised further in the report of the meeting. This summary primarily focuses on those areas where further actions are proposed or implied.

As was said on day one of the consultation, there is a need for practical suggestions on how to operationalise collaboration in implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

The purpose of this summary is to encourage further discussion in the final videoconference session of the Bern II consultation.

Context provided in the interventions and submissions

The post-2020 global biodiversity framework represents a unique opportunity to approach biodiversity in a cooperative and complementary manner and reflect on the priorities and contributions of each convention.

There is clear recognition amongst MEAs of the value of cooperation and collaboration in implementation at all appropriate levels, and that there is potential to do more.

It is also clearly recognised that a robust post-2020 global biodiversity framework integrating the mandates and interests of all MEAs with respect to biodiversity, and building on the 2030 Agenda will be very valuable.

It is accepted that all MEAs should have a role to play in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including with respect to reporting and accountability.

Each MEA is addressing many of the same direct threats and drivers of change, and each MEA is working with the same governments and is concerned with the same means of implementation.

However, each MEA is an independent entity with its own mandates and governance framework and must operate within this framework.

Development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

Conclusion 1: It is essential that the biodiversity-related interests of all relevant MEAs are integrated into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, so that all relevant MEAs can recognise their place and role in its future implementation. To achieve this, it is important that those developing and negotiating the framework are particularly sensitive to the inputs and interests of the various MEAs while developing the framework.

Related observations:

- MEA ownership relies on getting goals, targets and indicators right, cooperation and synergies will follow
- MEAs have already made a range of submissions to the post-2020 process
- Note the CMS [Gandhinagar Declaration](#) on CMS and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework
- Many aspects of the updated draft are welcomed
- There are concerns that the updated framework is still not sufficiently attractive to other MEAs
- Concerns remain about 'gaps' relevant to the experience and interests of particular MEAs
- This is also complicated by differences in terminology in some cases

All related comments made during the consultation will be directly communicated to the co-chairs of the open-ended working group on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and the report of the consultation will be made available to relevant meetings. However, participants might also want to consider questions such as the following:

1. *What else can be done to draw these concerns to the attention of the co-chairs of the open-ended working group on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?*

2. *Is there anything that can be done to draw these concerns to the attention of Parties to the CBD when they are negotiating the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?*

Indicators and the monitoring framework

Conclusion 2: When developing the post-2020 monitoring framework, it is important to use wherever possible relevant indicators already being used by other conventions and processes. This will avoid duplication and promote synergies. Use of common indicators, and building knowledge management and capacity building around them, will help to drive cooperation at appropriate levels, and help promote a common message.

Conclusion 3: Given the expected role of all relevant MEAs in supporting implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, it is important to ensure that these MEAs are able to actively participate in the technical expert group on indicators proposed in documents prepared for CBD SBSTTA on the monitoring framework.

Related observations:

- Links with relevant SDG indicators are crucial
- Important to build on what is already in place, and engage existing organizations and infrastructure
- Goals, target, indicators will influence how MEAs work towards implementation/reporting
- Example of the wetland extent indicator used by Ramsar Convention and in tracking SDGs
- Examples of ongoing development of indicators relating to: chemicals and waste; connectivity
- Other MEAs need to contribute to development of monitoring framework through their secretariats
- Need to also consider underlying data and knowledge management, and capacity for it
- Coordinated use of indicators helps promote more effective management and use of related data
- Use of common indicators gives opportunity to work together on quality, consistency and accessibility
- CBD SBSTTA documentation already highlights which indicators are used by other MEAs

These points will be made in the report of the consultation that will be made available to relevant meetings supporting development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and we are aware that this issue is already highlighted in relevant CBD documents (*and is in particular relevant to SBSTTA agenda item 3*).

Comments on specific indicators will also be forwarded to relevant CBD Secretariat staff. However, participants might also want to consider questions such as the following:

3. *Is there anything else that can be done to further promote the adoption of indicators that are already being used by other conventions and processes in the post-2020 monitoring framework?*
4. *What else can be done to increase cooperation and coordination in the ways in which different MEA processes use indicators, and encourage use of indicators by their parties?*

Review of implementation and reporting

Conclusion 4: If it is clear how the role and responsibility of each MEA relates to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and its implementation, then it will be easier for other MEAs to play an active role in its implementation. As a result, national reports and communications to each MEA will necessarily be relevant to assessment of progress in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Conclusion 5: If all MEAs are involved in implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, then a process should be developed to bring together reported information for the global review of progress in implementation (also referred to as a global stocktake). Avoiding duplication necessitates a more integrated system for reporting, but any new system will need to build on current processes and use reports that are already there. This may require new tools and approaches.

Related observations:

- If MEA strategic plans are aligned with post-2020, then MEA reports will become more aligned
- If indicators are more aligned across MEAs, then MEA reports will become more aligned
- More integrated planning leads to more integrated implementation, and more integrated reporting

- There remain opportunities to streamline and harmonize reporting
- Increased dialogue amongst secretariats on reporting might be beneficial
- Cooperation amongst MEA national focal points is valuable in planning, implementation and reporting
- Do we produce integrated reports on post-2020 at national level, or compile them at global level?
- The move to online reporting creates opportunities to more effectively 'mine' information
- Good mapping of who is doing what with respect to implementation helps with this
- As with indicators, need to consider underlying data and knowledge management, and capacity for it
- Potential of tools such as InforMEA and DaRT is increasingly apparent
- DaRT can facilitate more integrated use of reported information at the national level
- In many cases feedback on cooperation across MEAs is already a part of reporting
- Could we develop a common platform that draws together reported information?
- Must keep in mind the purpose of review and reporting is to improve implementation
- CBD SBI documentation addresses options to enhance synergies in reporting to MEAs
- Encouragement for pilot testing a modular reporting approach on a theme relevant to multiple MEAs

These points will be made in the report of the consultation that will be made available to relevant meetings supporting development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and we are aware that some of these issues are already highlighted in relevant CBD documents (*and are in particular relevant to SBI agenda item 9*). There are also specific comments on the co-leads paper that need further consideration by the co-leads. Additionally, participants might also want to consider questions such as the following:

5. *What steps could be taken now and in the future to more effectively align reporting and share reported information, leading to a more integrated approach to review of implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?*

Potential areas for cooperation on means of implementation

Conclusion 6: Cooperation and collaboration is not only critical to the development and implementation of cost-effective solutions, but it is also attractive to donors and is a key part of developing integrated approaches such as nature-based solutions (or ecosystem-based approaches). This includes identifying opportunities for collaboration in addressing all means of implementation such as capacity-building, resource mobilization and knowledge management, as well as communication.

Conclusion 7: Implementation might well be facilitated by the development of joint work programmes, or even a consolidated work programme across MEAs. Development of such a work programme or work programmes could be facilitated by existing coordination groups such as the Liaison Group of the Biodiversity-related Conventions (BLG) and the Joint Liaison Group (JLG).

Related observations:

- Cooperation needs more emphasis, as cooperation in one area will lead to cooperation in others
- Cooperation is important for avoiding duplication, sharing the burden and learning from others
- Examples of the benefits of cooperation already exist to be built on
- Further efforts to coordination capacity development in the context of post-2020 would be valuable
- Sharing of acquired knowledge in areas such as resource mobilization is valuable
- Common framework will naturally lead to greater cooperation on means of implementation
- Better integration of objectives of other MEAs into NBSAPs facilitates funding and implementation
- Working together is a 'no brainer'
- However levels of involvement will vary with topic/activity, as cooperation needs to be focused
- Post-2020 could be a good opportunity to increase cooperation in communication
- Coordinated approaches to funding can enhance outcomes of funding approaches
- Concern that "synergies" can be taken to imply that less money will be needed
- There may be value in increased sharing of technical materials and toolkits to support implementation
- All of the above important at both national and international levels

These points will be made in the report of the consultation that will be made available to relevant meetings supporting development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and we are aware that some of these issues are already highlighted in relevant CBD documents (*and is in particular relevant to SBI agenda items 6 and 7*). However, participants might also want to consider questions such as the following:

6. *Are there steps that could be taken in the short term to further increase collaboration on issues such as resource mobilization, capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation, and knowledge management?*
7. *What value do you see in the development of joint work programmes to support implementation? And if they could serve a useful purpose how should we go about developing them?*

Implementing synergies at the national level

Conclusion 8: At the national level it is important to encourage close interaction among the national focal points within each country, as well as with those responsible for coordinating actions and reporting related to delivering on the SDGs.

Conclusion 9: At the national level it is also important to promote and facilitate collaboration in development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) that address all relevant conventions with respect to biodiversity.

Conclusion 10: NBSAPs are largely driven by national geography, but when implementing MEAs and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework it is also important to consider how to work across national borders to address shared objectives and common challenges.

Related observations:

- Important to keep in mind national governments decide how they want to act in this regard
- Effective communication of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to all stakeholders is key
- Better integration of objectives of other MEAs into NBSAPs facilitates funding and implementation
- Integration of all relevant biodiversity aspects into NBSAPs will facilitate communication and profile
- It is important to create ownership in implementation, which requires collaboration
- There are already some good examples of coordination at the national level, and guidance materials
- Modular implementation (and associated reporting) would help to drive this increased collaboration
- GEF support to NBSAPs and reporting is relevant here
- It is in the interests of all biodiversity-related MEAs to mainstream biodiversity into other sectors
- And for biodiversity objectives to be integrated into other national development and sectoral plans
- Addressing common challenges and solutions is effective in building relationships
- Potential of coordinated approaches to harmful and potentially harmful activities

These points will be made in the report of the consultation that will be made available to relevant meetings supporting development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and we are aware that some of these issues are already highlighted in relevant CBD documents (*and are in particular relevant to SBI agenda items 9 and 11*). However, participants might also want to consider questions such as the following:

8. *Are there further steps that could be taken to promote increased cooperation at the national level in implementing MEAs, in particular in the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?*
9. *We have not really addressed mainstreaming so far in this consultation. Are there steps that MEAs could be taking to increase their cooperation and collaboration in promoting and supporting the mainstreaming agenda?*

Operationalization of the global biodiversity framework by conventions and processes

Conclusion 11: A key element of operationalization is to pick up elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in the mandates and strategies of other MEAs, which implies that they will need to take action following adoption of the framework. This is important for increasing ownership and building response, and in

this regard, there may be value in allocating specific responsibilities to other MEAs in implementing parts of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Conclusion 12: An ongoing process of coordination would be valuable, but it is important wherever possible to build on existing mechanisms and only develop something new when it is clearly shown to be necessary. This includes the need to define a clear purpose and identify why existing processes would be insufficient.

Related observations:

- Clarification of where responsibilities lie is important here, which relates back to framework wording
- UNGA recognition of post-2020 global biodiversity framework will be important
- Alignment of each MEA's strategy with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework
- Existing example of alignment of CMS and Ramsar strategies with Aichi Biodiversity Targets
- Identification of responsibilities associated with the monitoring framework is also relevant
- Also relevant is the earlier reference to possible joint work programmes
- There may be value in having a shared roadmap/calendar and mapping of responsibilities/interests
- There will be value in coordination mechanisms that are concerned with specific topics
- Is there a value of a common biodiversity COP, or a coming together of COPs
- Could there be a global forum associated with the global stocktake?
- BLG has value as a coordination body, but it only includes secretariats and not party representatives
- As a result, some see the need for a further body building on from the Bern II consultation
- The potential need for a coordination mechanism may go beyond biodiversity *sensu stricto*
- Regional conventions and programmes have an important role to play, and must not be overlooked

These points will be made in the report of the consultation that will be made available to relevant meetings supporting development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. However, participants might also want to consider questions such as the following:

10. *What is needed to increase understanding and recognition of which MEAs are doing what with respect to implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?*
11. *Is there a need for something like the Bern Consultation to continue, where representatives of both parties and secretariats are able to fully engage?*

Other issues raised by participants

- The **Leaders Pledge for Nature** supported by 83 countries/Head of States or Governments commits to the *“development and full implementation of an ambitious and transformational post-2020 global biodiversity framework for adoption at ... CBD COP 15 ... as a key instrument to reach the Sustainable Development Goals that includes ... commitments to strengthen the cooperation among relevant multilateral environmental agreements, international organizations and programmes to contribute to effective and efficient implementation of the biodiversity framework.”*
- The **no net loss** approach has been a strong concept for UNCCD, and the potential for using it as a basis for developing cooperation and synergies is very high. The Land Degradation Neutrality [conceptual framework](#) may be useful in this regard. The importance of no net loss in the area and integrity of wetland ecosystems including marine and coastal ecosystems is also recognised by the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands.
- The development and implementation of **nature-based solutions** (or ecosystem-based approaches) provide opportunity for efficiently integrating agendas of different MEAs with respect to implementation on the ground. This also closely relates to **ecosystem restoration** as a key mechanism to maintain ecosystem services, and the potential for addressing the interests of multiple MEAs.
- Continuing to strengthen and communicate the **emerging common narrative** about nature, climate and land use will help to further enhance a common agenda amongst relevant MEAs; a narrative, linked to the SDGs, that connects e.g. living in harmony with nature and a nature-positive world with a climate neutral world and land degradation neutrality, and that identifies a common set of actions.