

Second Consultation Workshop of Biodiversity-related Conventions on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (Bern II)

18 January to 2 February 2021

Contents

Executive Summary	2
Summary of the views of the Co-leads of the Consultation on next steps	5
Report of the Workshop	7
1. Background	7
2. Preparation for the second consultation	7
3. Organization of the second consultation	8
4. Opening videoconference (15 January)	9
5. Online platform (18-26 January) and second videoconference (22 January)	9
6. Final videoconference (2 February)	10
7. Synthesis of views expressed by participants	10
7.1. Context	10
7.2. Development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework	11
7.3. Indicators and the monitoring framework	11
7.4. Review of implementation and reporting	12
7.5. Potential areas for cooperation on means of implementation	13
7.6. Implementing synergies at the national level	14
7.7. Operationalization of the global biodiversity framework by conventions and processes	14
7.8. Other issues raised by participants	15
8. Next steps	16

Executive Summary

This report concerns the second of two consultation workshops set up to facilitate the engagement of other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), and in particular biodiversity-related conventions, in the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. There was representation in the consultation from parties and secretariats of 13 MEAs, including all eight of the biodiversity-related conventions that participate in the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions (BLG).¹ The report of the consultation workshop is being made available as an information document to upcoming CBD meetings, and in particular the third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI-3), the third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (WG2020-3), and the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CBD COP 15). In order to facilitate discussion in the upcoming meetings, the following table presents the conclusions that arose from the synthesis of workshop discussions and relates them to the key agenda items of the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA-24) and SBI-3. The conclusions were not formally agreed. In the body of the report each conclusion is supported by further context. The report also includes a summary prepared by the consultation co-leads, Somaly Chan of the Kingdom of Cambodia and Anne Teller of the European Union, on their views on next steps the consultation outcome and the next steps to be taken.

Conclusions	SBSTTA-24	SBI-3
Development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework		
Conclusion 1: It is essential that the biodiversity-related objectives 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 submissions and interventions made on behalf of the various MEAs while developing the framework.	Agenda Item 3: Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework	Agenda Item 5: Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Agenda Item 8: Cooperation with other conventions, international organizations and initiatives
Indicator and the monitoring framework		
Conclusion 2: When developing the post-2020 monitoring framework, it is important to use relevant indicators already being used by other conventions and processes including the SDGs. This will avoid duplication and promote synergies, in particular as data are already being gathered. 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.	Agenda Item 3: Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework	Agenda Item 5: Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Agenda Item 7: Capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation, technology transfer, knowledge management, and communication Agenda Item 9: Mechanisms for reporting, assessment and review of implementation
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.	Agenda Item 3: Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework	

¹ The following conventions were represented: Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (WHC); Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES); Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS); Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention); International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC); International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA); International Whaling Commission (IWC); United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD); Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions; and Minamata Convention on Mercury.

Conclusions	SBSTTA-24	SBI-3
Review of implementation and reporting		
<p>Conclusion 4: Ensuring clarity on how the objectives, roles and responsibilities of each MEA are integrated into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and its implementation, will make it easier for other MEAs to play an active role in its implementation. As a result, national reports and communications to each MEA will necessarily have content that is relevant to assessment of progress in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.</p>	<p>Agenda Item 3: Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework</p>	<p>Agenda Item 5: Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Agenda Item 8: Cooperation with other conventions, international organizations and initiatives Agenda Item 9: Mechanism for reporting assessment and review of implementation</p>
<p>Conclusion 5: If multiple MEAs are involved in implementation of particular aspects 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 tools and processes and use reports that are already there, which may require use of new tools and approaches.</p>	<p>Agenda Item 3: Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Agenda Item 8: Programme of work of the IPBES</p>	<p>Agenda Item 5: Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Agenda Item 8: Cooperation with other conventions, international organizations and initiatives Agenda Item 9: Mechanism for reporting assessment and review of implementation</p>
Potential areas for cooperation on mean of implementation		
<p>Conclusion 6: Cooperation and collaboration is not only critical to the cost-effective implementation of MEAs, it is also attractive to donors and is a key part of developing the integrated approaches such as nature-based solutions or ecosystem-based approaches that may be necessary for implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. 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.</p>		<p>Agenda item 5: Post-2020 global biodiversity framework Agenda Item 6: Resource Mobilization and the financial mechanism Agenda Item 7: Capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation, technology transfer, knowledge management, and communication Agenda Item 8: Cooperation with other conventions, international organizations and initiatives</p>
<p>Conclusion 7: Implementation may be facilitated by the development of joint work programmes on specific topics across MEAs, and by clearer understanding of who is doing what and with whom to promote and facilitate implementation. Development of such approaches at the global level could be facilitated by existing coordination mechanisms such as the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions (BLG) and the Joint Liaison Group of the Rio Conventions (JLG).</p>		<p>Agenda Item 8: Cooperation with other conventions, international organization and initiatives</p>
Implementing synergies at the national level		
<p>Conclusion 8: At the national level, close interaction amongst the national focal points for the different MEAs is essential for strengthening cooperation and collaboration in implementation. Conducting this in the context of the national mechanism that coordinates actions on the SDGs may provide additional benefits and may be an option for some. Additional steps may need to be taken to further encourage interaction among focal points where it is not already happening.</p>		<p>Agenda Item 8: Cooperation with other conventions, international organization and initiatives Agenda Item 11: Mainstreaming of biodiversity within and across sectors and other strategic actions to enhance implementation</p>

Conclusions	SBSTTA-24	SBI-3
<p>Conclusion 9: At the national level it is also critical to encourage, promote and facilitate collaboration in development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) so that they effectively address all relevant conventions with respect to biodiversity. Again, further steps may need to be taken to help ensure that this happens.</p>		<p>Agenda Item 8: Cooperation with other conventions, international organizations and initiatives</p> <p>Agenda Item 11: Mainstreaming of biodiversity within and across sectors and other strategic actions to enhance implementation</p>
<p>Conclusion 10: Although NBSAPs are national tools, effective implementation of MEAs requires consideration of transboundary and regional issues, and in developing and implementing 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.</p>		<p>Agenda Item 8: Cooperation with other conventions, international organization and initiatives</p> <p>Agenda Item 11: Mainstreaming of biodiversity within and across sectors and other strategic actions to enhance implementation</p>
<p>Operationalization of the global biodiversity framework by conventions and processes</p>		
<p>Conclusion 11: A key element of operationalization is for relevant elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be picked up in the strategies and work plans of MEAs other than CBD, which implies that they will each need to take action in their own processes following adoption of the framework by CBD COP. This is important for increasing ownership and building response, and in this regard, there may be value in allocating specific responsibilities to relevant MEAs in implementing parts of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.</p>	<p>Agenda Item 3: Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework</p>	<p>Agenda Item 8: Cooperation with other conventions, international organization and initiatives</p>
<p>Conclusion 12: Given the expected level of engagement of MEAs in implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, coordination will be valuable, both for enhancing cooperation and facilitating synergy. This should build wherever possible on existing mechanisms, only developing something new if it is clearly shown to be necessary (with clearly defined purpose and identifying why existing processes would be insufficient).</p>		<p>Agenda Item 8: Cooperation with other conventions, international organization and initiatives</p>

Summary of the views of the Co-leads of the Consultation on next steps

The following report, including its executive summary, has been prepared by the organizers of the consultation. However, as co-leads of the consultation, we provide here our personal perspective on the consultation and its conclusions. Our views draw on the very rich discussions during the consultation, as well as on the paper we prepared in advance to help guide discussion, the so-called Co-leads' paper.²

Inclusive goals, targets and monitoring framework: When it comes to the development and negotiation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, its goals, milestones, targets and monitoring framework need to be infused further with elements that clearly reflect the mandates, terminologies, issues (e.g. connectivity, no net loss, biodiversity and culture) of the multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) working on biodiversity-related issues, and expand upon synergies and cross-convention issues. We encourage the co-chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework to reflect on this and the Working Group at its 3rd meeting to carefully consider such issues and to cover potential gaps in the next iteration of the framework.

Encouraging cross-conventional coordination, cooperation and synergies: We also propose the inclusion of wording in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework that makes clear the importance of cross-convention coordination and synergies in working towards the targets, enshrining co-ownership and co-responsibility in the targets themselves. It will also be important to reference synergies in thematic and cross-cutting decisions taken by the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) at its fifteenth meeting (COP 15), such as those related to mainstreaming biodiversity in agriculture, marine, mining, health, to cooperation relating to nature-based solutions (ecosystem-based approaches), and also ecosystem restoration and any other relevant issues. We included some suggested wording in section 1 of the co-leads' paper.

Optimizing implementation and building capacity through cooperation and synergies at the national level: It is essential for national implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to harness synergies in an ambitious and innovative manner, ensuring that its targets are met by all Parties. To achieve this a range of options for Parties were discussed both in the consultation and in the co-leads' paper (in particular section 2.2 of the latter). This included issues such as biodiversity mainstreaming, resource mobilization (e.g. GEF synergistic funding for capacity-development, scientific and technical cooperation, monitoring and reporting across MEAs) and better coordination of all national level actors relevant to biodiversity governance. Relating to this, we urge Parties to establish national multi-sectoral steering committees to facilitate and coordinate implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and balance divergent national interests. National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and CBD National Reports are important tools to help drive cooperation and synergies.

Elements for a coherent, synergistic and effective implementation and operationalization of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework: With respect to the system for planning, monitoring, reporting and review for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, a move towards indicator-based monitoring, periodic reporting and reviews of progress is currently being discussed in the negotiation process. In order to be most useful, any reviews, such as potential global stocktakes and gap reports conducted at regular intervals, will be most effective if they are informed by inputs from all biodiversity-related conventions, other relevant MEAs and relevant international organizations and programmes through a well-defined process with clear roles and responsibilities and agreed metrics. We therefore proposed in the co-leads' paper (sections 2.1 and 3 respectively):

- a) Key elements of a mechanism in which monitoring, reporting and review by relevant MEAs can feed into any system for planning, monitoring, reporting and review agreed on for tracking progress in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Tools like the Data Reporting Tool (DART)³ could play an important role for streamlining reporting.

² Co-leads' paper - <https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/34774/BCP.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

³ See CBD/SBI/3/INF/8

- b) Elements for a framework by which relevant MEAs can work together to ensure that their efforts to contribute to implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and associated monitoring, reporting and review is comprehensive, coherent, synergistic and effective. Processes where specific topics (e.g. ecosystem restoration and how cooperation and synergies are important to its delivery) could be discussed at UN Biodiversity Summits, meetings of the United Nations Environment Assembly or synchronised COPs.

The approach we have taken in this consultation: In recognition of the respective mandates and independent governance structures of the different biodiversity-related conventions and other relevant MEAs, any effective synergistic system for planning, reporting and review of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will require text included in the framework itself and other CBD COP decisions, as well as in decisions of the governing bodies of the other agreements. It will also necessitate enhanced collaboration in implementation at both global and national levels. We wanted to ensure that the consultation addressed many of the key issues and came up with concrete conclusions. Also, in the co-Leads paper (section 2.1) we identified key technical elements that we believe need to be addressed to set up an effective synergistic system for planning, monitoring, reporting and review of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and technical and political options to advance the synergies agenda in the context of the framework, such as the establishment of a cross-convention working group mandated with the creation of a collaborative approach to operationalization of the framework.

We encourage you to carefully read and consider the report of the consultation and its conclusions, and to also review the suggestions we have made in the co-leads paper.⁴

Somaly Chan, Kingdom of Cambodia

Anne Teller, European Union

In their capacities as co-leads of the Second Consultation Workshop of Biodiversity-related Conventions on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (Bern II)

⁴ Co-leads' paper - <https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/34774/BCP.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Report of the Workshop

1. Background

In decision 14/34,⁵ the Conference of the Parties (COP) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) adopted the preparatory process for development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and requested the Executive Secretary to facilitate implementation of the process. In its decision, the CBD COP recognized the importance of involving biodiversity-related conventions, Rio Conventions and other conventions in the process, and invited all stakeholders, including other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), to actively engage and contribute to the process of developing a robust post-2020 global biodiversity framework in order to foster strong ownership of the future framework and strong support for its immediate implementation.

In order to facilitate engagement, in decision 14/30⁶ the CBD COP requested the Executive Secretary and co-chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework to organize a workshop among parties of the biodiversity-related conventions, with participation from the members of the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions (BLG), to explore ways in which the conventions can contribute to the elaboration of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. As a result, a Consultation Workshop of Biodiversity-related Conventions on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework⁷ was convened by CBD Secretariat in Bern, Switzerland, 10-12 June 2019 (Bern I), hosted by the Government of Switzerland.

The report of the workshop⁸ was made available to the first meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, held in Nairobi, Kenya, 27 – 30 August 2019. At this meeting, the Working Group welcomed the offer of the Government of Switzerland to host a further workshop as a follow-up. It was originally intended that this second workshop would also take place in Bern, but as a result of the global pandemic the decision was taken first to postpone the consultation, and then to hold it in a virtual setting.

2. Preparation for the second consultation

Responsibility for organization of the second consultation was given to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) who initiated the process by asking the secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions to provide their views on the first workshop and how this experience could be built upon. This helped to inform development of the objectives and agenda for the second consultation. The secretariats were also invited to provide feedback on the consultation **background document** prepared by the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC).⁹

UNEP convened a steering committee to oversee preparations for the consultation, which originally included representatives of UNEP, the CBD Secretariat, the host Government of Switzerland and UNEP-WCMC. Representatives of two Parties to the CBD were invited to co-lead the consultation, and to join the steering committee. These were Anne Teller of the European Union and Somaly Chan of the Kingdom of Cambodia. Recognising the breadth of potential topics and the need to focus discussion, the co-leads prepared a **Bern II co-leads paper** to help guide discussion.¹⁰

Because of the delays in convening the workshop resulting from the pandemic it was decided to hold two **online briefing sessions**, one in March 2020 and the second in September 2020. In each briefing session the process and background document were presented, together with the views of the co-leads on the organization of the work. Feedback from participants at the online briefing sessions was also taken into account in the completion of the Bern II co-leads paper.

⁵ See <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-34-en.pdf>

⁶ See <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-30-en.pdf>

⁷ See <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/post2020/brc-ws-2019-01/documents>

⁸ See <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/de6d/6f08/e6f5ab406bf39019f9d5db62/post2020-ws-2019-06-02-en.pdf>

⁹ See <https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/32961/Bern2.pdf>

¹⁰ See <https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/34774/BCP.pdf>

3. Organization of the second consultation


The overall **aim of the second consultation** was to strengthen cooperation among and coherent implementation of conventions with respect to biodiversity, by:

- a) Identifying concrete elements, including on common areas of work and cooperation among the conventions, that could be included in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and mechanisms for the monitoring and review of its implementation; and
- b) Identifying ways in which conventions other than the Convention on Biological Diversity can further contribute to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and its operationalization.

The **participation in the second consultation** was by invitation and comprised representatives of the parties of each convention (as nominated by the chairs of respective governing bodies), representatives from secretariats, and invited observers from international organizations and NGOs in a position to provide expert support. In the most part, the representatives of the parties to the conventions were elected officials of the standing bodies of the conventions. Reflecting the party-led process for the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, a primary consideration in the choice of this design of participation was to ensure discussion from the perspective of parties and that views and perspectives relevant to the circumstances of each the various conventions would be provided in a balanced manner. Efforts were also made to ensure regional balance among party representatives.

The following conventions were represented: Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (WHC); Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES); Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS); Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention); International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC); International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA); International Whaling Commission (IWC); United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD); Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions; and Minamata Convention on Mercury. The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change was also invited to participate.

Once the decision had been taken to hold the consultation online the following **structure of sessions** was devised to maximise opportunities for participants to make input. The consultation was held over a 15-day period from 18 January to 2 February. Given the consultation finally took place online, it was also decided to allow observers to follow the opening and final videoconferences through webcasts.



4. Opening videoconference (15 January)

The primary purpose of the opening videoconference was to set the scene and to explain the process, although the session also allowed time for questions and some initial discussion. Following opening remarks by Tita Korvenoja on behalf of UNEP and Norbert Baerlocher on behalf of the host Government of Switzerland, Diane Klaimi of UNEP explained the format of the meeting and the ways in which participants would be able to engage. This was followed by a number of presentations providing context for the discussions.

On behalf of the co-chairs of the CBD Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, Basile van Havre provided an update on progress in development of the framework and his observations on upcoming activities and opportunities. He looked forward to receiving the report of the consultation, but also encouraged participants to engage in the third meeting of the open-ended working group, as well as the twenty-fourth meeting of the CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA-24) and the third meeting of the CBD Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI-3) where a number of relevant issues will also be discussed. He also encouraged secretariats to engage with United Nations internal coordination processes.

The CBD Executive Secretary Elizabeth Maruma Mrema stressed the importance of the full engagement of everyone in addressing implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, which will be relevant across all conventions participating in the consultation. This included opportunities for collaboration in addressing all means of implementation and the monitoring framework. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp of the CBD Secretariat then introduced the process leading up to COP 15. She in particular noted that the agendas of the subsidiary body meetings included items of direct relevance to cooperation and synergies discussions, including agenda items on capacity building, resource mobilization, review and reporting, and the monitoring framework.

Following presentation of the background document¹¹ by Nadia Deckert of UNEP-WCMC, the co-leads of the consultation, Anne Teller (EU) and Somaly Chan (Cambodia) introduced the Bern II co-leads paper,¹² which was intended both to suggest priority topics for discussion during the consultation and to provide ideas on actions that could be taken. The following five topics were proposed for both the online forum and the second videoconference, although participants were free to raise other topics:

1. Indicators and the monitoring framework
2. Review of implementation and reporting
3. Potential areas for cooperation on means of implementation
4. Implementing synergies at the national level
5. Operationalization of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

A number of interventions were made by participants, following the presentations, and these have been captured as appropriate in the synthesis of views set out in section 7 below.

5. Online platform (18-26 January) and second videoconference (22 January)

Both the online platform and the second videoconference were restricted to invited participants, and were planned as opportunities for participants to make more substantive input on the topics proposed by the consultation co-leads. In advance of these discussions, those representing particular conventions were invited to wherever possible discuss issues amongst themselves and provide consolidated inputs where this was appropriate.

There was a total of 75 submissions to the online platform from 21 participants, and, in many cases, these were identified as submissions on behalf of all participants representing a particular convention. Submissions were made on all five topics, and in addition a number of other issues were raised. There were also several late submissions that were also considered. During the second videoconference, there were 24 interventions from 16 participants, as well as a number of questions raised in the 'chat'.

¹¹ See <https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/32961/Bern2.pdf>

¹² See <https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/34774/BCP.pdf>

Following the closure of the online platform, a synthesis of the views expressed was prepared, drawing on both the online platform and second videoconference, as well as the interventions made in the opening videoconference. The purpose of this document was to facilitate discussion in the final videoconference, and it was circulated four days in advance of the final session. The synthesis was presented as a series of conclusions, related observations and questions. The purpose of the 'related observations' was to demonstrate the breadth of the discussion, and to illustrate opportunities for building on work that was already under way.

The content of a number of the submissions to the online platform related directly to the actual content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, or to the proposed indicators for the monitoring framework. So that the detail of such submissions was not lost in developing the report these have been communicated as appropriate to the co-chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and to the CBD Secretariat.

6. Final videoconference (2 February)

Following opening remarks by Tita Korvenoja on behalf of UNEP, the synthesis of views expressed during the consultation was presented by Jerry Harrison of UNEP-WCMC. This was followed by a discussion session led by the consultation co-leads, who went through the themes and conclusions in turn, raising questions that participants might like to address while inviting any feedback. A total of 22 interventions were made during this session by 12 participants. The revised conclusions and related observations are set out in section 7, below. It is important to recognise that this is a synthesis of the discussion, and not something that was formally agreed.

7. Synthesis of views expressed by participants

7.1. Context

The post-2020 global biodiversity framework represents a unique opportunity for the biodiversity-related conventions and all other relevant MEAs and intergovernmental processes¹³ to approach biodiversity in a cooperative and complementary manner, reflecting on the priorities they each have, and the contributions they can each make.

Implementation of the various conventions responds to and is impacted by many of the same direct threats and drivers of change, and each is working with the same governments as parties, and is concerned with the same means of implementation, so there are many potential commonalities.

There is clear recognition of the value of cooperation and collaboration in implementation of conventions at all appropriate levels, and an appreciation that there is potential to do more in this area building on and enhancing existing experience. This could be enhanced through shared ambition in delivering the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

It will therefore be important to develop a robust post-2020 global biodiversity framework, which provides a framework for and leverages the work of all relevant conventions and processes with respect to biodiversity according to their respective mandates, and builds on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

There is a critical need for cooperation at the national level to enhance implementation of each of the related conventions in a synergistic way, for example through increasing efficiency and sharing experience and resources, and it is vital that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework encourages and facilitates such cooperation.

Although each is an independent entity with its own mandate and governance framework within which it must work, it is accepted that all relevant intergovernmental conventions and processes should have an active role to

¹³ References to intergovernmental processes is intended to cover strategies and frameworks agreed by governments, such as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, and any associated processes for implementation and review

play in delivering implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including with respect to reporting and accountability.

7.2. Development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

Conclusion 1: It is essential that the biodiversity-related objectives 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 submissions and interventions made on behalf of the various MEAs while developing the framework.

Related observations:

- This conclusion relates to all MEAs that impact on biodiversity, or will support future implementation
- Important to ensure that the framework leverages work of each MEA according to their mandates
- MEA ownership relies on getting goals, targets and indicators right, cooperation and synergies will follow
- A range of MEAs have already made submissions to the post-2020 process
- Note, for example, the Gandhinagar Declaration¹⁴ on CMS and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework
- Many aspects of the updated zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework¹⁵ are welcomed
- There are concerns that the updated framework is still not sufficiently attractive/relevant 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
- It may be appropriate for previous submissions from MEAs to be revisited when developing the first draft
- Clear commitment to shared ownership would be valuable in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework
- Critical that CBD national focal points consider the views of their counterparts from other MEAs

Specific comments related to the form and content of the updated zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework were also made by a number of participants, and these have been communicated direct to the co-chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. Opportunity has also been provided for participants to repost these comments and any substantive interventions to the [workshop webpage](#).¹⁶

7.3. Indicators and the monitoring framework

Conclusion 2: When developing the post-2020 monitoring framework, it is important to use relevant indicators already being used by other conventions and processes including the SDGs. This will avoid duplication and promote synergies, in particular as data are already being gathered. 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 indicators¹⁷ proposed in documents prepared for CBD SBSTTA on the monitoring framework.

Related observations:

- Links with relevant SDG indicators are crucial¹⁸
- Important to build on what is already in place, and engage existing organizations and infrastructures
- Goals, targets, indicators will influence how MEAs work together towards implementation and monitoring

¹⁴ See https://www.cms.int/sites/default/files/document/cms_cop13_res.13.1_gandhinagar-declaration_e.pdf

¹⁵ See <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/3064/749a/0f65ac7f9def86707f4eaefa/post2020-prep-02-01-en.pdf>

¹⁶ See <https://www.unep.org/events/workshop/bern-ii-consultation-workshop-biodiversity-related-conventions-post-2020-global>

¹⁷ Active participation could be through participation of secretariats, or representatives of technical subsidiary bodies

¹⁸ For example, with respect to wetlands extent (SDG indicator 6.6.1) or land tenure (SDG indicator 1.4.2) as highlighted by the Ramsar Convention and UNCCD respectively, and with respect to gender-responsive indicators.

- Example of the wetland extent trends indicator used by Ramsar Convention and in tracking SDGs
- Example of ongoing development of indicators relating to chemicals and waste¹⁹
- Example of ongoing development of indicator relating to connectivity to address a current gap²⁰
- Wherever possible build on work that is already being done both at national, regional and global levels
- Need to also consider underlying data and knowledge collection and 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
- Consistent and coordinated use of indicators across MEAs can also reduce burden on parties
- CBD SBSTTA documentation already highlights which indicators are used by other MEAs²¹
- It may be appropriate for previous submissions on monitoring framework from MEAs to be revisited
- Further collaborative work on monitoring framework needed before and immediately after CBD COP

7.4. Review of implementation and reporting

Conclusion 4: Ensuring clarity on how the objectives, roles and responsibilities of each MEA are integrated into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and its implementation, will make it easier for other MEAs to play an active role in its implementation. As a result, national reports and communications to each MEA will necessarily have content that is relevant to assessment of progress in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Conclusion 5: If multiple MEAs are involved in implementation of particular aspects 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 tools and processes and use reports that are already there, which may require use of new tools and approaches.²²

Related observations:

- If MEA strategic plans are more aligned, the content of national reports to each MEA have broader value
- If indicators are more aligned across MEAs, then their use increases consistency in reporting across MEAs
- More integrated planning leads to more integrated implementation and more integrated reporting
- NBSAPs are essential tools in this regard (see sections 7.5 and 7.6 below)
- There remain opportunities to streamline/harmonize reporting, as indicated in CBD SBI documents²³
- Increased regular dialogue amongst secretariats on reporting might be beneficial
- Cooperation amongst national focal points across MEAs is valuable in planning, implementation, reporting
- Increased potential to produce integrated reports at national level on work towards post-2020 targets
- The increase in online reporting creates opportunities to more effectively 'mine' information²⁴
- Good mapping of who is doing what with respect to implementation helps with this
- Example of established systematic monitoring and reporting mechanism by World Heritage Convention²⁵
- As with indicators, need to consider underlying data and knowledge management, and capacity for it

¹⁹ SAICM is currently implementing an intergovernmental process to develop a strategic approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020, which includes consideration of both targets and indicators. SAICM is the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management.

²⁰ CMS is actively working on development of indicators relating to connectivity, and would like to see these indicators widely used, including for assessing progress in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Development of a headline indicator for connectivity is also a priority for UNCCD.

²¹ See information document CBD/SBSTTA/24/INF/16 and in particular section 2.6 and Annex 1 (<https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/a6d3/3108/88518eab9c9d12b1c418398d/sbstta-24-inf-16-en.pdf>)

²² Such as DaRT - the Data and Reporting Tool for MEAs (<https://dart.informea.org/>) and InforMEA (<https://www.informea.org>)

²³ See, for example, working document CBD/SBI/3/11/ADD2 (<https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/38c5/24c3/d3ce15f5a2fa80e3bfec0de/sbi-03-11-add2-en.pdf>)

²⁴ Although it should be noted that for various reasons online reporting is not always fully accessible to all parties

²⁵ See the Periodic Reporting for the World Heritage Convention (<https://whc.unesco.org/en/periodicreporting/>) and the State of Conservation Information System (<https://whc.unesco.org/en/soc/>)

- Potential of tools such as InforMEA and DaRT is increasingly apparent
- DaRT can facilitate more integrated use of reported information at the national level²⁶
- DaRT has potential to improve effectiveness/efficiency of reporting against post-2020 targets
- In many cases feedback on cooperation across MEAs is already a part of reporting
- Recognition that global stocktake could draw on multiple sources, including national reports to MEAs
- 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
- Encouragement for pilot testing a modular reporting approach on a theme relevant to multiple MEAs
- When MEA COPs are close in time it may be possible to design reports and syntheses of value to both
- In much of the above, appropriate engagement of relevant stakeholders, including IPLCs,²⁷ is important

7.5. Potential areas for cooperation on means of implementation

Conclusion 6: Cooperation and collaboration is not only critical to the cost-effective implementation of MEAs, it is also attractive to donors and is a key part of developing the integrated approaches such as nature-based solutions or ecosystem-based approaches that may be necessary for implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. 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 may be facilitated by the development of joint work programmes on specific topics across MEAs, and by clearer understanding of who is doing what and with whom to promote and facilitate implementation. Development of such approaches at the global level could be facilitated by existing coordination mechanisms such as the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions (BLG) and the Joint Liaison Group of the Rio Conventions (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 useful
- 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 NBSAPs²⁸ facilitates funding and implementation
- Working together is something that it is obviously sensible to do
- However, levels of involvement will vary with topic/activity, as cooperation needs to be focused
- Adoption of the framework 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 less money is needed, which is not necessarily the case
- There may be value in increased sharing of technical materials and toolkits to support implementation
- All of the above are important at both national and international levels
- And it will be important to appropriately support civil society engagement in cooperative action
- In addition to the BLG and JLG, other coordination mechanisms, such as the EMG, can play a role²⁹
- New approach needed to engage with chemicals and waste conventions in joint work programming
- There may be potential for aligning topic-specific plans of different MEAs, such as gender action plans

²⁶ It was also suggested that the CBD's gender plan of action could be included within DaRT

²⁷ Indigenous peoples and local communities

²⁸ National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans developed as part of CBD implementation at national level

²⁹ The EMG is the UN Environment Management Group, which has a mandate to support coordination on environmental issues across the UN family (<https://unemg.org>)

7.6. Implementing synergies at the national level

Conclusion 8: At the national level, close interaction amongst the national focal points for the different MEAs is essential for strengthening cooperation and collaboration in implementation. Conducting this in the context of the national mechanism that coordinates actions on the SDGs may provide additional benefits and may be an option for some. Additional steps may need to be taken to further encourage interaction among focal points where it is not already happening.

Conclusion 9: At the national level it is also critical to encourage, promote and facilitate collaboration in development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) so that they effectively address all relevant conventions with respect to biodiversity. Again, further steps may need to be taken to help ensure that this happens.

Conclusion 10: Although NBSAPs are national tools, effective implementation of MEAs requires consideration of transboundary and regional issues, and in developing and implementing 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 organize themselves
- Effective communication of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to all stakeholders is key
- Better integration of objectives of all relevant MEAs into NBSAPs facilitates funding and implementation
- Integration of all relevant biodiversity aspects in NBSAPs facilitates communication and increases profile
- It is important to create ownership in implementation, which requires collaboration
- Coupling integrated NBSAP with national coordination mechanism provides real opportunity for synergy
- Good examples of coordination at the national level, and guidance materials to share and build upon
- Modular implementation (and associated reporting) would help to drive this increased collaboration
- GEF³⁰ support to NBSAPs and reporting is relevant, and GEF is more likely to support what is in NBSAPs
- 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
- This increases the number of focal points and sectors that need to be engaged in cooperative activities
- It will also be important to secure engagement of relevant stakeholders with experience of different MEAs
- Working together to address common challenges is an effective way to build working relationships
- Opportunities to promote coordinated approaches to harmful and potentially harmful activities
- Opportunities to increase cooperation through sharing of tools, guidance, training materials, etc.
- May need to build capacity for cooperation and knowledge sharing amongst focal points across MEAs
- There is value in the sharing of lessons learnt amongst focal points from different MEAs and countries
- Connectivity provides a basis for cooperation across boundaries

7.7. Operationalization of the global biodiversity framework by conventions and processes

Conclusion 11: A key element of operationalization is for relevant elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to be picked up in the strategies and work plans of MEAs other than CBD, which implies that they will each need to take action in their own processes following adoption of the framework by CBD COP. This is important for increasing ownership and building response, and in this regard, there may be value in allocating specific responsibilities to relevant MEAs in implementing parts of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Conclusion 12: Given the expected level of engagement of MEAs in implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, coordination will be valuable, both for enhancing cooperation and facilitating synergy. This should build wherever possible on existing mechanisms, only developing something new if it is clearly shown to be necessary (with clearly defined purpose and identifying why existing processes would be insufficient).

³⁰ Global Environment Facility (<https://www.thegef.org/>)

Related observations:

- High ambition is needed, but practical steps must be identified by which that ambition can be reached
- Need to discuss possible modalities/processes which would contribute to strengthening cooperation
- Build on existing processes, while promoting new collaboration on common interests
- Clarification of where responsibilities lie is important here, which relates back to framework wording
- UN General Assembly recognition of post-2020 global biodiversity framework will be important
- Alignment of each MEA's strategy with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will be needed
- Existing example of alignment of convention strategic plans with Aichi Biodiversity Targets^{31,32}
- Identification of responsibilities associated with the post-2020 monitoring framework is also relevant
- Also relevant is the possible identification of lead agencies for specific targets or issues
- Or the potential for developing joint work programmes
- Existing example of Ramsar Convention as lead agency of the CBD work programme on inland waters
- 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/issues
- Could consider some form of joint meeting to review implementation of post-2020 framework
- Is there value in having a common biodiversity COP, or a coming together of MEA COPs?
- Or a joint meeting of party representatives, thematic experts and civil society from across MEAs?
- Could there be a global forum associated with the global stocktake?
- BLG has value as a coordination body and has existed 17 years, so has experience that can be built upon
- However, it only includes secretariats and not party representatives
- As a result, some see the need for a continuation of something like the 'Bern Process'
- This would bring together secretariats, party representatives and relevant stakeholders
- Potential value of meetings of the chairs of MEA advisory bodies to address common issues³³
- 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
- UN system is working on a more consistent approach to biodiversity, involving bodies such as the EMG

7.8. Other issues raised by participants

During discussions following six cross-cutting issues were also referred to by participants.

- The **Leaders Pledge for Nature** supported by 84 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 (LDN) conceptual framework³⁴ may be useful in this regard with respect to the maintenance and restoration of ecosystems. The importance to the achievement of no net loss in the area and integrity of freshwater and marine and coastal ecosystems is also recognised by the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. LDN and the no net loss mechanisms used by other conventions are fully compatible, so it was suggested that building this into the post-2020 global biodiversity framework would help enhance synergies and be mutually beneficial to multiple MEAs.

³¹ See Annex A of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023

(https://www.cms.int/sites/default/files/document/CMS_Sharks_MOS2_Inf_9.pdf)

³² See Annex 2 of the Fourth Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016-2024

(https://www.ramsar.org/sites/default/files/hb2_5ed_strategic_plan_2016_24_e.pdf)

³³ In the past the Chairs of the Scientific Advisory Bodies of the Biodiversity-related Conventions (CSAB) met to discuss issues of common interest, but CSAB is not currently active. The last formal meeting took place in 2013.

³⁴ <https://www.unccd.int/publications/scientific-conceptual-framework-land-degradation-neutrality-report-science-policy>

- The development and implementation of ***nature-based solutions*** (or ecosystem-based approaches) provides 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.
- The recognition and implementation of the ***human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment*** is a key avenue to mainstream biodiversity across sectors and across MEAs, to strengthen action and synergies for the achievement of the 2050 Vision of Living in Harmony with Nature.³⁵ Cross-cutting issues such as human rights can usefully be integrated into the activities of all MEAs.
- Consider opportunities for ***streamlining gender equality*** and women’s empowerment in implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, taking into account the gender plans and actions under the Rio Conventions and other MEAs, and opportunities for cooperation and synergy in their implementation.

8. Next steps

During the closing session of the final videoconference, participants were informed about how the results of the consultation could be most effectively used. In particular this report will be made available as an information document to upcoming CBD meetings, and in particular SBI-3, the third meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (WG2020-3), and the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CBD COP 15). In order to facilitate discussion in the upcoming meetings, the executive summary of the report relates the conclusions set out in section 7 to key agenda items of SBSTTA-24 and SBI-3. In addition, all the conclusions of the consultation are relevant to the work of the co-chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and to the agenda of WG2020-3.

However, to be effective it will be important for CBD negotiators to not only be aware of this document, but for them to also discuss the conclusions with the national focal points of other conventions to which their country is party before coming to the negotiations. This will also include gaining an understanding of what other conventions need and expect to see in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. In this regard some of the detailed submissions and interventions made on behalf of individual conventions have already been sent to the co-chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, and invitation is also being extended for secretariats to resubmit them through the workshop website.³⁶

Whilst the results of the consultation are relevant to the form and content of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the associated monitoring framework which will be adopted by CBD COP 15, other issues might be more appropriately addressed within other CBD COP decisions (such as those relating to national reporting or capacity-building). In addition, following adoption of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, there will be need for other conventions to take action working through their own governance processes.

Cooperation is often discussed in MEA advisory and governance body meetings as a separate topic, however it is, of course, a cross-cutting issue relevant for many areas of work. There is clear desire for a post-2020 global biodiversity framework that will underpin the aims and aspirations of all relevant intergovernmental conventions and programmes, and a clear intent to find ways to work together effectively in its implementation. The ideas explored in this consultation will therefore need to be raised in many other fora, and in particular in the advisory and governance body meetings of each of the MEAs.

The Government of Switzerland was thanked for its support to the Bern II process, and in response a representative of Switzerland flagged the readiness of his Government to continue its support for an ongoing “Bern Process” for facilitating cooperating and synergies among biodiversity-related conventions in

³⁵ CBD/SBI/3/INF/22 Report of the thematic workshop on human rights as enabling condition in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

³⁶ See <https://www.unep.org/events/workshop/bern-ii-consultation-workshop-biodiversity-related-conventions-post-2020-global>

implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, if others thought this was appropriate. Thanks were also extended to the Bern II consultation co-leads, Anne Teller and Somaly Chan.
