

# Background document for Bern 2

Background document to inform the discussions at the second consultation workshop  
of the biodiversity-related conventions on the post-2020 global biodiversity  
framework (date and location TBC)

***Final version***

## Table of contents

Context, purpose and methodology .....	2
Main issues for discussion .....	3
<b>A. Thematic issues</b> .....	3
<b>B. Implementation issues</b> .....	6
<b>C. Operationalization by other conventions and processes</b> .....	12
Annex 1: Overview of explicit references to other MEAs in the zero draft.....	16
Annex 2: An overview of decisions, resolutions and declarations on alignment of the strategic planning documents of other biodiversity-related conventions than CBD with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.....	18
Annex 3: Timing of MEA governing body meetings up to CBD COP 15 and beyond (graphic).....	20
Annex 4: Overview of the timelines of Strategic Frameworks of MEAs up to 2030 (graphic) .....	21

## Context, purpose and methodology

This document aims to support the achievement of the objectives of the 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation workshop of biodiversity-related conventions on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework<sup>1</sup>, agreed upon following a consultative process, which are:

1. *To identify 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*
2. *To identify ways in which conventions other than the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)<sup>2</sup> can further contribute to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and its operationalization,*  
*in order to strengthen cooperation among and coherent implementation of conventions with respect to biodiversity and ecosystem services.*

It does so by presenting information and questions with the aim of facilitating and encouraging discussion before and at the workshop. There is no intention that this document is comprehensive, and it is not proposing a particular view or intended outcome. The document is simply aimed at providing background and ‘food for thought’ that will lead to more fruitful discussion.

Particular focus is on the biodiversity-related conventions (i.e. the eight conventions whose secretariats are members of the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions). Nevertheless, because of the complex interlinkages between biodiversity, climate, land degradation and chemicals and waste issues, some information included in this background document also relates to the Rio Conventions, chemicals and waste-related conventions and other intergovernmental processes, in particular where they relate to biodiversity.

Developed by UNEP-WCMC, the background document builds on input provided by the Secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions and UNCCD via a questionnaire shared by UNEP. The Secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions, the Rio conventions and the chemicals and waste-related conventions were also invited to review the draft document.

Other key workshop background documents include the [zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework](#) with its appendices, [the outcome documents from the second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework](#), the [outcomes of the first Consultation Workshop of Biodiversity-Related Conventions](#) (Bern 1, 10-12 June 2019), decisions by the governing bodies of Multilateral Environmental Agreements related to the post-

---

<sup>1</sup> As outlined in the briefing note for the consultation workshop (March 2020), CBD COP [decision 14/30](#) requested the CBD Executive Secretary and co-chairs of the open-ended working group (WG2020) on the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to organize a workshop among the biodiversity-related conventions as a contribution to the comprehensive and participatory process for the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Against that context, a consultation workshop of biodiversity-related conventions on the post-2002 global biodiversity framework was held in Bern, 10-12 June 2019 (Bern 1). The workshop also involved the Rio and chemicals and waste-related conventions. Subsequently, at its first meeting held in Nairobi, 27-30 August 2019, WG2020 welcomed the offer of the Government of Switzerland to host a follow-up workshop (paragraph 8 of the [working groups report](#)).

<sup>2</sup> In addition to the conventions represented in the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions, this includes at least the Rio conventions as well as the chemicals and waste-related conventions (*the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal; The Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade; The Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Minamata Convention on Mercury; The Vienna Convention for the Protection of Ozone Layer and its Montreal Protocol*).

2020 global biodiversity framework as well as any documents prepared by Secretariats of MEAs for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Bern consultation workshop.

Subsequent to the adoption by CBD COP of the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020* in 2010, the UN General Assembly recognized it as a universal framework for action on biodiversity and a foundation for sustainable development for all stakeholders, including agencies across the UN system (UNGA Resolution 65/161). The governing bodies of five other biodiversity-related conventions also recognized or supported the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020*, and the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions played a key role in this ([UNEP Sourcebook, 2015](#), chapter 6).

Through the adoption and implementation of a “comprehensive and participatory” process ([CBD COP decision 14/34](#)), the intention is that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is of universal nature in terms of relevance and ownership. A key step in achieving this goal is the active engagement of the other biodiversity-related conventions, the Rio conventions and other relevant MEAs and UN organisations in the process of its development.

With this purpose in mind, the outputs of the consultation workshop will be concrete operational proposals and recommendations that will be included in the workshop report. The co-chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, the subsidiary bodies of the CBD, and relevant conventions and UN organisations will be invited to consider the findings and recommendations of the consultation workshop.

With respect to the nature of the discussion at the consultation workshop, the UNEP document on [Guiding principles of the consultation workshop among the biodiversity-related conventions on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework](#) provides guidance.

## Main issues for discussion

Guided by the structure of the workshop agenda, the following three sections provide a brief introduction to each suggested topic and then pose questions and in some cases provide additional information and considerations. A number of questions make reference to possible options that could serve as a starting point for discussion. The aim is to provide a succinct overview of some of the key issues discussed to date as a basis for identifying concrete proposals and recommendations by the end of the consultation workshop. Reference to relevant documents, which include options, as well as more detailed information on the subject matter, are made at the end of each section under “*Selected key resources*”.

**THE QUESTIONS IN THIS DOCUMENT ARE NOT TO BE UNDERSTOOD AS THE LIST OF QUESTIONS TO BE DISCUSSED AT THE WORKSHOP. THE QUESTIONS IN THIS DOCUMENT AIM AT SUPPORTING THE PROCESS OF PRIORITIZATION OF THE KEY ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE THE CONSULTATION WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES.**

### A. Thematic issues

The discussion session on thematic issues and common areas of work and cooperation focuses on the goals and action targets (and corresponding indicators) included in the zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework that are of highest priority to the conventions with respect to biodiversity and ecosystem services, as well as on any gaps that have been identified.

Starting with the Ramsar Convention on Wetland’s Strategic Plan 1997–2002, strategic plans and frameworks have been key instruments for most of the biodiversity-related conventions. All

conventions' strategic plans aim to provide direction and guidance for implementation at both national and international levels, through the adoption of convention-specific objectives, targets, and indicators of progress. For an overview of current plans and plans in development, see *Annex 4*.

Over time, strategic plans have also evolved into vehicles to help build cooperation across conventions, including through the recognition of the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020* as the global plan for biodiversity<sup>3</sup>. Building up on the lessons learnt from the process of alignment of strategic plans of biodiversity-related conventions with the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020*, the ambition during the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is to achieve effective integration of convention-specific and cross-cutting issues to create ownership from responsible bodies and therefore ensure more effective and coherent implementation.

Questions that could be addressed:

- 1. How do you see the conventions' priorities in relation to the proposed goals, targets and indicators of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**
- 2. Goals and targets<sup>4</sup>:**
  - a. Regarding goals and targets, and potential gaps of the zero draft framework, which issues are not, or not adequately addressed in the zero-draft or in the discussions at OEWG2?
  - b. Should the identified elements be integrated into relevant draft goals or targets or should a proposal be made for a new stand-alone target or sub-target?
  - c. For which actions or issues should joint work programmes be developed at the international level (which can also guide the revision of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs))? These could for example build up on the CBD work programmes for which some of the biodiversity-related conventions are lead agencies (for example the Ramsar Convention is the lead agency for the inland waters biodiversity programme of work).
  - d. The IPBES assessments highlight the need for transformational change. For any specific goals, targets or other elements, what needs to be the level of ambition in order to achieve the objectives of the respective MEAs?
- 3. The draft monitoring framework<sup>5</sup>:**
  - a. With respect to the indicators included in the preliminary draft monitoring framework, do the elements and indicators identified for the individual targets cover all target elements of relevance to conventions, or are there any gaps that need to be filled?
  - b. Are there indicators used by other conventions<sup>6</sup>, including as part of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) process for which they are custodians, or suggested by other

---

<sup>3</sup> For an overview of different initiatives and mechanisms to enhance cooperation across conventions: UNEP-WCMC (2018). Overview of initiatives for enhancing coordination and collaboration at various levels across biodiversity-related conventions. <https://www.unep-wcmc.org/resources-and-data/biodiversitysynergies>.

<sup>4</sup> NOTE: Based on outcomes and request of WG2020-2, updated language for goals and targets is being prepared for work to be undertaken by SBSTTA-24 and will be published 6-weeks prior to SBSTTA-24. This will not constitute the first draft of the global biodiversity framework, which will be prepared after SBSTTA-24 and SBI-3, prior to WG2020-3.

<sup>5</sup> NOTE: Based on outcomes and request of WG2020-2, documents relevant to the draft monitoring framework are being prepared for SBSTTA-24. They will be made available in draft for peer review, following which they will be finalized and published 6-weeks prior to SBSTTA-24.

<sup>6</sup> Next to the biodiversity-related conventions, this also includes the Rio conventions and the chemicals and waste-related conventions

conventions, which should be used as a priority and included in the framework to monitor goals and targets? How can the principle of custodianship for indicators be reflected in the monitoring framework?

*The [Gandhinagar Declaration on CMS and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework](#), for example, recommends the consideration of the status of migratory species (by any species index such as Red List Index, Living Planet Index and Wild Bird Index) as a potential indicator of progress towards achieving the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including goals and targets on ecological connectivity.*

- c. How can harmonisation of indicators (e.g. common sets of indicators or elements thereof) be further enhanced across conventions in order to facilitate tracking of achievement?
- d. Should an additional column be included in the draft monitoring framework to highlight linkages and agreed key responsibilities and processes by other conventions?
- e. How can the use of biodiversity-related indicators at the national level be further improved in an integrated manner?

*Contracting Parties to the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) submit information to meet their National Reporting Obligations on the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests. This could provide a good baseline for a national level indicator on Invasive Alien Species (IAS), and later as a measure of success.*

- f. How can the structure of the monitoring framework help organize and integrate the information for the indicators in a consistent way across conventions?

#### 4. Other related topics

- a. How to ensure cooperation and synergies for the implementation of the **long-term approach to mainstreaming biodiversity**, a draft of which will be submitted to the SBI-3 by the Informal Advisory Group on Mainstreaming of Biodiversity?

##### Selected key resources

- Background information to the EU workshop on mobilizing up-scaling of Nature-based Solutions (NbS) for climate change throughout 2020 and beyond (4-5 March 2020, Brussels).
- CBD Informal Advisory Group on Mainstreaming Biodiversity: progress report and elements for the mainstreaming of biodiversity in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/bb51/b5cd/7710cb4ac2d839522477404d/wg2020-02-mainstreaming-en.pdf>
- CMS Secretariat (June 2019). Factsheet on connectivity and the post-2020 biodiversity framework – An introduction. <https://www.cms.int/en/publication/fact-sheet-connectivity-and-post-2020-biodiversity-framework-introduction>
- CMS Secretariat (August 2019). Factsheet on Connectivity and the Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework - Elements for new goals and targets. [https://www.cms.int/sites/default/files/publication/fact\\_sheet\\_connectivity\\_2.pdf](https://www.cms.int/sites/default/files/publication/fact_sheet_connectivity_2.pdf)
- IPPC (2020): The IPPC community contributes to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. <https://www.ippc.int/en/news/the-ippc-community-contributes-to-development-of-the-post-2020-global-biodiversity-framework/>
- UNCCD Secretariat (September 2019) proposal on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. <https://www.cbd.int/api/v2013/documents/6E70A3E5-6477-6E6E-E8A1->

[0DCEF9D8D1E4/attachments/UNCCD.pdf](#)

- UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs - Statistic Division (date unknown). Submission of views on possible targets, indicators and baselines for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and peer review of a document on indicators from the United Nations Statistics Division. <https://www.cbd.int/api/v2013/documents/A5FDE4DF-ED6B-61CF-3190-891C442E1209/attachments/UNSD.pdf>
- UNEP (2020). A thought starter: Strengthening the links between the biodiversity post-2020 framework with chemicals & waste. <https://s3.amazonaws.com/cbdddocumentspublic-imagebucket-15w2zyxk3prl8/a426992b24d9968973e92a2878b5ad5f>
- UNEP (2020). Assessment paper on linkages with other clusters related to chemicals and waste management and options to coordinate and cooperate on areas of common interest. *Submission to Fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020.* [http://www.saicm.org/Portals/12/documents/meetings/IP4/INF/SAICM\\_IP4\\_INF\\_3.pdf](http://www.saicm.org/Portals/12/documents/meetings/IP4/INF/SAICM_IP4_INF_3.pdf)
- UNEP-WCMC (2018). Mapping of current and potential use of biodiversity indicators across intergovernmental processes. <https://www.bipindicators.net/resources/global-publications/mapping-of-biodiversity-indicators-across-intergovernmental-processes>
- UNEP-WCMC (2015). Mapping Multilateral Environmental Agreements to Aichi Biodiversity Targets. <https://www.unep-wcmc.org/resources-and-data/mea-aichi-target-mapping>
- World Heritage Centre (December 2019). World Heritage and the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. <https://www.cbd.int/api/v2013/documents/9E891005-8B99-FFF2-B1D6-C3E8C8257C9C/attachments/WolrldHeritage.pdf>
- WWF (2020). Brief on Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework - Synergies, February 2020. [https://attachments.cbd.int/789d12946fd8e11ee5849fd7f1818e8f/WWF\(1\).pdf](https://attachments.cbd.int/789d12946fd8e11ee5849fd7f1818e8f/WWF(1).pdf)

## B. Implementation issues

This section addresses implementation support issues that are referred to in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, but will also potentially be addressed in other decisions to be adopted at CBD COP 15. Of key relevance for the discussions are the outcomes of the consultation workshops for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework on: (1) [resource mobilization](#) (14-16 January 2020); (2) [transparent implementation, monitoring, reporting and review](#) (20-22 February 2020); and (3) [capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation](#) (1-2 March 2020).

Questions that could be addressed:

1. **What should be the role of conventions other than CBD in implementing the post-2020 framework, and what specific elements should be included in the post-2020 GBF and in other CBD COP-15 decision language to facilitate this?**
2. **Shared implementation** of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework:
  - a. What should be the **roles and responsibilities** of conventions other than CBD in the implementation of the post-2020 framework, e.g. as lead partners for their areas of focus or specifically related to individual target elements/ targets or sub-targets?

- b. Should cross-reference to the strategic frameworks of other conventions that are already established for the post-2020 period be included (see *Annex 4*) and for which specific purpose?
- c. What should be the nexus between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond-2020 framework?
- d. How can aligned **planning for the implementation of related conventions at the national level** be facilitated and promoted?

Sub-questions that could be addressed include:

- i. How can **conventions** stimulate improved national coordination mechanisms, including strengthened mechanisms for cooperation amongst focal points? (E.g. via the adoption of relevant decisions by the convention's governing bodies or through the development or strengthening of guidance material, or access thereto).
- ii. How can **Parties** stimulate effective coordination mechanisms in their countries, including strengthened mechanisms for cooperation across different ministries and conventions (e.g. biodiversity-related conventions, Rio Conventions, chemicals and waste-related conventions, etc.)?
- iii. Do some established SDG national coordination mechanisms include the participation of national MEAs focal points (biodiversity, chemicals and Rio convention clusters)? How can such participation be encouraged?
- iv. What policy/legislation could be introduced or strengthened at national level to enhance synergy among biodiversity relevant conventions?
- v. Could regional and sub-regional workshops on NBSAPs help in achieving aligned planning for implementation of related conventions at the national level, and if so how?
- vi. Governments make a range of commitments relevant to biodiversity and ecosystem services, many responding to specific international agreements and processes. What are the opportunities for **conventions** to encourage a more aligned approach so that it is clearer how such commitments contribute to delivery of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?
- vii. Taking into account already existing materials, should new streamlined and simple guidance and tools for supporting the development, revision and implementation of NBSAPs (or pre-NBSAP commitments), targets and indicator development and monitoring across the conventions be developed, or existing one strengthened, and if so by whom?
- viii. How can the Global Environment Facility (GEF) foster (further) coherence of implementation?<sup>7</sup>
- ix. Could national focal points of CBD and other biodiversity-related conventions and agreements be informed of relevant biodiversity-related meetings and events through a shared calendar (cf. UNEP-WCMC post-2020 Biodiversity Strategic Planning Timeline <https://post2020.unep-wcmc.org/>)

---

<sup>7</sup> Guidance to be built on is included in Annex 3. On "Opportunities for accessing GEF Funds for the coherent implementation of the Biodiversity-related Conventions" (with respect to GEF-6) of the [UNEP Sourcebook of opportunities for enhancing cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions at national and regional levels](#).

- e. What mechanism could be introduced for **sharing of experiences** of the different conventions to identify similarities and implement joint programmes, as well as resolve differences?

Sub-questions that could be addressed include:

- i. Should agenda items at CBD COPs be included, which give other conventions, processes and instruments the opportunity to share information on their ongoing contributions to the achievement of certain goals, targets and actions in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?
  - ii. Could CBD-COPs focus on progress on certain targets in more detail (cf. High-Level Political Forum and SDGs) and invite relevant MEAs and international organisations related to biodiversity to report?
- f. Should relevant **language in the draft CBD Decision for adopting the post-2020 global biodiversity framework**, with respect to the role of relevant conventions other than CBD in implementation of the framework, be further strengthened (see *Annex 1*)? If yes, how? [Thereby it should be kept in mind that the text of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework itself is to be global in nature, without language specifically targeting CBD or Parties to the CBD or any other convention]

Sub-questions that could be addressed include:

- i. Should the post-2020 global biodiversity framework call for the inclusion in NBSAPs of convention specific priorities and encourage Parties to include in their NBSAPs appropriate reference to other biodiversity-related conventions to which they are also Parties?
  - ii. With regard to transparent implementation, monitoring, reporting and review for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, how can it recognize the role of the various biodiversity-related Conventions as well as other relevant MEAs?
  - iii. Should the roadmap for enhancing synergies among the biodiversity-relevant conventions at the international level 2017 -2020 ([CBD COP decision 13/24](#), Annex II) be updated in the light of the post-2020 framework? Several elements of the 2017-2020 roadmap that are still relevant could be carried forward into the new roadmap.
- g. How to ensure a coherent and synergistic implementation of the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration?
- h. What could be the role of other UN-bodies in supporting the shared implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework by the conventions, e.g. the role of UNEP/UNEA in supporting the MEAs through programmatic cooperation?

**3. Review and reporting mechanisms, including the role of the different stakeholder groups:**

Options for enhancing synergy on national reporting among biodiversity-related conventions and Rio Conventions are already under discussion, and secretariats have been consulted by the CBD Secretariat on the basis of a consultation paper prepared by UNEP-WCMC. This has been done in response to paragraph 3e of [CBD COP decision 14/27](#).<sup>8</sup> A number of 'options for action'

---

<sup>8</sup> In paragraph 3e of decision 14/27, the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity was requested to carry out these consultations with the aim of identifying and costing concrete actions to advance synergies on reporting, inter alia, through the following issues: (i) common indicators, where appropriate; (ii) reporting modules on shared issues; (iii) interoperability of information management and reporting



were identified in the consultation paper and the subsequent discussion, in addition to exploring how different goals and targets might align.

- a. How can the following ‘options for action’, be most effectively implemented and further enhance synergies amongst conventions (recognising that these options are already further elaborated in a document that secretariats have made input to)?:
  - i. Reporting modules on shared issues
    - Identify thematic areas or issues of common interest to a number of conventions and processes
    - Pilot test a modular reporting approach on identified issues
  - ii. Interoperability on information management and reporting systems: In how far can the following tools be used to enhance synergies amongst conventions?
    - Promote the use of common standards and ontologies
    - Strengthen the implementation of InforMEA
    - Implement the Data and Reporting Tool (DaRT) (What processes would be needed to facilitate awareness-raising and testing by Parties under different MEAs?)
    - Increase interoperability amongst online reporting tools
    - Increase access to relevant guidance
  - iii. Other issues
    - Provide guidance on the preparation of reports and communications including Voluntary National Commitments (VNRs) for SDGs
    - Promote an increased focus on biodiversity in VNRs
- b. What would be an effective review mechanism for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?
- c. Should relevant MEAs and UN organisations contribute to periodic reviews? If yes, how?
- d. With regard to the discussion on a **global stocktake of level of commitment and associated implementation** (as a source to complement national reports in assessing progress in implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework), what are opportunities here to enhance synergies amongst conventions? (E.g. alignment with the timing of national commitments and global stocktake under UNFCCC/ Paris Agreement)

**4. Cooperation among Conventions:** Identification of other key actions on how conventions can enhance their collaboration and cooperation – together and with other key bodies – in delivering and implementing the framework

- a. What practical steps can be taken to increase cooperation on **capacity-building** with respect to delivering and implementing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

Sub-questions that could be addressed include:

- i. What are immediate opportunities for collaboration on capacity-building activities and on developing more aligned and possible common approaches?
- ii. What specific mechanisms could help to enhance cooperation and collaboration in capacity-building activities amongst the conventions?
- iii. Should conventions be involved further in development of the CBD’s long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020? And if so, how?

---

systems; (iv) other options for increasing synergies in national reporting among the biodiversity-related conventions and the Rio conventions.

**b. What practical steps can be taken to increase cooperation with regards to **technical and scientific cooperation** (Art. 18 CBD)?**

Sub-questions that could be addressed include:

- i. How can increased cooperation support an inclusive process to review and renew technical and scientific cooperation programmes, including the IPBES, Bio-Bridge Initiative, the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative and the Global Taxonomy Initiative, in order to support the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework ([CBD COP decision 14/24](#) paragraph 9 and [SBSTTA recommendation 23/6](#))?

**c. What practical steps can be taken to increase cooperation with regards to **knowledge management**?**

Sub-questions that could be addressed include:

- i. What are opportunities for collaboration with regards to the development of a knowledge management component as a part of the preparatory process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework ([CBD COP decision 14/25](#) paragraph 14(f)), as well as its implementation?

**d. What practical steps can be taken to increase cooperation with regards to **resource mobilization** (in particular via GEF, the Green Climate Fund, or the Biodiversity Finance Initiative BIOFIN) for the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?**

Sub-questions that could be addressed include:

- i. What instruments can achieve coherence and complementarity while mobilizing resources?
- ii. Are there current hurdles in achieving joint implementation that are linked to resource mobilization?
- iii. How to get the most for biodiversity out of the significant growth in climate finance?
- iv. How to improve finance initiatives in the synergy space among the Rio conventions (Land Degradation Neutrality Fund, LDN Fund, etc.)?
- v. How can the biodiversity-related conventions best pursue a coordinated approach to securing funding from GEF and Green Climate Fund?
- vi. How can convention secretariats and GEF implementing agencies continue to support this? E.g. by facilitating liaison among the national focal points and authorities of different conventions, capacity-building on the development of joint proposals including on biodiversity-related issues covered by conventions that are not independently able to access GEF funding, raising awareness of national GEF operational focal points on the opportunities for synergistic implementation etc.
- vii. How can donors, particularly those concerned with development assistance, be best encouraged to help expand opportunities and provide further incentives for coordination and synergies in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?
- viii. How can information on work to support parties in resource mobilization, including in relation to innovative financial mechanisms that promote cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions, be most effectively shared?

- ix. How can past and current experiences relating to synergies between MEAs and wider mainstreaming efforts be regularly reviewed and shared to identify means of boosting the cost-effectiveness of synergistic action on biodiversity?
- e. What practical steps can be taken to increase cooperation with regards to a **common communication** strategy/ joint messaging related to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

In decision 14/34, the Conference of the Parties decided that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be accompanied by an inspirational and motivating 2030 mission as a stepping stone towards the 2050 Vision of “living in harmony with nature”, which will be supported by a coherent, comprehensive and innovative communication strategy.

Sub-questions that could be addressed include:

- i. Would more common messaging be helpful, and how could this best be achieved (while recognising that different conventions will have different takes and approaches to this messaging), including with regard to COVID-19?
- ii. Is there potential for developing joint information and awareness campaigns, including in the context of the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration 2021-2030?

**Selected key resources:**

- CBD Secretariat (2020). Report on the thematic workshop on resource mobilization for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Berlin, 14-16 January 2020. <https://www.cbd.int/conferences/post2020/POST2020-WS-2020-03/documents>
- FOEN, UNEP-WCMC, NatureConsult (2016). Elements for a modular reporting against the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. <https://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/cop/cop-13/information/cop-13-inf-24-en.pdf>
- IUCN (2018). Capacity building and synergies across the biodiversity-related conventions. Contributing to the design and subsequent implementation of a long-term strategic framework for capacity building for biodiversity beyond 2020. [https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/capacity\\_building\\_and\\_synergies\\_-\\_contribution\\_to\\_the\\_long-term\\_strategic\\_framework\\_for\\_capacity\\_building.pdf](https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/capacity_building_and_synergies_-_contribution_to_the_long-term_strategic_framework_for_capacity_building.pdf)
- UNEP (2015). Sourcebook of opportunities for enhancing cooperation among the Biodiversity-related Conventions at national and regional levels. [wcmc.io/sourcebook-web](http://wcmc.io/sourcebook-web)
- WWF (2020). Brief on Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework - Synergies, February 2020. [https://attachments.cbd.int/789d12946fd8e11ee5849fd7f1818e8f/WWF\(1\).pdf](https://attachments.cbd.int/789d12946fd8e11ee5849fd7f1818e8f/WWF(1).pdf)

### C. Operationalization by other conventions and processes

A number of the biodiversity-related conventions have adopted strategic plans that go beyond 2020, so ending during the period covered by the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. This includes, for example, the 4<sup>th</sup> Strategic Plan of the Ramsar Convention 2016-2024 and the CMS Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023. In 2019, CITES adopted the CITES Strategic Vision 2021-2030 covering the same period as the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) is expected to adopt a new instrument for SAICM and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond-2020 at the fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management, currently scheduled for July 2021<sup>9</sup>. For an overview of the current and future strategic plans of conventions and SAICM, see *Annex 4*.

The different strategic planning timelines, which reflect the different timings and cycles of the biodiversity-related conventions' governing body meetings (see *Annex 3*), have potential implications for the operationalization of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework by the other conventions. Also relevant is the extent to which opportunities for alignment are already foreseen in existing decisions or resolutions of those governing bodies (*Annex 2*). The specific circumstances and mandates of each convention will thus guide the discussions under this topic of operationalization by other conventions and processes.

The role of mechanisms and initiatives to enhance cooperation and collaboration among conventions, such as the Environment Management Group (EMG), the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions (BLG), and the Joint Liaison Group (JLG) of the three Rio conventions, can be discussed with respect to their potential to support the operationalization of the post-2020 biodiversity framework by other conventions.

#### Questions that could be addressed:

1. **How can the other conventions endorse and operationalize the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework through their own processes of governance?**
2. How can the conventions reflect the post-2020 biodiversity framework in decisions of their own governing bodies?
  - a. What would be the rationale of any welcoming or endorsement by other conventions, also taking into account previous decisions and resolutions that refer to the post-2020 biodiversity framework, and how can this be best achieved?<sup>10</sup>
  - b. How could the other conventions recognize and outline a specific role in the implementation in response to respective CBD decisions?

---

<sup>9</sup> In this context it should be noted that the SAICM post-2020 framework does not subsume all work within the chemicals and waste cluster, i.e. the legally-binding conventions listed in the first footnote. The targets in the chemicals and waste conventions are not subsumed into SAICM, or overseen by SACIM. Instead, once the SAICM post-2020 framework is adopted in 2021 it would be additional to what the Parties to the Conventions have signed up. For example, the Minamata Convention includes legally-obliged deadlines on mercury reductions and phase-out/phase-downs of mercury over the next decade. The post-SAICM framework will not be repeating the Minamata Convention obligations, but rather look at areas of work in chemicals over and above those already covered by the Minamata Convention (and other chemical conventions).

<sup>10</sup> The governing bodies of five biodiversity-related conventions, other than the CBD, recognized or supported the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 through the following decisions and resolutions: CMS Resolution 10.18; CITES Resolution 16.4; Ramsar Convention Resolution XI.6; ITPGRFA Resolution 8/2011; WHC Decision: 37 COM 5A.

- c. Should all conventions aim at alignment of their current and future convention strategies/ targets and indicators with the post-2020 global framework for biodiversity (view *Annex 4*), including through the development of target mappings? What are the options and challenges in doing so?
- d. How can challenges such as the timing of the different governing body meetings and therefore different timing for implementation and review processes be addressed (view *Annex 3*) for an overview of the timing of MEA governing body meetings up to CBD COP 15 and beyond)?

Sub-questions that could be addressed include:

- i. Should it be explored to better coordinate and streamline meetings of (selected) convention government bodies, for example through simultaneous meetings – arranging meetings jointly or in parallel, or back-to-back meetings, i.e. arranging meetings one following the other sequentially in the same location?
  - ii. How can review of implementation be organized in a more synergistic manner?
  - iii. Should a permanent location for the decision-making bodies of (selected) conventions be created (i.e. a joint secretariat), which would permit the development of an infrastructure to support them, including potentially the creation of specialized missions from member states/ parties
3. What roles could the **EMG**, the **BLG**, the **JLG**, etc., have in fostering the operationalization and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework by other conventions and organizations?
- a. What can the **BLG and/ or JLG** do under its current mandate and format, in other words through secretariat liaison, to help foster the operationalization of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?

Sub-questions that could be addressed include:

- i. Could efficiency in the **BLG** be scaled up by replicating the “lead secretariat” model? (For example with regard to the work with funding institutions or for the development of communication and awareness programmes related to the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework)
  - ii. Should the **BLG and/or JLG** seek closer collaboration and consultation with parties such as through the invitation of members of the COP bureaux and chairs of standing committees to their meetings? Activities could include consultation on their work programmes/ agendas; continued intersessional communication to increase transparency or initiatives mixing Parties/Bureau members and relevant secretariats of intergovernmental processes related to biodiversity (e.g. Bern consultation workshops, event to be organised under UNEA-5 etc.).
- b. What are the opportunities for further developing the mandate of the **BLG and/or the JLG**, and what could this be used to achieve in the context of delivering the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?
  - c. **“BLG+” (or intergovernmental committee / working group)**: Would there be value in establishing a cooperation and coordination mechanism consisting of Parties of the biodiversity-related conventions (including potentially working groups on different areas for cooperation)? If so, how could this be established? (E.g. *joint committee would be mandated by all conventions to create recommendations for consideration by the governing bodies of*

*the different conventions – this could follow the example of the Ad Hoc Joint Working Group of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions) – And should this be initiated by CBD COP 15 to strengthen implementation and review of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?*

- d. How can the **EMG** contribute to engaging relevant sectors in taking up the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and actively supporting implementation?
4. Are there other measures and mechanisms that could be considered to help foster further liaison and cooperation across sectors/clusters?
5. How can it be ensured that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is clearly seen by all actors as a vehicle for helping to deliver the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its **Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)** (as established by [CBD COP decision 14/34](#))?

The SDGs include 12 targets that integrate elements of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and have been set for achievement by 2020 so as not to undermine the implementation of targets established under other internationally agreed frameworks of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and SAICM. They fall within the following five goals: SDG 2 (*Food security*), SDG 6 (*Water and Sanitation*), SDG 12 (*Consumption and Production*), SDG 14 (*Life in Water*) and SDG 15 (*Life on Land*). While the targets have not yet been fully achieved, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its SDGs have a 2030 timeline. Biodiversity-related conventions that are custodians of relevant SDG indicators (such as the Ramsar Convention) will continue to exercise this role and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework targets will contribute to the achievement of the SDGs and their targets by 2030.

- a. What should be the role of the conventions in ensuring that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is seen by all actors as vehicle for helping to deliver the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its SDGs?
- b. How can cooperation among conventions and coherent implementation of conventions lead to enhanced support of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development?

### Selected key resources

- *Biodiversity and the Sustainable Development Goals*. Background document to the Ninth Trondheim Conference on Biodiversity, 2 –5 July 2019.  
[https://trondheimconference.org/assets/Files/TC9%20Background%20documents/TC9 Biodiversity-and-the-SDGs\\_final.pdf](https://trondheimconference.org/assets/Files/TC9%20Background%20documents/TC9_Biodiversity-and-the-SDGs_final.pdf)
- Nordic Council of Ministers (2009). Possibilities of enhancing co-operation and co-ordination among MEAs in the biodiversity cluster.  
<https://www.norden.org/en/publication/possibilities-enhancing-co-operation-and-co-ordination-among-meas-biodiversity-cluster>
- UNEP (2016). Elaboration of options for enhancing synergies among biodiversity-related conventions. <https://medwet.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/elaborations-options-enhancing-synergies.pdf>
- UN Environment (2016). The role of Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).  
<http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/9966/role-mea-synergies-sdgs.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- UNEP-WCMC (2018). Overview of initiatives for enhancing coordination and collaboration at various levels across biodiversity-related conventions.  
[http://wcmc.io/synergies\\_overview](http://wcmc.io/synergies_overview)
- UNEP-WCMC (2012). Promoting synergies within the cluster of biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements. <https://www.unep-wcmc.org/resources-and-data/promoting-synergies-within-the-biodiversity-cluster-of-biodiversity-related-multilateral-environmental-agreements>
- WWF (2019). Discussion Paper on Options for the SDG Environment Targets maturing in 2020. Global Policy and Advocacy, 26<sup>th</sup> March 2019.  
[http://d2ouvy59p0dg6k.cloudfront.net/downloads/discussion\\_paper\\_options\\_for\\_maturing\\_2020\\_environment\\_targets\\_final.pdf](http://d2ouvy59p0dg6k.cloudfront.net/downloads/discussion_paper_options_for_maturing_2020_environment_targets_final.pdf)

## [Annex 1: Overview of explicit references to other MEAs in the draft decision adopting the post-2020 global biodiversity framework](#)

The following extracts from the zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework make direct reference to; (1) the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; (2) biodiversity-related conventions and Rio conventions other than CBD; (3) other multilateral environmental agreements; other (4) relevant international processes, strategies and instruments; or (5) international obligations.

### **ZERO DRAFT OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK**

#### **II. INTRODUCTION TO THE ZERO DRAFT**

9. The zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework has been prepared with the following points in mind:

(c) Pursuant to the mandate from the Conference of the Parties at its fourteenth meeting,<sup>11</sup> the post-2020 global biodiversity framework is intended to be used not only under the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Protocols, but also for the other biodiversity-related and the Rio conventions, other multilateral environmental agreements, other international processes and instruments and the broader international community;

*Annex I*

### **THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK**

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

##### **B. The purpose**

2. The framework aims to galvanize urgent and transformative action by Governments and all of society, including indigenous peoples and local communities, civil society, and businesses, to achieve the outcomes it sets out in its vision, mission, goals and targets, and thereby to contribute to the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity and other biodiversity related multilateral agreements, processes and instruments.

4. The framework will contribute to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. At the same time, progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals will help to provide the conditions necessary to implement the framework.

##### **C. Theory of change**

8. The theory of change is complementary to and supportive of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It also takes into account the long-term strategies and targets of other multilateral environment agreements, including the biodiversity-related and Rio conventions, to ensure synergistic delivery of benefits from all the agreements for the planet and people.

#### **II. THE FRAMEWORK**

##### **D. 2030 action targets**

10. The Framework has 20 action-oriented targets for 2030 which, if achieved, will contribute to the outcome-oriented goals for 2030 and 2050. Actions to reach these targets should be implemented

---

<sup>11</sup> Decision 14/34, Annex.



consistently and in harmony with the Convention on Biological Diversity and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socioeconomic conditions.<sup>12</sup>

#### **F. Enabling conditions**

14. Appropriate consideration of a set of enabling conditions will facilitate the implementation of the framework. In addition, effective action on these enabling conditions will contribute to the attainment of other societal objectives. These enabling conditions are:

(e) Synergies with other relevant multilateral environmental agreements and processes;

15. Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals, such as the Goals on quality education, gender equality, reduced inequality, and peace and justice, as well as sustainable production and consumption, will help to create enabling conditions for the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

#### **G. Responsibility and transparency**

16. The framework contains measures to monitor, review and report on its implementation at the national, regional and global levels. These are essential elements of the framework and include:

(b) Periodic reporting, including through the use of identified indicators, by Governments, multilateral environmental agreements and other relevant international processes, indigenous peoples and local communities, civil society and the private sector of the actions taken to implement the framework, the successes achieved, and the challenges encountered;

#### **H. Outreach, awareness and uptake**

17. All actors will need to help to raise awareness of the framework and of the need for whole-of-society engagement to implement it. This includes the need for activities at the local, national, regional and global levels and the need to implement the framework in a way which is supportive of other relevant international processes and strategies.

---

<sup>12</sup> Countries will establish national targets/indicators aligned with this framework and progress towards the national and global targets will be periodically reviewed. A monitoring framework (Appendix 2; see CBD/WG2020/2/3/Add.1) provides further information on indicators of progress towards the targets.

## [Annex 2: An overview of decisions, resolutions and declarations on alignment of the strategic planning documents of other biodiversity-related conventions than CBD with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework](#)

- **CITES** resolution Conf. 18.3 on the CITES Strategic Vision 2020-2030, recognizes that the CITES Strategic Vision 2021-2030 can make an important contribution to the post 2020 global biodiversity framework. Furthermore, objective 2 under goal 4 reiterated the importance of achieving CITES' aim as a contribution to achieving the relevant Sustainable Development Goals, as well as the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;
- In **Ramsar Convention** resolution XIII.5 regarding the review of the fourth Strategic Plan of the Ramsar Convention, the Conference of the Contracting Parties decided that the review should take into account developments in the global environmental agenda, including the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Further, the Strategic Plan Working Group established by the Standing Committee is to identify any potential refinements to the fourth Ramsar Strategic Plan and its targets and indicators, including from the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, to be considered at COP14 (in 2021). In Ramsar Convention resolution XIII.7, the Secretariat is also requested to present, at the 58th meeting of the Standing Committee, a plan to strengthen synergies with other MEAs and contributions to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;
- The **Gandhinagar Declaration on CMS** and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework adopted at CMS COP 13, amongst others, recognizes that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will set a global agenda to put biodiversity on a path to recovery for the coming decade, in which the CMS should play an important role;
- **CMS COP Decision 13.7** requests Parties to: a) ensure that migratory species' needs and considerations are integrated in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework; b) report to the Conference of the Parties at its 14th meeting (COP14) on the progress in implementing the Decision. And according to **CMS COP Decision 13.8** the Secretariat shall: a) continue support the CMS Family Working Group on the post-2020 framework and transmit the contributions into the Open-ended Working Group established by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and thereby to the CBD COP15 in Kunming, China in October 2020; b) support the development of the follow-up of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species in line with the analysis of the post-2020 framework to be conducted under Decision 13.4 Options for a Follow-Up to the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023; c) report to the Standing Committee at its 52nd and 53rd meetings and to COP14 on the progress in implementing this Decision.
- The **World Heritage Committee** at its 43rd session in 2019 called on all States Parties to the Convention to actively engage in the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in order to set an ambitious global agenda to halt biodiversity loss, including through the implementation of the World Heritage Convention (Decision **43 COM 5A**).
- **UNCCD** decision 3/COP14 requests the secretariat and appropriate Convention bodies and institutions, within their respective mandates and existing resources, to seek new partnerships to further enhance the implementation of the Convention and the UNCCD 2018–2030 Strategic Framework in the context of the Paris Agreement and emerging issues such as the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration 2021–2030; The New Delhi Declaration from COP14 requests Parties to promote opportunities that

support, as appropriate and applicable, the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement and the development of an ambitious post-2020 global biodiversity framework, taking into consideration land-based solutions for climate action and biodiversity conservation and the mutually supportive implementation of the three Rio conventions.

Annex 3: Timing of MEA governing body meetings up to CBD COP 15 and beyond (graphic)



Annex 4: Overview of the timelines of Strategic Frameworks of MEAs up to 2030 (graphic)

