Convention on Biological Diversity
Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals
Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
Ramsar Convention on Wetlands
World Heritage Convention

MINUTES OF THE EIGHTH MEETING OF THE LIAISON GROUP OF THE BIODIVERSITY – RELATED CONVENTIONS
13 February 2013
Bogis-Bossey, Switzerland

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

1. The eighth meeting of the Liaison Group of the Biodiversity-related Conventions (BLG) was held on 13 February 2013 in Bogis-Bossey, Switzerland. The meeting built upon the discussions which took place during the informal meeting of the BLG on 23 January 2013 in the margins of the first meeting of the plenary of the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES-1, 21-26 January 2013 in Bonn, see also minutes of the informal meeting). In subsequent bilateral communications, it was agreed that the eighth meeting of the BLG would be co-chaired by Mr. Braulio Dias, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and Mr. John Scanlon, Secretary-General of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). Mr. Dias opened the meeting, welcomed the participants and presented the agenda, which was adopted without changes.

2. Mr. Scanlon emphasized in his introductory remarks the important opportunity given by the BLG to the biodiversity-related Conventions to send a common message on various issues. He mentioned the good work achieved at the first meeting of the IPBES plenary in January 2013 in Bonn) by the BLG which was able to speak with one voice. He stated that the BLG provides a useful platform for discussion on issues of mutual interest among the conventions. In this regard, he indicated that BLG's role could be further strengthened to present common convention-related priorities in relevant fora and processes such as the GEF and meetings related to the follow up of Rio+20, in particular in relation to paragraph 89 of its outcome document, *The future we want* (A/RES/66/288), which calls for strengthening the cooperation among multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). He also informed the meeting that the sixteeth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (CoP16) would be held in Bangkok, Thailand,

from 3 to 14 March 2013. Parties at CoP16 would be discussing an extension of the CITES Strategic Vision to 2020, including reference to the relevant Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and a draft resolution and decision on the cooperation of CITES with other biodiversity-related conventions submitted by Swtizerland. Mr. Scanlon continued by stating that synergies among conventions should be Party driven. However, the BLG provides opportunities for better coherence

3. Mr. Dias informed the group in his introductory remarks that the CBD Secretariat (SCBD) is presently reviewing its operations in order to further strengthen support for and focus on implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. He mentioned the meeting of the Friends of the CBD held from 11 to 12 February 2013 in Bogis-Bossey (Switzerland) which was very successful in identifying new avenues for implementing the Convention. The cooperation among institutions, related Conventions and stakeholders was also reviewed. He emphasized the importance and necessity to promote cooperation among the biodiversity-related Conventions, but mentioned that the model of synergies adopted among the chemicals Conventions could not be applied to the biodiversity-related Conventions one-to-one. He also mentioned the important opportunity for the BLG to promote the integration of biodiversity in the follow-up process of Rio+20 including the development of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and in the post-2015 development process.

ITEM 2. INTERGOVERNMENTAL PLATFORM ON BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES (IPBES)

4. Mr. Dias recalled the origin of the IPBES process, which was initiated after a conference in Paris (i.e. the final meeting of the multistakeholder international steering committee for a consultative process on an International Mechanism of Scientific Expertise on Biodiversity (IMoSEB) held in November 2007) He recalled as well the progress made since April 2012 when IPBES was established. He mentioned that although some issues remained unresolved, such as the rules of procedure on the admission of observers, the following achievements can be noted: (i) the election of the IPBES Chair, Bureau and the nomination of members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel (MEP); (ii) adoption of an initial budget; and (iii) agreement on steps towards the development of an initial IPBES work program. He mentioned also (i) the complexity of the institutional arrangements, where the four UN agencies involved (UNEP, FAO, UNDO and UNESCO) should establish an institutional link with IPBES through collaborative partnership arrangements and (ii) the leading role given to UNEP to support the IPBES Secretariat.

5. Mr. Carlos Martin-Novella (UNEP), in recalling the decision of IPBES-1 to request UNEP to provide the Platform's secretariat, informed the group that UNEP will soon begin the recruitment of the head and staff of the IPBES Secretariat. He also mentioned the different perceptions of the institutional arrangements regarding the relationship between IPBES and the UN system.

6. Mr. Scanlon and Ms. Marceil Yeater (CITES) recalled discussions related to the need for obtaining external funding to support participation by representatives of the biodiversity-related Conventions in IPBES meetings (e.g. the MEP and the Plenary) and the decision by IPBES-1 not to use its core funding to support the participation in its meetings of any observers.

7. Mr. David Cooper (CBD) recalled the BLG's informal meeting of 23 January 2013 in Bonn, Germany, where participants agreed on the need for a coordinated approach within the framework of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity to develop joint requests to IPBES. Since the next IPBES meeting will be held in December 2013 or in early 2014, he drew attention to the timing issue for the BLG to submit joint proposals and on the role of the CBD SBSTTA-17 (scheduled to meet in October 2013) which will discuss requests to IPBES. Those may include an assessment of biodiversity for 2018. As discussed at the informal BLG meeting in January 2013, joint requests considered by the BLG should address and distinguish between long-term, high-level elements of the work program (e.g. capacity building, policy tools) and more key short-term focused thematic assessments (eg. pollination).

8. Mr. Dias emphasized the need for and challenge in obtaining timely outputs from IPBES to support the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets. He also noted the importance and relevance of the Global Biodiversity Outlook and its findings for IPBES' work.

9. Ms. Yeater mentioned also that no priorisation of requests by governing bodies of MEAs was agreed to at the IPBES-1 meeting. Since no explicit priorities were agreed by IPBES, Mr. Dias emphasized the particular relevance for the BLG to discuss how members could coordinate their requests to transmit coherent views, taking into account their respective thematic priorities.

10. Mr. Shakeel Bhatti, International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA), highlighted the relevance of assessments and knowledge on protected areas in relation with *in situ* conservation and with the conservation of crop wild relative and landrace. ITPGRFA is committed to engage further in the work of the BLG, notably on those issues related to IPBES.

11. Mr. Nick Davidson, Ramsar Convention, informed the participants of Decision 11/6 adopted by Parties at the 11th Meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties, which was held in Bucharest, Romania, from 6 to 13 July 2012, where Parties requested the Secretariat to engage more in the work of the BLG and decided to incorporate references to IPBES into Resolution XI.6 (*Partnerships and synergies with Multilateral Environmental Agreements and other institutions*) with a view to preparing interim guidelines for the formulation of requests to IPBES. He mentioned that a set of anticipated and coordinated requests from the six biodiversity-related Conventions would be very useful and give additional weight to the requests. Concerning the priorities on focused thematic assessments Mr. Davidson mentioned the relevance and needs of an assessment on a Global Network of Protected Areas (PAs) which should include a subset of PAs such as the Ramsar and the World Heritage Convention sites. In relation to the quality of data, he added that inputs should not be limited to peer-reviewed publications which would exclude important information for biodiversity.

12. Mr. Bert Lenten, Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), noted the lack of overall assessments for many species and the importance for IPBES to look at the broader landscape to consider the connectivity of ecosystems for migratory species.

13. In referring to the different scope and needs of the six biodiversity-related conventions, Mr. Scanlon noted that they include many interlinkages. He suggested that the BLG could collate and transmit in a coherent way the various needs of the BLG members to IPBES.

14. Ms. Yeater drew attention on the criteria decided by IPBES that should be taken into account for the submission of requests.

15. In recalling the prioritized set of objectives, deliverables, actions and milestones for advancing the four functions of IPBES (assessment, knowledge generation, policy support and capacity-building) Mr. Dias emphasized the importance of capacity building and the core needs of IPBES to ensure that biodiversity policies are well informed by science. Mr. Cooper and Mr. Dias called the group's attention to the importance of linking biodiversity issues with the broader agenda of sustainable development and poverty alleviation, and to target requests to IPBES before 2015, such as those related to the resilience of ecosystems to climate change.

16. Mr. Martin-Novella mentioned that the existence of available and reliable data on protected areas make this topic a good candidate for IPBES to develop one of its first assessments.

17. Mr. Jon Hutton, UNEP-WCMC, proposed that a useful "quick win" would be to send available data to IPBES and that IPBES should deal with the issue of "Essential Biodiversity Variables" or EBVs (i.e. measurements for the study of, reports on and management of biodiversity change). He also stressed the need to have the biodiversity-related Conventions well represented at the upcoming meeting of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel Meeting (MEP) that will be held in May or June 2013.

18. Mr. Guy Debonnet, UNESCO World Heritage Centre, emphasized the importance of including broader societal data such as traditional knowledge and the value of PAs for society.

19. Following the previous informal BLG meeting, the group agreed that before the next MEP meeting the BLG will exchange information among its members on inputs to the initial IPBES work program. **The CBD Secretariat will collect ideas for a joint submission for the deadline 5 May.**

ITEM 3. PLAN FOR JOINT ACTIVITIES FOR THE BIENNIUM 2013-2014

3.1 Contribution of the BLG to the Rio+20 follow-up process and to the SDG elaboration

20. Mr. Dias informed other participants about the follow-up process for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) Conference which includes four main elements: (i) to launch a process to develop a set of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), (ii) to build upon the Millennium Development Goals, (iii) to converge with the post 2015 development agenda, and (iv) to establish an intergovernmental process under the General Assembly to prepare options on a strategy for sustainable development financing. He suggested that the Permanent Missions in New York need to be better informed about environmental issues, including those related to biodiversity. Mr. Dias said that the CBD Secretariat is currently looking at possible contributions to the elements of the Rio+20 follow-up process and prepare an information package on biodiversity to be transmitted in New York. He then asked the participants how the BLG could contribute to provide coherent information to New York with some focus to mainstream biodiversity into the elaboration of the SDGs.

21. Mr. Martin-Novella noted that the follow-up process of Rio+20 is not sufficiently explicit on the environment and biodiversity and that there is a need to further contribute to the process. In this connection, he mentioned that UNEP is presently looking into ways in which it can most efficiently provide its input to relevant bodies and the UN Secretariat in New York.

22. Mr. Debonnet mentioned that a message related to biodiversity for the SDGs and the follow-up process of Rio +20 should include the links between biodiversity, society and culture.

23. Mr. Davidson recalled the importance of the TEEB Report on water and wetlands as a valuable contribution to sustainable development linking well biodiversity wetlands and water supply.

24. **Mr. Scanlon concluded by saying that the CBD is best placed to represent the views of BLG members on the post-2015 development process agreed at Rio +20 and elaboration of the SDGs. In this connection, the CBD could serve as an interlocutor between the BLG and the UN Secretariat in New York, as well as other relevant bodies, in relation to this work. This invitation was well received and agreed by the BLG members.**

3.2 Other strategic aspects and joint activities for the biennium 2013-2014

25. Based on the discussion, during the informal meeting of the BLG in January 2013, on identifying strategic matters that could be developed into a plan for joint activities for the biennium 2013-2014, the CBD secretariat developed the document "Potential issues for collaboration for the biennium 2013-2014", contained in annex II to the minutes of this meeting.

26. **BLG members agreed that this document (contained in Annex II) constitutes a framework under which they can elaborate specific cooperative activities.**

ITEM 4. OPTIONS FOR THE FORM AND CONTENT OF A PROCESS TO ENHANCE COORDINATION, COHERENCE AND NATIONAL LEVEL SYNERGIES

27. Mr. Cooper recalled the CBD COP11 decisions to further promote synergies among the biodiversity-related MEAs within the framework of the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and its Aichi Targets with closer involvement of the Parties. He also referred to the UNEP-EU ENRTP project proposal on enhancing synergies among biodiversity-related conventions and the issue of the involvement of the BLG.

28. Mr. Martin-Novella advised meeting participants that the above-mentioned UNEP-EU ENRTP project would be launched very soon and that, in accordance with its own mandate, UNEP is very committed to assisting all Conventions to increase their efficiency. This project would also provide an overall picture and framework on options to promote synergies among biodiversity-related MEAs, including at the national level. Responding to the question addressed by the BLG members on their involvement and consultation on the projects, he mentioned that the projects are still at a very early stage and that the comments of the MEA secretariats are now considered. Mr. Martin-Novella referred also to the MEA Information and Knowledge Management Initiative (IKM initiative) -developed in collaboration by the MEAs and UNEP– which provides an important platform to promote technical cooperation and synergies among the

biodiversity-related MEAs. The IKM Initiative could complement and support the projects mentioned previously.

29. Mr. Scanlon expressed the view that cooperation and synergies are processes led by Parties and that the experience of the chemicals and waste cluster would be difficult to transfer to the biodiversity-related MEAs, emphasizing that the context and history of the chemicals MEAs are very different. He mentioned that efforts to enhance cooperation among MEAs should focus on the NBSAP process which is a very good entry point and that UNEP has a strong comparative advantage to promote coordination at the national level, notably by facilitating joint meetings of the biodiversity MEA National Focal Points. He concluded by saying that a distinction has to be made between the administrative and the programmatic relationships between MEAs and UNEP when promoting synergies. He also advised that some CITES Parties are cautious on the issue of synergies because they wish to avoid being distracted from the Convention's core mandate.

30. Mr. Dias agreed with his co-chair on the need to prioritize the work on promoting the cooperation among the Biodiversity related Conventions through the NBSAP process.

31. Mr. Cooper noted that work on synergies and cooperation is facing limited resources in terms of time and financial means, and that there was a need to define clear priorities.

32. **Mr. Dias requested that UNEP place increased emphasis on consulting the MEA secretariats on such matters in order to ensure their support.**

ITEM 5. FACILITATION OF ACCESS TO RESSOURCES FOR CONVENTIONS OTHER THAN THE CBD

33. At the informal meeting of the BLG in January 2013 in Bonn, participants agreed that a joint approach by the biodiversity-related Conventions could facilitate access to the Global Environment Financial mechanism (GEF) resources. Mr. Scanlon informed BLG members that CITES Parties, at the upcoming CITES CoP16, would consider a proposal to request the GEF to serve as a financial mechanism for CITES and/or to open a financial window for CITES.

34. Mr. Dias recalled that additional funding for activities of the biodiversity-related conventions may be obtained if those activities contribute to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity. The other biodiversity-related Conventions could therefore be funded through this window which offers a good entry point to the GEF. The challenge is to define, in requests made for GEF funding, well-coordinated priorities which refer to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

35. Mr. Dias reported from his meeting with Mr. Gustavo Fonseca, GEF Secretariat, the options which Mr. Fonseca had outlined for enhance access to GEF funding, which includes (i) opening up windows for the biodiversity-related Conventions, (ii) accessing the GEF through an established mandate within the framework of implementing the Aich Biodiversity Targets, and (iii) establishing voluntary funds such as those for the Nagoya Protocol. Mr. Fonseca had noted that it is up to countries to define their priorities, hence the role of NBSAPs in recognizing and promoting the role of the various biodiversity-related Conventions and that it would be difficult at present to get additional funds. Mr. Fonseca had also informed Mr. Dias that for the

preparation of the 6th replenishment period for the GEF (GEF6) and its related programming strategy, some technical advisory groups on biodiversity were established and that a draft programme had been developed. Mr Dias said that this draft programme would be further shared with the BLG members, which would offer a good opportunity for mainstreaming the priorities identified by all biodiversity-related MEAs.

Mr. Lenten mentioned that current allocations under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) do not work well for projects on migratory species because this requires obtaining allocations for several countries. He made a strong plea for money to be set aside under GEF for regional projects (e.g. for migratory species).

36. Mr. Debonnet highlighted the importance of integrating GEF requests into the priorities for work on protected areas and network sites which have international recognition and cover important surfaces in the world. He also mentioned the need to take better account of the recommendation of the World Heritage Convention in setting priorities.

37. Mr. Davidson noted the need to develop a "Multiple Strand Strategy" for the GEF which should reach actions on the ground.

38. Mr. Dias emphasized the need to scale up small grant projects which offer good potential for supporting projects on sustainable land management and community based protected areas. He mentioned also that Aichi Target 12 (on species) in particular provides a good entry point for GEF projects. In stressing the opportunity to make better use of the CBD GEF window to support the other biodiversity-related MEAs, he concluded by saying that GEF projects also offer incentives for collaboration among National Focal Points to demonstrate how they might integrate their priorities and avoid inter-agency competition.

39. **BLG members recalled that the GEF council, at its 41st session in November 2011, requested the GEF secretariat to organize a meeting of the biodiversity-related Conventions to facilitate the coordination of their priorities for inclusion in the GEF programming strategy for GEF6. Mr. Dias undertook to further examine this decision and to inform other BLG members about the possibilities for organizing such a meeting and for facilitating coherent input by BLG members to the GEF secretariat for GEF6.**

40. Mr. Robert Lamb, UNEP/EMG, informed meeting participants about the UNEP project proposal entitled "Strengthening synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions" which had been already presented and transmitted to the BLG members during their January 2013 informal meeting in Bonn. At that time, BLG members were invited to provide comments by 8 February 2013. The project aims essentially at enhancing cooperation and synergies among the National Focal Points of the biodiversity-related Conventions through the promotion of an integrated strategic framework for resource mobilization. Mr. Lamb advised that the project proposal had obtained some financial support from Switzerland and that it would complement well the EU ENRTP projects. **The proposal was welcomed and additional comments were invited by Mr. Lamb.**

ITEM 6. PRESENTATION : CMS FAMILY ONLINE REPORTING SYSTEM

41. Mr. Florian Keil, Information Officer, UNEP/AEWA Secretariat, presented the Online Reporting System (ORS) for MEAs developed by UNEP –WCMC, through the CMS family. It is a new tool that has the potential to facilitate reporting by allowing National Focal Points to continuously up-date their national reports. ORS is also a tool designed to generate templates for reporting. The ORS is being discussed under the IKM Initiative, particularly with regard to sharing of costs and a technical platform. Mr. Keil described the features of the project, including the ability to accommodate multiple languages, which offer many advantages and opportunities for the MEAs, such as a shared platform, the linkages with other systems, updating and sharing facilities for reporting, the delivery of successful metrics, and the long-term sustainability of the system. Such a project, if extended to other MEAs, could also contribute to facilitating joint fundraising. The next step foreseen in the project is to develop the ORS as a more analytical tool.

42. Ms. Eva Duer, UNEP/DELC, was invited to present the IKM Initiative and its first product, the web portal InforMEA. InforMEA is a project under the IKM Initiative which brings together 43 international and regional legally binding instruments from 17 Secretariats hosted by three UN organizations and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). to develop knowledge and information projects for use by their respective Parties. It is supported by UNEP. The InforMEA project harvests COP decisions, reports events and news from MEAs and lists data of National Focal Points. A thesaurus on environmental law is under development to allow more specific research and it is also foreseen to develop InforMEA as an analytical tool for Parties and stakeholders.

43. Mr. Dias welcomed the presentations and emphasized the merit of the initiatives presented to facilitate, as appropriate, shared information exchange platforms to develop knowledge and information tools. This will greatly minimize the difficultiy of dealing with too many platforms. Since the CBD is placing increased emphasis on implementation, the CBD Secretariat will look at these initiatives as possible tools for facilitating the preparation and submission of national reports, encouraging self assessments and enabling better access to data. **He mentioned that the CBD secretariat team is ready to interact with these projects.**

44. The other BLG members also welcomed these initiatives, explained their earlier and ongoing work to develop ORS (e.g. CITES) and mentioned their readiness to examine how they can continue to engage with these projects.

45. **Mr. Hutton emphasized the need for financial resources for these initiatives to be expanded, in order for them to serve as analytical tools. For this purpose, he suggested that the Executive Secretary of the CBD – on behalf of the BLG members – write a letter to the UNEP Executive Director inviting more financial support for the projects and initiatives mentioned. The BLG welcomed this proposal.**

ITEM 7. PROCEDURAL ISSUES

46. **Concerning the venue and date of next BLG meeting, the CBD secretariat will provide further information to the BLG members after the present meeting.**

47. **With regard to the modus operandi BLG members agreed that certain flexibility is required with regard to the date and time of the annual meeting of the BLG.**

ITEM 8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

48. Mr. Scanlon informed the BLG about the upcoming CITES CoP16 (Bangkok, 3-14 March 2013. BLG members agreed to consider at a later date the possibility of a future agenda item on law enforcement issues related to biodiversity.

49. Before closing the meeting, Co-chair Mr. Dias thanked the participants for their active contributions and expressed his wish to provide more space and opportunities for all biodiversity-related Conventions to provide information on activities they undertook on issues related to the CBD agenda and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity.

Annex I

List of Participants

Mr. Braulio Dias, Executive Secretary, CBD

Mr. David Cooper, CBD

Mr. John Scanlon, Secretary-General, CITES

Ms. Marceil Yeater, CITES

Mr. Marcos Silva, CITES

Mr. Shakeel Bhatti, Secretary, ITPGRFA

Mr. Anada Tiega, Secretary-General, Ramsar

Mr. Bert Lenten, Deputy Executive Secretary and Officer-in-Charge, CMS Secretariat

Mr. Florian Keil, Information Officer, CMS/AEWA Secretariat

Mr. Guy Debonnet, UNESCO World Heritage Centre

Mr. Craig Mills, Head of Programme, UNEP-WCMC

Mr. Jon Hutton, Director, UNEP-WCMC

Mr. Carlos Martin-Novella, UNEP/DELC

Ms. Eva Duer, UNEP/DELC

Mr. Robert Lamb, UNEP/EMG

Annex II

FRAMEWORK FOR COLLABORATION

DURING THE BIENNIUM 2013-2014

- ***Support for achieving the objectives of the strategic documents of BLG members, including the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020***

General cooperation

1. One of the overarching goals in the Modus Operandi for the Liaison Group of the Biodiversity-related Conventions is to provide support for achieving the objectives of the strategic plans of its members, including the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity in line with respective mandates.

Monitoring and indicators

2. The CBD Secretariat is in the process of preparing the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook. CBD COP Decision XI/3 requests the promotion of the further harmonization of global indicators and their use between the Convention on Biological Diversity and other conventions and processes and how to promote further collaboration.

3. Collaboration could be considered with regard to the identification of available indicators and how they can be utilized to monitor their progress in achieving the respective strategic plans of the biodiversity-related conventions as well as the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and its Aichi targets.

UN Decade on Biodiversity

4. Opportunities for collaboration include messaging and outreach in the context of the UN Decade on Biodiversity as well as on progress in the implementation of their respective strategic plans and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity.

- ***Programmatic cooperation***

Linking better the different dimensions of biodiversity (species, ecosystems/sites and genetic resources)

5. The biodiversity-related conventions focus on different dimensions of biodiversity, such as sites, species, or genetic resources. Closer collaboration among the biodiversity-related conventions in addressing different Aichi Targets at both the species and ecosystems/sites level provides a potential area for enhanced collaboration, so that the different approaches among the conventions can complement each other and be used most effectively, building on the related side event held at CBD COP 11 and the comparative advantage of each convention. Potential closer collaboration on genetic resources and the enhancement of ecological connectivity also provides opportunities.

Cooperation on other programmatic issues

6. The BLG members could potentially cooperate further on other programmatic issues related to the Aichi targets and other targets specific to the biodiversity-related conventions.

- ***Cooperation among the respective scientific bodies***

7. To enhance the cooperation among the respective scientific bodies, guidance could be provided to CSAB for its further work, especially regarding those issues which would benefit from consideration by the scientific advisory bodies and their chairs, as a complement to the work undertaken by the secretariats.

- ***Cooperation among national focal points and support for NBSAPs***

8. A further area of cooperation includes ways to cooperatively support harmonization, as appropriate, of the different objectives and priorities of the six conventions at the national level, especially through the national focal points of the conventions. In particular, there may be opportunities for jointly facilitating

the integration of aspects specific to respective conventions into revised NBSAPs and their implementation.

- ***Information systems and reporting***

MEA Information and Knowledge Management Initiative (IKM Initiative)

9. A joint review of the work of the respective conventions with UNEP and other partners under the IKM Initiative, including the status of the InforMEA web portal could lead to a further improvement of the initiative.

Reporting

10. Existing intergovernmental and other initiatives to increase synergies on both national databases and national reporting under the biodiversity-related conventions including the use of on-line tools such as the CMS Family Online Reporting System developed by UNEP-WCMC, could open further areas of cooperation.

- ***Options for the form and content of a process to enhance coordination, coherence and national level synergies***

11. In Decision XI/6, paragraph 17(b), CBD COP 11 requested the Executive Secretary to propose, in consultation with Parties and other members of the Biodiversity Liaison Group and the Joint Liaison Group, options for the form and content of a process to enhance coordination, coherence and national level synergies among the biodiversity related conventions and exploring options for closer collaboration among the relevant bureaus. Paragraph 89 of the Rio+20 outcome document, The Future We Want, states as follows:

We recognize the significant contributions to sustainable development made by the multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). We acknowledge the work already undertaken to enhance synergies among the three Conventions in the chemicals and waste cluster (the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions). We encourage parties to MEAs to consider further measures, in these and other clusters, as appropriate, to promote policy coherence at all relevant levels, improve efficiency, reduce unnecessary overlap and duplication, and enhance coordination and cooperation among MEAs, including the three Rio Conventions as well as with the UN system in the field.

- ***Facilitation of access to GEF resources***

12. The 41st GEF Council requested the GEF Secretariat to organize a meeting of biodiversity-related conventions with the Secretariat of the CBD to facilitate the coordination of their priorities for inclusion in the GEF-6 programming strategy. Mr. Robert Lamb, Senior Programme Officer, UNEP/EMG, with funding from Switzerland, developed a project proposal for strengthening synergies among the biodiversity related conventions through the mobilization of financial resources.