



**Convention on  
Biological Diversity**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/GTI-CM/12/2  
10 February 2012

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**COORDINATION MECHANISM FOR THE  
GLOBAL TAXONOMY INITIATIVE**

Twelfth meeting  
Montreal, 5-6 November 2011

**REPORT OF THE TWELFTH MEETING OF THE COORDINATION MECHANISM FOR THE  
GLOBAL TAXONOMY INITIATIVE**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. Pursuant to decision X/39, the Coordination Mechanism for the Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI) met for its eleventh meeting in Montreal on 3-4 June 2011. The Executive Secretary, in consultation with the Coordination Mechanism and others, prepared the draft comprehensive capacity-building strategy for the GTI (UNEP/CBD/GTI-CM/11/2), which was discussed at the meeting and later peer-reviewed, resulting in UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/5.

2. During the eleventh meeting of the Coordination Mechanism, the Executive Secretary received further advice on how the capacity-building strategy could be implemented in an effective and timely manner (UNEP/CBD/GTI-CM/11/3). The advice included the following:

(a) Regional training workshops would enable the CBD and GTI national focal points to assist Parties to deliver their commitments and at least two such workshops should be completed by 2014 and set the basis for additional workshops until 2020, contingent on funding. These regional workshops would seek to both enhance cross-sectoral communication and strengthen collaboration among experts in the education sector;

(b) Outreach materials, whose production had been suggested at the tenth meeting of the Coordination Mechanism, should be closely linked to regional workshops. One module should relate taxonomy to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and another module should focus on technical cooperation and research networks; it would be relevant to integrate case studies and other information related to the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization;

(c) Parties should be assisted in improving their infrastructure, which notably should include modern tools and up-to-date information;

(d) Design and development of programmes tied to ecosystem services, including pollinators, or other thematic approaches focusing on biodiversity hotspots, protected areas and invasive alien species, were needed for capacity-building actions, in order to overcome the difficulty of covering all taxa;

/...

In order to minimize the environmental impacts of the Secretariat's processes, and to contribute to the Secretary-General's initiative for a C-Neutral UN, this document is printed in limited numbers. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

(e) Any global species checklist should be examined at the national level so that Parties could incorporate relevant information appropriately and reflect the use of a broad series of tools and sources of information in their national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs);

(f) It would be crucial to include existing networks, partnerships, local, regional and global institutions in the GTI capacity-building strategy, and their engagement should be encouraged in implementing the GTI and other relevant decisions;

(g) Full participation of regional representatives in official meetings of the Coordination Mechanism should be ensured to facilitate capacity-building in taxonomy in all regions.

3. The Coordination Mechanism had further advised the Executive Secretary to convene physical meetings in the margins of upcoming meetings of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) and the Conference of the Parties with maximum possible participation of the regional representatives to follow up the above, so that the implementation of the capacity-building strategy would be facilitated and synergized among the relevant partners and organizations at regional and global levels.

4. Accordingly, the twelfth meeting of the Coordination Mechanism for the GTI was held at the office of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Montreal, on 5-6 November 2011. The list of participants is annexed below. Some members participated in the meeting by teleconference and/or submitted their comments in writing. The agenda adopted for the meeting is shown in section 2.1 below.

## **ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING**

5. A representative of the Executive Secretary of the Convention opened the meeting at 9.15 a.m. on 5 November 2011. She welcomed participants and explained the process of presenting the comprehensive capacity-building strategy for the Global Taxonomy Initiative to the fifteenth meeting of SBSTTA (SBSTTA 15).

6. Participants then introduced themselves, highlighting their specific interests in this meeting.

7. The meeting contained two separate time slots for teleconferences to collect information and suggestions from members who could not physically participate in the meeting. The members who participated by teleconference, and/or in writing, are indicated with an asterisk(\*) in the list of participants annexed below.

8. Participants remembered two colleagues who had recently passed away, Mr. Larry Speers and Mr. Frank Bisby, who had both contributed to the promotion and achievement of biodiversity informatics and supported the implementation of the GTI by contributing to the outcome-oriented deliverables (annex to decision IX/22).

## **ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS**

### ***2.1. Adoption of the agenda***

9. Mr. Mark Graham, Chair of the Coordination Mechanism of the GTI, addressed the group and discussed the items on the provisional agenda. It was agreed that interested members who could only attend via teleconference should also have the opportunity to comment on any agenda items of this meeting.

10. Some changes to the provisional agenda were proposed, namely to move discussion on “Guidance on non-commercial research under the Nagoya Protocol” to the second day of the meeting, to allow full participation by the group, given that some members were unable to be present for all of the first day.

11. The Coordination Mechanism adopted, with changes, the provisional agenda that had been circulated as part of UNEP/CBD/GTI-CM/12/1/Add.1. The items were as follows:

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
  - 2.1. Adoption of the agenda;
  - 2.2. Election of officers.
3. Substantive matters:
  - 3.1. Review of the draft capacity-building strategy for the GTI 2011-2020;
  - 3.2. Review of the standard format for taxonomic needs assessment;
  - 3.3. Guidance on non-commercial research under the Nagoya Protocol;
  - 3.4. Taxonomic indicators to monitor the progress of implementation of the GTI 2011-2020;
  - 3.5. Identification of relevant international workshops and technical training in 2011-2012;
  - 3.6. Coordination of international workshops and technical training in 2011-2012;
  - 3.7. Review of a training module on the GTI.
4. Other matters.
5. Closure of the meeting.

## **2.2. Election of Officers**

12. The Coordination Mechanism of the GTI nominated Ms. Patricia Koleff Osorio, from Mexico, as Co-Chair of the Coordination Mechanism, with Mr. Mark Graham retained as the other Co-Chair.

13. The Coordination Mechanism of the GTI nominated Mr. Chris Lyal as Rapporteur for the meeting.

## **ITEM 3. SUBSTANTIVE MATTERS**

### **3.1. Review of the draft capacity-building strategy for the GTI 2011-2020**

14. The Coordination Mechanism reviewed the draft comprehensive capacity-building strategy for the GTI annexed to UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/5, which was to be considered at SBSTTA 15. The intent was to consider any actions that should be taken in the short term, in order to assist the Executive Secretary in responding to the wishes of SBSTTA 15 and the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The meeting discussed each of the ten actions of the capacity-building strategy, as reported below.

**Action 1: taxonomic needs assessments**

15. The Coordination Mechanism pointed out that the capacity-building strategy's suggested timeline for national needs assessments to be completed was very close, especially considering that the Conference of the Parties would not meet until 2012, the year during which the assessments were required to have been completed according to the draft capacity-building strategy. However, it was noted that the Conference of the Parties had previously urged Parties to conduct such assessments, in decisions V/9 and VI/8, which meant that Parties should have completed such assessments already. Later, in 2006, the Conference of the Parties again urged Parties to conduct taxonomic needs assessment (paragraph 9 (b) of decision VIII/3). The Coordination Mechanism felt that indicating "by the end of 2012" in the strategy should not be superseded by later dates. It was concluded that the timeline was required, given that the assessments should inform the contents of NBSAPs, since Parties had been urged to review, and as appropriate update and revise, their NBSAPs, and to report thereon to the Conference of the Parties at its eleventh or twelfth meeting, under the timetable of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (paragraph 3 (c) of decision X/2 and paragraphs (a)(i) and (b)(i) of decision X/9).

16. One of the members mentioned that the needs assessment form prepared by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/INF/4) was based on the best practice of needs assessment conducted in Ghana in collaboration with BioNET-INTERNATIONAL and the Natural History Museum (United Kingdom). The member stressed that the form as originally designed was not stand-alone, but more usable results were obtained if it was employed as packaged with needs assessment workshops and interviews. A document outlining the full methodology was then made available to the meeting.

17. To apply the form for the maximum use by Parties he suggested producing a "kit" of existing global, regional and relevant national taxonomic needs assessments. Previously identified needs that matched national requirements could be extracted and assigned to the Strategic Plan and its goals (decision X/2). It was suggested that a training document with full methodology provided with such a kit could include advice to incorporate elements of previous national reports where needs might have been identified at national level.

18. A small working group led by the Chair was asked to consider how such a kit could be developed. The small group met on the second day of the meeting and discussed the feasibility of a kit under the current circumstances of Parties. (See section 3.2 below, *Review of the standard format for taxonomic needs assessment*.)

**Action 2: regional workshops**

19. The Secretariat mentioned that a series of regional capacity-building workshops for the GTI and CBD focal points was planned, with generous support from the Government of Japan. The first such workshop, to be held for the Latin American region on during 12-13 November 2011, at the margins of SBSTTA 15, would provide a test for the methodology. This initial workshop was expected to be followed by two subregional workshops in Africa, the first to be held in English in Nairobi in December 2011, and a second one, organized in collaboration with the Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle in Paris and others, to be held in French in Senegal in 2012.

20. The Coordination Mechanism noted that lack of awareness of the GTI as a cross-cutting issue under the Convention would have to be addressed on the occasion of regional workshops, and recommended inviting both GTI and CBD national focal points. The current and potential stakeholders often had a limited understanding of the function and nature of the GTI, in part because documentation was too technical.

21. The Coordination Mechanism suggested that the GTI could be made more obviously relevant during workshops targeting non-specialists. To highlight the value of taxonomy, presentations could indicate costs incurred to suggest financial support for collections and personnel, emphasizing how much more it costs to employ foreign experts than nationals. The GTI logo (downloadable from the Convention website) could also assist awareness-raising as a branding tool and by any project that sought to implement the GTI.

22. The importance of linking GTI capacity-building workshops with broader NBSAP workshops was stressed. This linkage would enable participants to be alerted to the possibility of a taxonomic impediment that might prevent successful outcome of the NBSAP in any area, and thus be able to incorporate any such taxonomic issues in the NBSAPs developed. The need to have more synergy between meetings was also noted.

23. The Coordination Mechanism requested the Executive Secretary to ensure that the meeting website would present the GTI and NBSAP workshops as soon as such meetings were confirmed, as the calendar could facilitate strengthening linkages between GTI and NBSAP workshops.

### **Action 3: additional workshops held by partners**

24. The Coordination Mechanism recognized that workshops held by partners of the GTI could provide important opportunities to increase synergies and promote the capacity-building strategy. To this end, participants noted the importance of both fostering partnerships with other organizations and/or related biodiversity initiatives and, insofar as possible, of aligning the views of experts with the aims of the GTI. The meeting discussed the opportunities provided by workshops held by initiatives associated with the GTI. These included:

(a) The Consortium for the Barcode of Life (CBOL) would hold an African workshop with training in 2012. The agenda was very fluid so GTI could be added. Funding was available to bring some participants from within Africa. There might also be workshop synergy with GBIF;

(b) The World Federation for Culture Collections (WFCC) would be meeting in Beijing in 2013 and could incorporate GTI.

25. Other planned or possible activities by GTI partners or potential partners with relevance to the GTI and action 3 of the strategy were discussed as follows:

(a) The UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) would discuss whether UNEP-WCMC could link taxonomic issues to workshops on conservation issues, in concert with IUCN as holder of Red Lists;

(b) The Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC) initiative was in a similar situation to the GTI and it needed coordination. It was pointed out that the same national focal points attended meetings of GSPC and GTI, and perhaps others. This signalled the need to find funds to enable others to attend, and also the importance of synergy between the meetings. A request was made to big institutions to support additional participation to spread training and understanding.

(c) The Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES): The Coordination Mechanism considered that the taxonomic community should provide input to IPBES on progress of the GTI and its contribution to a better implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, recognizing that IPBES might require more interdisciplinary input than simple taxonomy. Engagement with IPBES might be encouraged by Parties.

(d) The Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) had been focusing on training people on how to provide information; it was suggested that they could work with taxonomists and other scientists and show how data might be used.

(e) Regarding the South Pacific nations, New Zealand was funding a series of workshops on diagnostics on fungal and pest organisms, for the purposes of improving trade and export prospects. These were not currently branded as GTI but this would be considered.

26. The Consortium of Scientific Partners on Biodiversity (CSP) was a potentially important partner for the GTI, and some members of the Coordination Mechanism were also associated with CSP. The Coordination Mechanism pointed out that CSP regularly held meeting in the margins of meetings of SBSTTA and of the Conference of the Parties, but stronger links needed to be forged so that the CSP training could be integrated with that proposed by the GTI Coordination Mechanism.

27. The Secretariat agreed to look into the possibility of ensuring greater synergy between meetings of the Coordination Mechanism and of CSP, and avoid the consequence of the meetings coinciding and thus splitting efforts. The Secretariat agreed to discuss the possibility of placing the dates of CSP meetings on the GTI meetings calendar. It was also agreed that CSP members on the Coordination Mechanism would seek a more mutually supportive collaboration in training workshops and other opportunities.

28. Participants stated that it would be helpful for Parties, in adapting the global GTI indicator, to develop one or more national indicator(s) in order to assess progress of the GTI programme, and activities and impact of the GTI at national level. Different indicators could include those pertaining to management (e.g., number of workshops, participants etc) and/or impact (e.g., number of NBSAPs that include the GTI), for example. A dynamic way of gathering data would also have to be established. It was regarded that it would be particularly useful if the series of NBSAP workshops could take this matter up in their discussions.

29. The Coordination Mechanism pointed out that the Secretariat should be more informed on upcoming and completed workshops that were implementing GTI (whether branded or not) by partner organizations so that they could be publicized through the Convention's quarterly reports and through information documents to SBSTTA and the Conference of the Parties.

30. Participants also considered that resources for educators (e.g., PowerPoint presentations, outreach materials) should be made available on the website of the Convention. It was agreed that Coordination Mechanism members who have relevant awareness-raising materials, such as PowerPoint presentations, should circulate them among members with the aims of making them available on the website.

#### **Action 4: biodiversity tools**

31. It was noted that there was a need for updated information on what tools were available and what training was available to use such tools. The Coordination Mechanism suggested making the information available on websites, such as for instance <http://taxonomy.icipe.org/essential-websites/4.html>, as a meta-finding aid for the users of tools.

32. In relation to such meta-finding aid websites, the difference between a policy website (<http://www.cbd.int/>) and a website providing information that was part of implementation (e.g., the actual tools) was discussed.

33. Populating such a website would not be a trivial activity and it would not be just a responsibility of the Coordination Mechanism. The suggested actors mentioned in the outcome-oriented deliverables as

well as the draft capacity-building strategy identified a very broad range of possible actors. Developing comprehensive meta-finding aids could be a finite project to be adopted by a government.

34. The Coordination Mechanism suggested a database developed by specialists acting in the area, such as the Digital Automated Identification System (DAISY). It was however noted that such databases can rapidly become outdated.

35. The Coordination Mechanism also suggested that an assessment could be made on the linked information resource site from the current GTI website. Ideally this action would follow action 1 of the draft capacity-building strategy. However it was felt that no significant progress could be made at this point in its discussions and that the point could be revisited at a future date.

#### **Action 5: review human capacity and infrastructure**

36. The Coordination Mechanism discussed what such a review would entail and what form the results should take. The outputs could be a database of specialists acting in the area (cf. DAISY as mentioned above for action 4), although it was noted that such databases can rapidly become out of date. There could be links from the GTI website to resources so that such an assessment could be made. Ideally this action follows action 1. The Coordination Mechanism felt that no significant progress could be made at this point in its discussions.

#### **Action 6: build and maintain information systems and infrastructure**

37. The Coordination Mechanism clarified that this action related to information systems pertaining to collections. The content of such information systems was not included under action 6, as content came under action 8 below. There seemed little point in reiterating the already extensive discussion in Convention documents about the construction of a taxonomic information system, other than to note that the cost of data capture could be very significant, and there were possible implications for implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.

#### **Action 7: infrastructure to maintain biological collections**

38. The Coordination Mechanism was informed of the United States of America Act of Congress that included collections, the *America Creating Opportunities to Meaningfully Promote Excellence in Technology, Education, and Science Reauthorization Act of 2010 (America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010)*, which protects collections (<http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/about/BILLS-111hr5116enr.pdf>). The value of making standards and best practices for collections was discussed.

39. The Coordination Mechanism requested that relevant members send up-to-date information regarding the Act above and standards for collections to the Secretariat with references.

#### **Action 8: improve and increase quality and quantity of records**

40. This action related to the content of the systems discussed under action 6, and the development of models to use the data. It was an ongoing action, but focused on the improvement of data quality and increase in number of records. The Coordination Mechanism felt that there was no need for input at this time.

#### **Action 9: All Taxa Biodiversity Inventory (ATBI)**

41. The rationale for this action was discussed at length. It was pointed out that an ATBI was a hugely ambitious activity and could be very costly. The Coordination Mechanism determined that the

intent of the action was to build capacity by smaller-scale (e.g., BioBlitz) or geographically-limited (e.g., DNA-barcoding in Moorea island) activities, which both contributed to larger ATBIs and served as valuable training, awareness-raising and attractive activities.

### **Action 10: monitor progress of GTI**

42. The proposal for a taxonomic indicator, developed by UNEP-WCMC, BioNET and the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, and agreed upon by the eleventh meeting of the Coordination Mechanism, was submitted to the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group Meeting on Indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (June 2011), and was included in the framework of indicators for the Aichi Biodiversity Targets to be discussed at SBSTTA 15. The Coordination Mechanism felt that the sub-indicator linking taxonomy to the NBSAP process and indicators at national levels was particularly important.

43. As a conclusion of this agenda item the Coordination Mechanism suggested the following actions:

(a) The Secretariat would send a circular to all GTI national focal points, SBSTTA focal points, Coordination Mechanism members and associates with a report of the meeting, noting the calendar of relevant meetings and soliciting input, and asking if they had been involved in their national NBSAP process. The Secretariat might use "Survey Monkey" or something similar;

(b) Members of the Coordination Mechanism would submit any suitable presentations or other materials that can be used as a resource to raise awareness of the GTI to the Secretariat; and

(c) The Secretariat would make the materials from (b) above available on the GTI website.

### **3.2 *Review of the standard format for taxonomic needs assessment***

44. In paragraph 17 of decision X/39, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to develop a standard format for taxonomic needs and capacity assessments for use by Parties. A draft was presented to and reviewed by members of the Coordination Mechanism at its eleventh meeting in June 2011.

45. At its eleventh meeting, the Coordination Mechanism discussed the draft standard format for taxonomic needs assessment as prepared by the Executive Secretary. The draft was based on the best practices for a needs assessment conducted in Ghana in collaboration with BioNET-INTERNATIONAL and the Natural History Museum (United Kingdom). The Coordination Mechanism had suggested modifications of the form, and the revised standard format for taxonomic needs assessment was presented as information for SBSTTA 15 for its consideration (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/INF/4).

46. At that time, it was agreed that the standard format should be divided into two parts: one for taxonomic needs assessment for the Global Taxonomy Initiative, and one regarding organizations' provision of taxonomic information. The Coordination Mechanism considered the possibility of developing one more general questionnaire to assess taxonomic capacity, and another aimed specifically at organizations that have confirmed biological collections.

47. Following the discussion on action 1 in section 3.1 above, a small working group of the Coordination Mechanism had agreed to discuss advice on taxonomic needs assessments under item 3.2 on the second day.



48. The small group concluded that although the detailed assessment information was available as presented in UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/INF/4, there were unlikely to be sufficient time or funds for many Parties to carry out such assessments in the timeline suggested by action 1 of the capacity-building strategy.

49. A short question and “chapeau” were therefore proposed as an alternative, which could be used as a lead-in to a full assessment. The modifications sought to ensure that the necessary taxonomic information would be included in the NBSAP.

50. It was noted that the website of the Convention on Biological Diversity could be used to support Parties requiring more information on taxonomic needs assessments, and it was accordingly agreed that Coordination Mechanism members would assist the Secretariat in ensuring that all pertinent documents were on the website, including indications of how the GTI might be included appropriately in the NBSAP process.

### 3.3. *Guidance on non-commercial research under the Nagoya Protocol*

51. Pursuant to adoption of decision X/1 (Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity) and decision X/39 (Global Taxonomy Initiative), the Coordination Mechanism, at its eleventh meeting, discussed the facilitation of capacity-building in taxonomy with regional and global collaboration under the Nagoya Protocol, and recognized a strong need for outreach materials for taxonomists to understand the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including the Nagoya Protocol (UNEP/CBD/GTI-CM/11/3).

52. Article 8 (a) of the Nagoya Protocol sought to “Create conditions to promote and encourage research which contributes to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, particularly in developing countries, including through simplified measures of access for non-commercial research purposes, taking into account the need to address a change of intent for such research”.

53. While there had been no specific mandate for the Coordination Mechanism to develop guidance on non-commercial research under the Nagoya Protocol, there had been requests by focal points for the GTI to develop materials to provide guidance on international collaboration to implement the GTI, which often required transfer of biological specimens that could be considered as genetic resources by some Parties.

54. A member of the Coordination Mechanism, Mr. Christopher Lyal, delivered a presentation to outline some of the areas in which guidance might be required both to those implementing policy on access and benefit-sharing (ABS) and those implementing the GTI, and to suggest ways forward. The presentation was also made available to the Secretariat.

55. The Coordination Mechanism discussed the need for clarity on the scope of the Nagoya Protocol / access and benefit-sharing, and whether non-commercial taxonomic research implementing the GTI fell under utilization of genetic resources. The Coordination Mechanism noted that carrying out taxonomic research for the GTI *de facto* involved obtaining prior informed consent (PIC) and establishing mutually agreed terms (MAT) and, in any case, being compliant with Parties’ legislation and regulations. The importance of requiring PIC and MAT from indigenous and local communities (ILCs) was noted, particularly in the case of traditional knowledge (TK).

56. There was general agreement among the Coordination Mechanism members that Article 8 (a) of the Protocol should be highlighted and that the GTI and ABS national focal points needed to collaborate

in awareness-raising on the importance of genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources, and related access and benefit-sharing, in accordance with Article 21 of the Protocol.

57. It was noted that there was increasing operational overlap between legislation and regulations designed to protect benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources, on the one hand, and practices to support areas such as agriculture, medicine, pest control, biological control and CITES, on the other. Examples were provided indicating where identifications required for applied work within countries had been affected by legislation related to access and benefit-sharing.

58. Within the arena of biocontrol it was acknowledged that considerable financial benefit could result from a successful introduction; however, this was in terms of increased production by many individuals, not necessarily a profit made by a "user". It was pointed out that many biological control agents did not establish permanent populations and needed to be reintroduced with each crop season, and so the regular provision of biological material could be seen to be a commercial activity to the extent that fees were charged for the material. The challenging boundary of what constituted "commercial" was discussed.

59. The discussion highlighted the need for Parties developing legislation to be mindful of the dangers of hindering the timely delivery of benefits needed from the GTI. It also considered that new regulation related to access and benefit-sharing required alignment with existing legislation, including legislation pertaining to agricultural or other systems. It was agreed that there was a clear need for awareness-raising in this context.

60. Best practices for the taxonomic community were discussed, including regarding access to and sharing of information, and the importance of developing best practice guidelines, in accordance with requirements of the Protocol under Articles 19 and 20.

61. The Coordination Mechanism felt that it was important to be proactive and to provide guidance to Parties as they developed legislation. As a result, the Coordination Mechanism decided to draft an information document for the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention. This document could be used by focal points and granting councils, among others, and might also be distributed to professional associations for greater impact.

62. It was agreed that helpful guidance would include a framework indicating broad contexts for why collections were kept, and how this practice relates to taxonomic work, as well as all associated best practices. The possibility of developing an "ideal" process for linking GTI and access and benefit-sharing was also discussed. Some members of the Coordination Mechanism agreed to provide an initial draft of the information document, which was expected to be reviewed by all members of the Coordination Mechanism and completed by August 2012, three months before the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

#### ***3.4. Taxonomic indicators to monitor the progress of implementation of the GTI 2011-2020***

63. At its tenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary, in consultation with the Coordination Mechanism for the GTI and the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Post-2010 Indicators, to consider developing an indicator in order to assess the progress on the implementation of the programme of work for the Initiative as needed (paragraph 18 of decision X/39).

64. Accordingly, the Executive Secretary, together with the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), BioNET-INTERNATIONAL and the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, jointly prepared a draft indicator (and sub-indicators) for taxonomy.

65. A presentation on indicators was delivered to members of the Coordination Mechanism by a member of the Secretariat, Kieran Noonan-Mooney.

66. It was noted that the indicator for taxonomy, which was reviewed by members of the Coordination Mechanism following its eleventh meeting, was presented at the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) Meeting on Indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, held from 20 to 24 June 2011 in High Wycombe, United Kingdom.<sup>1</sup> It was further noted that all suggested indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets were going to be presented to SBSTTA during its fifteenth meeting as UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/2.

67. The members of the Coordination Mechanism expressed their support in favor of the establishment of an indicator for taxonomy.

### ***3.5. Identification of relevant international workshops and technical training in 2011-2012***

68. The Secretariat announced that it was planning a series of relevant regional workshops to connect with the Convention process, including workshops on invasive alien species and the GTI in Latin America, two subregional workshops in Africa (one in English, one in French), NBSAP workshops, and follow-up workshops; a follow-up meeting with involvement of the Consortium for the Barcode of Life (CBOL) was seen to be beneficial.

69. A large number of other relevant workshops and meetings were identified, including regional indicator workshops organized by the Secretariat of the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership to complement NBSAP workshops, and a meeting that would be organized by CBOL in Africa in late 2012 in association with GBIF.

70. It was also noted that the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Joint Genome Institute (JGI) had an annual user meeting which had a significant taxonomic component (<http://www.jgi.doe.gov/meetings/usermeeting/index.html>). The JGI taxonomy projects included both a Genomic Encyclopedia of Bacteria and Archaea (GEBA) project and a newly launched “1000 Fungal Genomes” project ([http://www.jgi.doe.gov/News/news\\_11\\_11\\_03.html](http://www.jgi.doe.gov/News/news_11_11_03.html)). (See also <http://nrs.fs.fed.us/news/release/sequencing-fungal-genomes>, <http://www.umkc.edu/news/news-release.asp?id=1157>.)

71. The East and Southeast Asia Biodiversity Information Initiative (ESABII) ran workshops in East and South-East Asia in 2011 on coral taxonomy, plant taxonomy, and identification of CITES species. In early 2012 ESABII would hold a planning and inception workshop for its second phase of implementation; its plant taxonomy group had identified monocots for training, as well as corals and CITES species. Other activities would include an internship programme. The New Zealand Government was funding a series of taxonomic and diagnostic training events in the Pacific for plant disease organisms and plant pests; Malaysia ran an international firefly identification course earlier in 2011; different nations in the South Pacific were being progressively assisted in the development of collections where relevant, developing resources to identify organisms (bacteria, fungi, invertebrates) and creating identification manuals.

---

<sup>1</sup> The proposal was shown in UNEP/CBD/AHTEG-SP-Ind/1/inf/10. The report of AHTEG meeting (UNEP/CBD/AHTEG-SP-Ind/1/3) contained the proposed indicator as an indicator for target 19 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

### **3.6. Coordination of international workshops and technical training in 2011-2012**

72. The need for a CSP event calendar with liaison and better coordination with the GTI was reiterated and it was suggested that focal points for the GTI be invited to inform the Secretariat of any relevant workshops taking place in their countries.

73. It was reiterated that the generous contribution of the Government of Japan would make it possible to hold two capacity-building workshops for the GTI in 2011 which would be aimed at increasing the awareness of CBD and GTI national focal points regarding the GTI program of work and its deliverables. It was noted that priority regions for the workshops were Latin American countries in 2011 and Africa in 2011-2012. It is also expected that, subject to the availability of funding, priority regions for 2012 would be small island developing States (SIDS) and Asia.

74. It was noted that the Secretariat would be mainstreaming workshops for GTI and other proposals for workshops including regional project proposal preparation. To assist in this task, the Secretariat needed dates for other workshops planned in the targeted regions and it requested relevant input from Coordination Mechanism members.

### **3.7. Review of a training module on the GTI**

75. During its eleventh meeting, members of the Coordination Mechanism agreed that outreach materials should be closely linked to regional workshops, and that the Coordination Mechanism could work on specific modules of those workshops. It was suggested that one module should specifically relate taxonomy to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and another module should focus on technical cooperation and research networks; in this module it would be relevant to integrate case studies.

76. An initial draft of the modules on the GTI was prepared by the Secretariat prior to the twelfth meeting of the Coordination Mechanism. A small sub-group of the Coordination Mechanism formed a working group to discuss and review the draft module.

77. Several modifications were made and it was agreed by the members of the working group that such outreach materials should be brief, clear, and understandable to non-specialists, and should seek to explain the basic functions and priorities of the Global Taxonomy Initiative. It was also agreed that they should also promote a stronger web presence.

78. The Secretariat agreed to take into account the proposals made by the working group and to present a revised version of the module at the thirteenth meeting of the Coordination Mechanism.

## **ITEM 4. OTHER MATTERS**

79. The results of discussions from the two small working groups on taxonomic needs assessment and the training module for the GTI, respectively, were compiled by the Secretariat so that they might be reflected in updated versions of those documents.

80. It was agreed that the thirteenth meeting of the Coordination Mechanism should be held in May 2012, preferably prior to SBSTTA 16, followed by another meeting in October 2012, around the time of the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

## **ITEM 5. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

81. The meeting was closed by Mr. Mark Graham, Chair of the Coordination Mechanism, at 5 p.m. on 6 November 2011.

*Annex*

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

The following individuals participated in the meeting of the GTI Coordination Mechanism. Members in this list marked with an asterisk (\*) participated either by teleconference or submitted their comments in writing.

**CBD PARTIES**

***AFRICA***

**\* *Botswana***

Ms. Pearl Dijeng Lebatha  
Department of Basic Sciences  
Botswana College of Agriculture  
Private Bag 0027, Gaborone, Botswana  
Tel.: +267 365 0390  
Fax: +267 392 7202  
E-Mail: [plebatha@bca.bw](mailto:plebatha@bca.bw)

**\* *Tunisia***

Mr. Mohamed Elyes Kchouk  
BIONET-NAFRINET  
Centre de Biotechnologie de Borj Cedria  
B.P. 901, Hammam-Lif 2050, Tunisia  
Tel.: +216 79 325 855  
Fax: +216 71 290 260  
E-Mail: [mohamedelyes@gmail.com](mailto:mohamedelyes@gmail.com)

***ASIA AND THE PACIFIC***

**\* *China***

Mr. Qin Haining  
Institute of Botany  
Chinese Academy of Sciences  
20 Nanxincun, Xiangshan  
Beijing 100093, China  
Tel.: 86-10-628 36023  
E-Mail: [hainingqin@ibcas.ac.cn](mailto:hainingqin@ibcas.ac.cn)

***Japan (Presidency of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties)***

Mr. Wataru Suzuki  
Assistant Director  
Biodiversity Policy Division  
Ministry of the Environment  
1-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo 100-8975, Japan  
Tel.: +81 3 5521 8343  
Fax: +81 3 3591 3228  
E-Mail: [wataru\\_suzuki@env.go.jp](mailto:wataru_suzuki@env.go.jp)

***Malaysia***

Mr. Saw Leng Guan  
Senior Director  
Forest Biodiversity Division  
Forest Research Institute Malaysia  
Kepong, Selangor  
Kuala Lumpur 52109, Malaysia  
Tel.: +603-62797218  
Fax: +603-62797858  
E-Mail: sawlg@frim.gov.my, navarani@nre.gov.my

***CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE (CEE)***

***\* Russian Federation***

Mr. Alexey Kotov  
A.N. Severtsov Institute of Ecology and Evolution  
33 Leninskij prosp.  
Moscow, 119071, Russian Federation  
E-Mail: [alexey-a-kotov@yandex.ru](mailto:alexey-a-kotov@yandex.ru)

***\* Slovakia***

Mr. Karol Marhold  
Institute of Botany  
Slovak Academy of Sciences  
Dubravska cesta 14  
SK-842 23 Bratislava, Slovakia  
E-Mail: [karol.marhold@savba.sk](mailto:karol.marhold@savba.sk)

***GROUP OF LATIN AMERICAN AND CARRIBEAN COUNTRIES***

***Mexico***

Ms. Patricia Koleff  
Directora Técnica de Análisis y Prioridades  
Comisión Nacional para el Conocimiento y Uso de la Biodiversidad (CONABIO)  
Av. Liga Periferico-Insurgentes Sur  
No. 4903 Col. Parques del Pedregal  
Mexico C.P. 14010, Mexico  
Tel.: +52 55 5004 5004  
Fax: +52 55 5004 4994  
E-Mail: [patricia.koleff@conabio.gob.mx](mailto:patricia.koleff@conabio.gob.mx)

Mr. Hesiquio Benítez Díaz  
Director de Enlace y Asuntos Internacionales  
CONABIO  
Comisión Nacional para el Conocimiento y Uso de la Biodiversidad  
Av. Liga Periferico-Insurgentes Sur  
No. 4903 Col. Parques del Pedregal  
Mexico C.P. 14010, Mexico  
Tel.: +52 55 5004 5025  
Fax: +52 55 5004 4985

E-Mail: [hbenitez@conabio.gob.mx](mailto:hbenitez@conabio.gob.mx)

Web: [www.conabio.gob.mx](http://www.conabio.gob.mx)

### ***WESTERN EUROPE AND OTHER GOVERNMENTS (WEOG)***

#### ***Canada***

Mr. Mark Graham  
Chair of the GTI Coordination Mechanism  
Canadian Museum of Nature  
240 McLeod Street  
Ottawa ON K2P 2R1  
Canada  
Tel.: +1 613 566 4743  
Fax: +1 613 364 4021  
E-Mail: [mgraham@mus-nature.ca](mailto:mgraham@mus-nature.ca)

#### ***New Zealand***

Mr. Peter Buchanan  
Science Team Leader, Biosystematics Team  
Landcare Research  
Private Bag 92170  
Auckland 1142, New Zealand  
E-Mail: [buchananp@landcareresearch.co.nz](mailto:buchananp@landcareresearch.co.nz)

### **UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES**

Mr. Peter Herkenrath  
Senior Programme Officer  
United Nations Environment Programme - World Conservation Monitoring Centre  
219 Huntingdon Road  
Cambridge CB3 0DL, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland  
Tel.: +44 1223 277 314  
Fax: +44 1223 277 136  
E-Mail: [peter.herkenrath@unep-wcmc.org](mailto:peter.herkenrath@unep-wcmc.org)

### **INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

Mr. Filiberto A. Pollisco Jr.  
Programme Development Specialist  
Programme Development and Implementation  
ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity  
3/F, ERDB Bldg., UPLB Forestry Campus  
University of the Philippines, Los Banos, College  
Laguna 4031, Philippines  
Tel.: +63 49 536 3989  
Fax: +63 49 536 2865  
E-Mail: [fapollisco@aseanbiodiversity.org](mailto:fapollisco@aseanbiodiversity.org), [gsrodulfo2@aseanbiodiversity.org](mailto:gsrodulfo2@aseanbiodiversity.org)  
Web: <http://www.aseanbiodiversity.org>

Ms. Sarah A. Simons  
Director, International Relations  
BioNET-INTERNATIONAL  
Nairobi Office  
United Nations Avenue  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel.: +254 20 722 44 50  
Fax: +254 20 7122150  
E-Mail: [s.simons@cabi.org](mailto:s.simons@cabi.org)  
Web: <http://www.cabi.org>

Mr. Samy Gaiji  
Senior Programme Officer for Science & Scientific Liaison  
Global Biodiversity Information Facility  
GBIF Secretariat  
Universitetsparken 15  
Copenhagen 2100, Denmark  
E-Mail: [sgaiji@gbif.org](mailto:sgaiji@gbif.org)  
Web: <http://www.gbif.org/>

#### **NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

Mr. Kevin McCluskey  
World Federation for Culture Collections, Executive Board  
Curator Fungal Genetics Stock Center  
Associate Research Professor, School of Biological Sciences  
University of Missouri-Kansas City, 5007 Rockhill Road  
Kansas City MO 64110, United States of America  
Tel.: (816) 235-6484  
Fax: (816) 235-6561  
E-Mail: [mclluskeyk@umkc.edu](mailto:mclluskeyk@umkc.edu)

#### **EDUCATION/UNIVERSITY**

Mr. Christoph Häuser  
Museum für Naturkunde,  
Leibniz Institute for Research on Evolution and Biodiversity at the Humboldt University Berlin  
Invalidenstrasse 43  
Berlin D-10115, Germany  
Tel.: +49 30 2093 8479  
Fax: +49 30 2093 8561  
E-Mail: [christoph.haeuser@mfn-berlin.de](mailto:christoph.haeuser@mfn-berlin.de)

Mr. Leonard Hirsch  
Senior Policy Advisor  
Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network - GEO BON  
1100 Jefferson Drive SW, #3123  
MRC 705 P.O. Box 37012  
Washington DC 20013-7012, United States of America  
Tel.: +1 202 633 4788  
Fax: +1 202 312 2888  
E-Mail: [lhirsch@si.edu](mailto:lhirsch@si.edu)



Mr. Chris Lyal  
Department of Entomology (Beetle Diversity and Evolution Programme)  
Natural History Museum  
Cromwell Road  
London SW7 5BD, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland  
Tel.: +44 207 942 5113  
Fax: +44 207 942 5661  
E-Mail: [c.lyal@nhm.ac.uk](mailto:c.lyal@nhm.ac.uk)

Mr. Scott E. Miller  
Deputy Under Secretary for Collections  
Smithsonian Institution  
PO Box 37012, MRC 009  
Washington DC 20013-7012, United States of America  
Tel.: +1 202 633 5135  
Fax: +1 202 633 2047  
E-Mail: [millers@si.edu](mailto:millers@si.edu)

### **OBSERVERS**

Mr. Posa Skelton  
Pacific Invasives Learning Network Coordinator  
Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme  
P.O. Box 240  
Apia, Samoa  
Tel.: 00 685 21929 ext 276  
E-Mail: [posas@sprep.org](mailto:posas@sprep.org)  
Web: <http://www.sprep.org>

Ms. Monina T. Uriarte  
Capacity Development Specialist  
Programme Development and Implementation  
ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity  
3/F, ERDB Bldg., UPLB Forestry Campus  
University of the Philippines, Los Banos, College  
Laguna 4031, Philippines  
Tel.: +63 49 536 2845  
Fax: +63 49 536 2865  
E-Mail: [mturiarte2@aseanbiodiversity.org](mailto:mturiarte2@aseanbiodiversity.org)  
Web: <http://www.aseanbiodiversity.org>

### **CBD SECRETARIAT**

Ms. Junko Shimura  
Programme Officer  
Taxonomy and Invasive Alien Species  
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity  
413 St. Jacques St. W., Suite 800  
Montreal, QC H2Y 1N9, Canada  
Tel.: +1 514 287 8706  
E-Mail: [junko.shimura@cbd.int](mailto:junko.shimura@cbd.int)

Ms. Cristina Romanelli  
Programme Assistant  
Taxonomy and Invasive Alien Species  
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity  
413 St. Jacques St. W., Suite 800  
Montreal, QC H2Y 1N9, Canada  
Tel.: +1 514 288 6288  
E-Mail: [cristina.romanelli@cbd.int](mailto:cristina.romanelli@cbd.int)

Mr. Kieran Noonan Mooney  
Programme Assistant  
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity  
413 St. Jacques St. W., Suite 800  
Montreal, QC H2Y 1N9, Canada  
Tel.: +1 514 287 8721  
Email: [kieran.mooney@cbd.int](mailto:kieran.mooney@cbd.int)

-----