UNEP

CBD

Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/2
30 April 2012**

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC,
TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE
Sixteenth meeting
Montreal, 30 April - 5 May 2012
Item 3 of the provisional agenda *

WAYS AND MEANS TO IMPROVE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

Ways and means to improve the effectiveness of the Subsidiary Body in light of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and issues, modalities and options for collaboration with the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services (IPBES)

Note by the Executive Secretary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the development of an intergovernmental science policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services present both challenges and opportunities for the future work of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice. Earlier reviews of the effectiveness of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice in delivering the responsibilities laid out in Article 25 of the Convention, confirmed by more recent assessments by its Bureau, indicate that the Subsidiary Body fulfils its overall mandate of providing timely advice relating to the implementation of the Convention and has been particularly effective in responding to scientific, technical and methodological questions from the Conference of the Parties. However, the Subsidiary Body has not yet identified or prioritized key research needs for the implementation of the Strategic Plan. It has also not been successful in assessing the effectiveness of the types of measures taken in response to the provisions of the Convention.

The Subsidiary Body has a crucial role in reviewing the scientific and technical needs of Parties, particularly in view of the challenges involved in the implementation at national and sub-national levels of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and channelling priority needs to the intergovernmental

** Reposted to include the following changes on page 6: footnote 7 is deleted; paragraph 11 (d) is deleted and subsequent paragraphs are renumbered accordingly.

* UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/1.

/…

science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services or by addressing them in other ways. The Convention on Biological Diversity will be a key client of the Platform and the Subsidiary Body needs to establish its role as a strategic partner of the Platform and a proponent of streamlining the varied needs of the biodiversity-related multilateral agreements and the biodiversity community at large.

To fully respond to its mandate, the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice needs to establish a process for identifying the scientific and technical needs related to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020; for reviewing the effectiveness of existing policy support tools and methodologies developed or used under the Convention; and for assessing the effects of the types of measures taken in accordance with the provisions of the Convention. This process could draw on existing mechanisms at the disposal of the Subsidiary Body while anticipating the emergence of the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

The Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) may wish adopt a recommendation along the following lines:

A. The Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice:

1. *Welcomes* the outcomes of the two sessions[1] of the plenary meeting to determine modalities and institutional arrangements for an intergovernmental science policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services;

2. *Takes note of* the progress in defining the work programme for the intergovernmental science policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services as well as the functions and structures of its bodies and its rules of procedure; [2]

3. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, to initiate work on the tasks listed in paragraph 5 below;

B. The Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice recommends that the Conference of the Parties adopts a decision along the following lines:

The Conference of the Parties,

Recalling its decisions VIII/9, IX/15, X/2 and X/11, and in particular, *reaffirming* that a regular assessment is needed to provide decision-makers with the necessary information base for adaptive management and to promote the necessary political will for action in addressing biodiversity loss and the degradation of ecosystems and ecosystem services and the implications for human well-being,

Recalling that the function of the Subsidiary Body, as set out in Article 25 of the Convention, is to provide the Conference of the Parties and, as appropriate, its other subsidiary bodies, with timely advice relating to the implementation of the Convention, including providing scientific and technical assessments of the status of biological diversity and of the effects of the types of measures taken in accordance with the provisions of the Convention,

[1] The second session of the plenary meeting to determine modalities and institutional arrangements for an intergovernmental science policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services plenary meeting will be held in Panama City from 16 to 21 April 2012. SBSTTA will therefore be able to consider its outcomes at its sixteenth meeting.

[2] This recommendation may need to be adjusted in the light of the outcomes of the second session of the plenary meeting to determine modalities and institutional arrangements for an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services plenary.

Reaffirming the need to strengthen the ability of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice to deliver advice in this regard,

4. *Decides* that the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, within its mandate and under the guidance of the Conference of the Parties, and in order to fulfil the functions assigned to it through Article 25 of the Convention:

(a) Should identify the scientific and technical needs related to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets so that these needs, and gaps in filling them, can be taken into account in the work of the Subsidiary Body and its requests to the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services;

(b) May submit requests directly to the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services to address relevant issues that require independent scientific advice if these requests are of a scientific and technical nature and are part of an existing mandate of the Subsidiary Body, also taking into account the additional considerations listed in annex I to this note;

(c) Shall examine the regular and timely assessments of knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services and their inter-linkages carried out by the platform, as well as the other responses of the platform to requests from Governments and other multilateral environmental agreements, where relevant;

and provide recommendations on these issues to the Conference of the Parties;

5. *Noting* the assessment of the effectiveness of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technical Advice in meeting its mandate contained in annex II to this note, *requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of the necessary resources, to initiate an expert process with the following objectives:

(a) Identify the scientific and technical needs related to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets, including needs shared by other multilateral environmental agreements and organizations and needs that could be addressed by IPBES;

(b) Review existing policy support tools and methodologies developed or used under the Convention and their adequacy, impact and obstacles to their uptake and identify gaps and needs for further development of such tools and methodologies, including gaps and needs that may be addressed by IPBES;

(c) Assess the adequacy of data systems for monitoring the biodiversity attributes addressed in the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and identify effective ways to monitor priority issues at the appropriate spatial and temporal scales; and

(d) Review options for assessing the effects of the types of measures taken in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, including, as appropriate, the potential role of IPBES in such assessments;

and to provide a progress report to a meeting of the Subsidiary Body prior to the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

6. *Considers* that the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets provide a useful flexible framework for the delivery of the biodiversity agenda at all levels and *invites* the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services to consider how its work plan can contribute to their achievement;

7. *Noting* the potential contribution of the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services to technical and scientific cooperation in accordance with Article 18 of the Convention, *requests* the Executive Secretary to consider how the role of the new platform in helping to catalyse support for subregional and national assessments, identifying policy-relevant tools and methodologies in support policy formulation and implementation in prioritizing capacity-building needs and providing and catalysing funding to address such needs could contribute to the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020; to collaborate in this regard with the Secretariat of the Platform, once established; and to report to the Subsidiary Body and/or the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention, as appropriate;

8. *Noting* the potential of sub-global assessments to strengthen the capacities of Parties to update and implement their national biodiversity strategies and action plans in line with decision X/2, *invites* the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services to take note of the process for updating national (as well as (sub-)regional and sub-national) biodiversity strategies and action plans in accordance with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and to consider ways in which the assessments and other relevant activities of the Platform could build on, contribute to and strengthen this process;

9. *Further invites* the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services to take note of the plans for preparation of the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook[3] including planned work on biodiversity scenarios, and consider ways in which the assessments and other relevant activities of the Platform could build on, contribute to and strengthen this process;

10. *Invites* the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, when establishing processes to receive and prioritize requests in line with paragraph 6(a) of the Busan outcome,[4] to consider adopting modalities that would allow it to respond to requests from the Convention in a timely and predictable manner;

11. *Requests* the Executive Secretary and the head of the secretariat of the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, in consultation with the Subsidiary Body Bureau, to develop options for formalizing the collaboration with the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, including by considering the development of a joint work plan and/or memorandum of cooperation, and *further requests* the Executive Secretary to prepare proposals reflecting these in the consolidated *modus operandi* of SBSTTA[5] for consideration by the Subsidiary Body and by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In accordance with Article 25 of the Convention, the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice was established to provide the Conference of the Parties and, as appropriate, its other subsidiary bodies with timely advice relating to the implementation of the Convention.

2. The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020[6] shows that the Convention process has shifted its emphasis from policy development to implementation. Accordingly, the Subsidiary Body will need to

[3] The plans for preparation of the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook are contained in document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/3.

[4] UNEP/IPBES/3/3, annex.

[5] Decision VIII/10, annex III.

[6] Decision X/2, annex.

focus on providing assessments of policy options for the implementation of the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, analysing their consequences and developing tools that enable Parties to evaluate the impacts on biodiversity of their development strategies and policies.

3. Through decision X/9, on the multi-year programme of work for the Conference of the Parties for the period 2011-2020, the Conference of the Parties has scheduled for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its eleventh meeting "the need for and possible development of additional mechanisms, ways and means, to enhance existing mechanisms such as the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention, to strengthen the ability of Parties to meet their commitments under the Convention" as well as "the implications of the possible establishment of an intergovernmental science- policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services on the work of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice".

4. The way in which the Subsidiary Body responds to its mandate in future has to be seen in the light of the establishment of the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services. In decision X/11 the Conference of the Parties, considered the outcomes of the third ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, held in Busan, Republic of Korea, from 7 to 11 June 2010 and the implications of the establishment of an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services (IPBES) for the Convention and for SBSTTA.

5. In the same decision, the Conference of the Parties emphasized the need for IPBES to follow the guidance provided by Governments in the outcome of the Busan meeting and be responsive to, *inter alia*, the needs of the Convention, and to thereby strengthen SBSTTA in the delivery of its mandate.

6. The Conference of the Parties reaffirmed that a regular assessment is needed to provide decision-makers with the necessary information base for adaptive management and to promote the necessary political will for action in addressing biodiversity loss and the degradation of ecosystems and ecosystem services and their implications for human well-being.

7. In paragraph 4 of decision X/11, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with the Bureau of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, to consider, once the arrangements and modalities for IPBES are decided, how the Convention could make full and effective use of the platform, seeking complementarity and avoiding duplication between the work of the Convention, in particular the Subsidiary Body, and the proposed platform, and to report thereon to a meeting of the Subsidiary Body before the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

8. In recommendation XV/8 the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice requested the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with the Bureau of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties, to identify issues, modalities and options for collaboration with the intergovernmental science-policy platform for biodiversity and ecosystem services (IPBES), taking into consideration the views presented at the fifteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body, and to prepare a report for consideration by the Subsidiary Body at its sixteenth meeting.

9. The current note therefore reviews evidence of the ways in which the Subsidiary Body has discharged its functions to date (section II); analyses the opportunities arising from the establishment of the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services (section III); and draws conclusions for the cooperation between the two bodies (section IV).

10. This note draws on a range of documents and analyses quoted below and is guided by discussions and observations made in several meetings of the SBSTTA Bureau. An earlier draft of this note was reviewed by the bureaux of the Conference of the Parties and the Subsidiary Body.

II. SUPPORTING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSTIY 2011-2020

11. In accordance with Article 25 of the Convention, the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice was established to provide the Conference of the Parties and, as appropriate, its other subsidiary bodies with timely advice relating to the implementation of the Convention. Its specific functions are to:

(a) Provide scientific and technical assessments of the status of biological diversity;

(b) Prepare scientific and technical assessments of the effects of types of measures taken in accordance with the provisions of this Convention;

(c) Identify innovative, efficient and state-of-the-art technologies and know-how relating to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and advise on the ways and means of promoting development and/or transferring such technologies;

(d) Provide advice on scientific programmes and international cooperation in research and development related to conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity;

(e) Respond to scientific, technical, technological and methodological questions that the Conference of the Parties and its subsidiary bodies may put to the body.

12. A review of the effectiveness of the processes under the Convention, including the effectiveness of the Subsidiary Body, was carried out in preparation for the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention.[7] It concluded that the Subsidiary Body fulfils its overall mandate of providing timely advice relating to the implementation of the Convention. However, it also noted that the experience in carrying out its specific functions varied, as summarized in the table prepared for this review and updated for the current note (see annex II below).

13. The review found that the Subsidiary Body has undertaken considerable work on scientific and technical assessments of the status of biological diversity (Article 25, paragraph 2 (a)). It has undertaken a number of pilot assessments, reviewed the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, conducted in-depth reviews of the thematic programmes of work, established a number of expert assessments, including one in collaboration with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and assessed the achievement of the 2010 Biodiversity Target through the third edition of Global Biodiversity Outlook. However, these assessments were carried out within limited time frames and were therefore limited with regard to their inclusiveness, multi-disciplinarity and contribution to capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation.

14. The review noted that the Subsidiary Body has yet to provide assessments of the effects of types of measures taken to implement the Convention (Article 25, paragraph 2 (b)). The Subsidiary Body has not played an active role in identifying the key research that needs to be undertaken in order to implement the Strategic Plan, the notable exception being research related to indicators and scenarios undertaken to assess the achievement of the 2010 Biodiversity Target. The review observed that the

[7] See UNEP/CBD/WGRI/1/3 at http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/wgri/wgri-01/official/wgri-01-03-en.doc.

Subsidiary Body has provided advice on scientific programmes in an ad hoc manner and could facilitate cooperation among biodiversity-related organizations and initiatives if it did so more strategically.

15. The review noted that the Subsidiary Body has identified a range of tools and technologies relating to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity (Article 25, paragraph 2 (c)). In particular, these are related to the implementation of programmes of work (e.g. protected areas, marine and coastal biodiversity, mountain biodiversity, forest biodiversity) and cross-cutting issues (e.g. sustainable use, ecosystem approach, biodiversity and climate change). The Subsidiary Body has also developed the programme of work on technology transfer and technological and scientific cooperation and advised on ways to promote development and transfer of technologies through the clearing-house mechanism.

16. The Subsidiary Body has developed a range of cooperative relationships with scientific programmes and research networks (Article 25, paragraph 2 (d)). There is regular coordination with partner conventions and their scientific advisory bodies, including through regular meetings of the chairs of scientific advisory bodies, as well as with technical bodies and academic associations on a range of issues including protected areas, marine and coastal biodiversity, inland water biodiversity, forest biodiversity, biodiversity and climate change, plant conservation, monitoring, ecosystem restoration among others. The collaboration with regional centres of excellence is relatively recent and needs further development.

17. Since its establishment, the Subsidiary Body has focused primarily on responding to scientific, technical and methodological questions from the Conference of the Parties (Article 25, paragraph 2 (e)). Responses have always been timely, but they have not always been based on thorough scientific assessments or on scientific data alone. This is likely a result of the Subsidiary Body's overburdened workload, limited financial resources and technical expertise, particularly in developing countries, and the nature of the requests it receives from the Conference of the Parties.

18. In responding to requests from the Conference of the Parties, the Subsidiary Body had in its fourteenth meetings held prior to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties prepared guidance on thematic areas and cross-cutting issues, including through the elaboration of programmes of work, and in-depth reviews of their implementation as well as principles, guidelines and other guidance materials. The Subsidiary Body has established ad hoc technical expert groups, consulted with experts and cooperated with scientific bodies and initiatives of biodiversity related conventions, institutions and organizations, to provide the scientific and technical basis for its advice. It has also defined guidelines for the conduct of pilot assessments for the Subsidiary Body.

19. The Conference of the Parties, in decision X/12, requested the Subsidiary Body to take into account the need to focus its work, in particular, on the scientific and technical aspects of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the multi-year programme of work, under the authority of and in accordance with the guidance laid down by the Conference of the Parties, upon its request.

20. To do this, the Subsidiary Body needs to respond to the scientific and technical needs of Parties and the global community at large arising from the challenges of implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. This means that the Subsidiary Body needs to dedicate significantly more time and efforts to provide advice on the effectiveness of the tools, measures and policies put in place (Article 25, paragraph 2 (b)). On the other hand, the Subsidiary Body needs to minimize the requests it receives from the Conference of the Parties (Article 25, paragraph 2 (e)). This can be achieved by reducing the number of recommendations the Subsidiary Body sends to the Conference of the Parties that contain requests to future meetings of the Subsidiary Body. Instead, the Subsidiary Body should develop a work stream centred around the following issues:

(a) Identification of the scientific and technical needs related to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets, including needs shared by other multilateral environmental agreements and organizations and needs that could be addressed by IPBES, and prioritize gaps and identify ways in which they can be filled;

(b) Review of existing policy tools and methodologies developed under the Convention and their adequacy, impact and obstacles to their uptake and identify gaps and opportunities to further develop such tools and methodologies, taking into account the potential role of IPBES in this process;

(c) Assessment of the adequacy of data systems for monitoring the biodiversity attributes addressed in the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and identify effective ways to monitor priority issues at the appropriate spatial and temporal scales; and

(d) Assessment of the effects of measures taken in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, taking into account the potential to submit requests for such assessments to IPBES, as appropriate.

21. The issues addressed in the goals and targets of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 are more or less covered by the existing programmes of work and initiatives under the Convention. However, it should be noted that there are certain gaps and inadequacies:

(a) The Convention has ongoing activities related to the underlying causes of biodiversity loss, including the programme on communication, education and public awareness (relevant to Target 1), the activities and experiences on valuation, removal of perverse incentives and the programme of work on incentive measures (Targets 2 and 3), and the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity (Target 4). However, these alone will not be sufficient to achieve the mainstreaming of biodiversity across government and society and to address the biodiversity and ecosystem services related aspects of cross-cutting issues that include aspects which extend beyond the mandate of the Convention. The capacity of the Subsidiary Body with regard to social sciences (including economic and political sciences) will need to be strengthened to address these challenges;

(b) Land use change remains the most significant driver of biodiversity loss. It is addressed in all thematic programmes of work under the Convention on a biome-by-biome basis. However, decisions on land use in one area or ecosystem have multiple effects in other areas and ecosystems. For this reason there is a need to consider land-use change in a more integrated and holistic way to achieve Target 5, and the Convention is currently not well equipped to do so. The Subsidiary Body may therefore need to give more attention to this issue, including by collaborating with scientific advisory bodies of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), and other bodies;

(c) Although regional processes on criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management have a long history and despite efforts to promote sustainable agriculture, aquaculture and fisheries the Subsidiary Body has not systematically engaged with FAO in promoting the development of tools and protocols for monitoring and assessing the level of sustainability of these production systems, making the achievement of Targets 6 and 7 a challenge;

(d) The Subsidiary Body has developed scientific and ecological criteria for marine areas in need of protection and is guiding the process on the description of ecologically and biologically significant areas in the marine environment. However, it needs to be emphasized that we have a limited understanding of marine biodiversity, in particular biodiversity in deep-sea habitats, and that there is a need to continue to update a comprehensive and accessible global database of all forms of life in the sea, and further assess and map the distribution and abundance of species in the sea;

(e) The management for the delivery of multiple ecosystem services, the assessment of impacts of planned projects, plans and policies on ecosystem services and the quantification of ecosystem services trade-offs are not well developed, and needs the Subsidiary Body to dedicate work to supporting Parties in the achievement of Target 14;

(f) There are also scientific challenges with regard to the impacts of pollutants on biodiversity (Target 8), addressing multiple pressures on biodiversity (Target 10), or assessing genetic diversity of wild species (Target 13).

22. To overcome these challenges requires the continued input from the Subsidiary Body on policy relevant guidance and the concerted action on technical and scientific cooperation in accordance with Article 18 of the Convention. It also requires a more comprehensive approach to monitoring biodiversity as a basis for adaptive management and for adjusting and fine-tuning policy instruments with a view to optimizing biodiversity outcomes in the implementation of sustainable development strategies and the development and sharing of technologies and methodologies that enable countries to gradually fill these gaps.

23. The Subsidiary Body has experience with regard to providing the technical advice and guidance to enable countries to address such challenges. The Subsidiary Body has over the years engaged in scientific assessments and in the preparation of policy support tools, toolkits, databases and technical documentation to support capacity-building. The number of workshops on scientific and technical issues has increased significantly over the years with a particularly large number focusing on the implementation of the programme of work on protected areas. The Secretariat has also initiated a number of mechanisms, partnerships and collaborative arrangements through which competent institutions deliver capacity-building activities in support of the Convention. These include the Collaborative Partnership on Forests, Consortium of Scientific Partners, Friends of PoWPA, Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, Group on Earth Observation Biodiversity Observation Network, Global Partnership for Plant Conservation, Coordination Mechanism for the Global Taxonomy Initiative, and various liaison groups, among others.

24. However, it has been difficult to assess the effectiveness of individual policies and measures, both at global (for example, decisions of the Conference of the Parties) and at national level, with regard to their outcomes for biodiversity. The Subsidiary Body therefore needs to become better equipped to fulfil the function laid out in paragraph 2 (b) of Article 25, i.e., to prepare scientific and technical assessments of the effects of types of measures taken in accordance with the provisions of the Convention.

25. Parties increasingly call attention to the need for scientific and technical support in implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Several decisions request subregional workshops on scientific and technical issues that should be held where possible in connection with workshops on national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

26. It is therefore evident that the Subsidiary Body will need to increasingly focus its attention on the provision of scientific and technical support to the implementation of the provisions of the Convention, including the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 in line with Article 18 of the Convention. To do this effectively, the Subsidiary Body would need to dedicate time to the activities listed in paragraph 20 above.

27. The establishment of IPBES provides an opportunity for the Subsidiary Body to respond to these tasks by building on its own experiences, tools and approaches while also drawing on the deliverables expected from IPBES. The following section considers these opportunities and the expectations the Subsidiary Body may have vis-à-vis IPBES.

III. IMPLICATIONS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF IPBES FOR THE WORK OF SBSTTA: FUNCTIONS OF IPBES AND THEIR RELEVANCE TO SBSTTA

28. The following paragraphs address the links between the functions of the Subsidiary Body and those established for IPBES through the Busan outcome[8] and further elaborated in the note on possible elements of the work programme of the platform (UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/2), prepared for the second session of the IPBES plenary.[9] While the four functions and their implications for the Subsidiary Body are reviewed individually, it should be noted that they are envisaged to be implemented in an integrated manner.

Assessments

29. IPBES is expected to perform: (i) regular and timely assessments of knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services and their interlinkages, which should include comprehensive global, regional and, as necessary, subregional assessments at appropriate scales; and (ii) thematic assessments including assessments of new topics identified by science. IPBES should also maintain a catalogue of relevant assessments, identify the need for regional and subregional assessments and help to catalyse support for subregional and national assessments, as appropriate.

30. It would be expected that comprehensive assessments are conducted over a period of several years and that they are programmed in such a way as to respond to user needs, including those of the Convention. Thematic assessments might include assessments for which urgent responses are required and might then be conducted more rapidly while maintaining the core characteristics of scientific credibility, independence, peer-review and the identification of uncertainties.

31. The note by the UNEP secretariat on possible element of the work programme of IPBES (UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/2), prepared for the second session of the IPBES plenary meeting, highlights that assessments can combine all four functions of the platform in an integrated matter. They are based on available data, information and knowledge, and lead to improved understanding of gaps in such knowledge, and of knowledge generation needs in the future. Capacity-building has formed an important part of nearly every international assessment process undertaken in the recent past and assessments are themselves tools for supporting policy formulation and implementation, and can be a useful means for identifying and assessing policy options and policy-relevant tools and methodologies.

32. The Subsidiary Body has itself provided, in recommendation VI/5, guidance regarding the methodologies for scientific assessment, taking into account the recommendations of the brainstorming meeting held in Oslo[10] on the procedures for initiating, preparing, carrying out, using and reporting on, scientific assessments and listed criteria and approaches to be considered. The Subsidiary Body also emphasized the importance for scientific assessments to contribute to capacity-building and enhancement of institutions and promote scientific cooperation, education and public awareness.

33. The consolidated *modus operandi* of the Subsidiary Body, contained in annex III of decision VIII/10, reflects the experience made in conducting these assessments and provides additional guidance

[8] Report of the third ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services (UNEP/IPBES/3/3). Available at: http://www.ipbes.net/images/stories/documents/K1061514%20%20IPBES-3-3%20-%20REPORT.doc.

[9] http://www.ipbes.net/downloads/doc_download/596-work-programme-edoc-advanced.html.

[10] See the note by the Executive Secretary prepared for the sixth meeting of SBSTTA on scientific assessments: development of methodologies and identification of pilot studies (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/6/9/Add.1). Available at: http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/sbstta/sbstta-06/official/sbstta-06-09-add1-en.pdf

on scientific and technical assessments initiated by the Subsidiary Body including the process for their conduct.

34. In addition to these pilot assessments, the Subsidiary Body has, in accordance with the schedule for in-depth reviews, assessed status and trends of, and threats to the biodiversity of the biomes for which thematic programmes of work have been established. The Subsidiary Body has also overseen the preparation of the editions of Global Biodiversity Outlook and reviewed the findings of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment among others.

35. As IPBES develops its work programme on assessments it could take into account and build on both the needs and the relevant outcomes from the work of the Subsidiary Body as appropriate. To do so, IPBES needs to be made aware of the assessment needs of Parties, in particular in the context of national implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity. The early development of consistent assessment methods and approaches by IPBES could assist Parties in conducting these assessments and, where feasible and appropriate, linking national assessments with the scheduled regional and subregional assessments undertaken by IPBES and the Subsidiary Body could play a role in reviewing and promoting the assessment methods and approaches.

36. The Subsidiary Body would respond differently to the different types of assessments:

(a) The Subsidiary Body could give additional guidance and inputs to the comprehensive programmed sub-global and global assessments and would review the findings from these assessments, including in the context of their contribution to assessing progress in implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. To do so in a timely manner, the agendas of future meetings of the Subsidiary Body will need to allocate time for this purpose;

(b) The thematic assessments would mostly have a shorter duration and the Subsidiary Body could propose subjects for such assessments, including from among the proposal of new and emerging issues made in accordance with the procedure for identifying such issues established through decision IX/29, and taking into account the additional considerations listed in annex I below.

Knowledge generation

37. IPBES is expected to identify and prioritize key scientific information needed for policymakers at appropriate scales and catalyse efforts to generate new knowledge by engaging in dialogue with key scientific organizations, policymakers and funding organizations. It is expected that the assessments of the state of knowledge undertaken by IPBES will provide information on the full range of knowledge needs and point to areas for which new research or monitoring programmes or other knowledge is required, although IPBES itself will not undertake such research or monitoring.

38. At the same time it is recognized that capacity-building will also be an important prerequisite for adequately responding to some of the identified needs in relation to knowledge generation, as well as for integrating knowledge from multiple and diverse sources.

39. The Subsidiary Body could benefit significantly from the delivery of the knowledge-generation function of IPBES. As noted above, the analysis conducted for the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention concluded that the Subsidiary Body has not played an active role in identifying the key research that needs to be undertaken in order to implement the Strategic Plan for the Convention 2002-2010. The Strategic Plan provides both a new opportunity and challenge in this regard in that it has been developed through a thorough and inclusive consultative process and it is recognized as a framework for the entire biodiversity community. The challenge is that its implementation calls for an integrated and holistic view of data, information and knowledge from multiple disciplines and different forms of knowledge.

40. The Subsidiary Body has in the past focused on natural sciences. For example, the conclusion of one of the pilot assessments initiated by the Subsidiary Body through recommendation VI/5, focusing on the impacts of invasive alien species, concluded that the assessment was adequate with regard to the impacts on habitats and species and that the socio-economic impacts had not been adequately assessed. Moreover, while Articles 8(j) and 10(c) of the Convention focus on traditional knowledge and customary use, these are being pursued under the auspices of the Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions, and the Subsidiary Body has not tasked itself to seek to integrate the results and conclusions from different knowledge systems.

41. A key task for the Subsidiary Body would therefore be the identification of the knowledge gaps and research needs that need to be acted upon for the successful implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Given the urgency of this task, the Subsidiary Body could initiate an expert review of the existing gaps and then decide how these can be adequately addressed, taking into account the status of operationalization of IPBES as well as its possible early deliverables, and noting that the integration of different knowledge systems is an agreed key principle on which IPBES is being operationalized.

42. Such a review could build on the partnerships the Convention has developed with scientific and technical institutions and networks how have responded to the mandates provided by the Convention and embraced the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Examples include *inter alia*:

(a) DIVERSITAS, in collaboration with the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), has led the development of scenarios for the third edition of Global Biodiversity Outlook and has developed its strategic plan for the decade 2011-2020 on the basis of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020;

(b) The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, established to support the evaluation of the Strategic Plan of the Convention 2002-2010 and the 2010 Biodiversity Target, is now actively engaged in assisting Parties to develop the scientific basis of setting national targets and supporting the development or refinement of monitoring programmes for the evaluation of progress towards these targets;

(c) The Group on Earth Observation Biodiversity Observation Network has prepared, upon invitation from the Subsidiary Body and the Conference of the Parties, an assessment of the adequacy of observation systems for the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and is further developing its work on essential biodiversity variables;

(d) The Friends of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas, consisting of, *inter alia*, The Nature Conservancy, World Wide Fund for Nature, Conservation International, BirdLife International, Wildlife Conservation Society, and IUCN-World Commission on Protected Areas, continue to assist countries in conducting key assessments for the implementation of the programme of work, such as ecological gap analysis, management effectiveness, the development of sustainable finance plans, and protected areas governance.

43. These organizations and networks are expected to equally service the needs of IPBES and with a minimum of coordination the products they develop can serve both the Subsidiary Body and IPBES, no matter which body initiated them. Such coordination could also be formalized through a Memorandum of Cooperation as appropriate and this could facilitate the availability of timely advice and the predictability of the delivery of needed products while avoiding the duplication of efforts.

Policy support tools and methodologies

44. IPBES is expected to support policy formulation and implementation by identifying policy-relevant tools and methodologies, such as those arising from assessments, to enable decision makers to gain access to those tools and methodologies, and, where necessary to promote and catalyse

their further development. The range of policy support tools and methodologies, as outlined in the note by the UNEP secretariat on possible elements of the work programme of the platform (UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/2) include:

(a) Assessments, and communication and interpretive materials derived from them, including mapping tools, indicators and metrics;

(b) Models, scenarios and other forecasting techniques, including early warning mechanisms;

(c) Risk, cost-benefit, and trade-off analyses, including valuation techniques and offsetting frameworks;

(d) Tools that increase access to data, information, lessons learned, and other knowledge, and deliver it in meaningful ways;

(e) Other analysis and interpretation tools.

45. The Subsidiary Body has developed considerable experience and an arsenal of tools and methodologies in this regard. It has fulfilled its key function – the review of scientific evidence and provision of policy-relevant advice to the Conference of the Parties – through the development and review of programmes of work, guidance on a range of cross-cutting issues and the preparation, review and compilation of tools relevant to the implementation of the Convention. Examples of tools developed by the Subsidiary Body include mapping tools, indicators, models, scenarios, valuation techniques and data sharing tools among others. The Subsidiary Body has also developed guidebooks, manuals, training courses, best practice kits, case-studies databases and toolkits and various subjects.

46. These materials, approaches and tools are widely accessible and can serve as inputs to the work of IPBES in further developing and refining policy support tools and methodologies, in addition to support the capacity-building function of IPBES. The Subsidiary Body could provide further guidance to IPBES on gaps in and limitations of existing tools. This would require a thorough review of the range of tools and methodologies relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits derived from the utilization of genetic resources, as well as an assessment of possible obstacles facing their wider use and application.

Capacity-building

47. IPBES is expected to prioritize key capacity-building needs to improve the science-policy interface at appropriate levels and then provide and call for financial and other support for the highest priority needs related directly to its activities by providing a forum with conventional and potential sources of funding and to integrate capacity-building into all relevant aspects of its work according to priorities decided by its governing body.

48. The capacity-building function is seen as an integral and cross-cutting component of the work programme of IPBES and would support assessment and knowledge generation and underpin the formulation and implementation of policy.

49. Through its operations and practices, the Subsidiary Body contributes to capacity-building and promotes research and training, the enhancement of institutions and scientific cooperation, access to data, information and knowledge, education and public awareness and the respect for tradition knowledge in accordance with Articles 8(j), 12, 13, 17 and 18 of the Convention.

50. The move of the Convention from a phase of policy generation into a phase of implementation has gone along with a significant increase in efforts on capacity-building. This is reflected in the types of

supporting activities of key partners of the Convention, including the GEF implementing agencies. It is also evident in the growing number of workshops and training events organized by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity to assist Parties and other stakeholders in the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

51. The capacity-building function of IPBES, and its integration across the other functions of the Platform, could be particularly effective in identifying knowledge needs, carrying out assessments and developing and applying policy tools in connection with the implementation, at different scales, of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

52. The report of the International Expert Meeting on IPBES and Capacity-Building, held in Trondheim, Norway, from 25 to 27 May 2011[11] noted that capacity-building is essential to ensuring that scientific information plays a more significant role in decision-making, helping to ensure capacity both to undertake assessments and to implement policy based on the results of these assessments. Capacity-building is needed to help link science to policy, ensuring that more policymakers have the information and tools available to help them make informed decisions.

53. In this vein, IPBES could plan its sub-global assessments so that they build on the ongoing process in many countries of updating the national biodiversity strategies and action plans and contribute to building the capacities to complete the planning processes and enable and support their implementation.

54. Article 18 of the Convention sets out responsibilities and expectations of countries with regard to technical and scientific cooperation in the field of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and there are good examples of both South-South and North-South cooperation in support of the obligations of Parties related to identification and monitoring as laid out in Article 7.

55. In delivering its functions in an integrated manner, IPBES has a potential to promote and strengthen technical and scientific cooperation in support of assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services in a systematic manner and to thereby strengthen the capacities of countries, in particular of developing countries, to monitor, assess and report on biodiversity.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Framework for cooperation

56. The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 is the result of a comprehensive and inclusive consultation process. Drawing also on the conceptual framework for the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, it represents a useful flexible framework that is relevant to all biodiversity-related conventions. Its implementation requires the engagement of all stakeholders and the inclusion of biodiversity considerations across all sectors of society, in line with the principles of the ecosystem approach as the primary framework for action under the Convention.

57. IPBES could assist countries with assessments of scientific knowledge relevant to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. To do this effectively and coherently, it is expected that the development of a common conceptual framework on processes and methodologies for such assessments across regions, scales and themes would be developed. The note on possible elements of the work programme of the platform (UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/2), prepared for the second session of the IPBES Plenary, suggests that this might be one of the early activities of the Platform and that it could build on lessons, *inter alia*, from the global and sub-global assessment under the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment.

[11] The report is available at www.dirnat.no/content/500042028/Meeting-report.

Promoting implementation of Article 7 of the Convention

58. The Convention has ongoing partnerships with relevant bodies and networks that support the gathering of and access to observational data relevant to biodiversity and ecosystem services, their use in indicators for the detection of changes in biodiversity-related attributes, as well as promoting the systematic monitoring of the components of biodiversity. The knowledge and information derived from these efforts facilitates the preparation of assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services and the increase in quantity and quality of data and information will improve accuracy, spatial and temporal resolution of products and confidence levels of the products that can inform assessments.

59. IPBES can be a driver in, and rationale for, the development of a coherent and integrated biodiversity observation system, including in the further development of indicators, metrics, mapping tools and models, and could build on the experience of the Convention in this regard. In the longer term, more systematic linkages between the Convention's efforts on biodiversity indicators, monitoring and reporting could be envisaged, both at global and sub-global level.

60. IPBES can also assist the Convention in the delivery of "integrated national, regional and sub-global ecosystem assessments including, where appropriate, response scenarios that build on the framework and experiences of relevant biodiversity assessments, such as the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment" as called for in paragraph 1 of decision IX/15.

Options for the engagement with IPBES

61. The Subsidiary Body has a history of engaging with assessments or assessment bodies, including by participating in the conduct and review of assessments and giving guidance on issues to be addressed in assessments. The Subsidiary Body also has experience in considering assessment findings and transmitting the implications of these assessments for the work of the Convention to the Conference of the Parties.

62. Close linkages and ongoing communication between the Subsidiary Body and IPBES will help to avoid overlaps and the duplication of efforts between the two bodies. A spirit of synergy and mutual support should guide the relationship. Cooperation with IPBES should be seen as a two-way stream where both bodies can benefit from the work of the other. Once the functions and structures of bodies under IPBES and its rules of procedure have been decided the Conference of the Parties might consider formalizing the relationship of the bodies established under the Convention with IPBES, such as through a memorandum of cooperation.

63. The functions of the Subsidiary Body and IPBES are mutually supportive. Through relevant institutional arrangements and transparency of the processes it should not be difficult to avoid overlaps and to maximize synergies between the two bodies, their operations and deliverables. In particular, it is evident that the benefits of such a collaborative arrangement would be mutual.

64. At the time of preparing this note, prior to the second session of the plenary of IPBES, it would be premature to consider details of possible institutional arrangements between the Subsidiary Body, other bodies of the Convention and IPBES until the functions and structures of the bodies to be established under IPBES as well as its rules of procedure are determined. Depending on the outcome of that meeting, however, the Subsidiary Body may be in a position to discuss these matters at its sixteenth meeting. It would then be advisable to consider ways to ensure that the interaction and communication between the two bodies is supportive of the timely delivery of outcomes by both bodies. To this effect it would be helpful if the modalities adopted for IPBES would allow it to respond to requests from the Convention in a timely and predictable manner.

65. In decision X/11, the Conference of the Parties emphasized the need for IPBES to follow the guidance provided by Governments in the outcome of the Busan meeting and be responsive to, *inter alia*,

the needs of the Convention, and to thereby strengthen the Subsidiary Body in the delivery of its mandate.

66. The note on possible elements of the work programme of IPBES (UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/2) considers the possibility of a number of strategic partnerships, including with the biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements and, in particular, with their scientific advisory bodies, to increase efficiency and streamline programme implementation.[12] Annex I below lists key considerations that should be taken into account in developing an effective interaction with IPBES.

[12] The full set of documents being considered at the second session of the plenary meeting to operationalize IPBES (Panama City, 16-21 April 2012) can be found at www.ipbes.net/plenary-sessions/second-session-of-plenary.html.

Annex I

KEY CONSIDERATIONS FOR A STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE AND THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL SCIENCE-POLICY PLATFORM ON BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES

The Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice should develop requests addressed to the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services to respond to its mandate and in order to fulfil the functions assigned to it through Article 25 of the Convention and the consolidated *modus operandi* contained in annex III to decision VIII/10. It should submit requests directly to the Platform on relevant issues that require independent scientific advice if these requests are of a scientific and technical nature and are part of an existing mandate of the Subsidiary Body. The Subsidiary Body should thereby take into account the following considerations:

(a) Activities should focus on the scientific and technical aspects of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (decision X/2, annex) and the multi-year programme of work for the Conference of the Parties (decision X/9);

(b) Deliverables prepared by IPBES should respond to the information needs of Governments and support them in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020;

(c) Activities should be carried out in such a way as to enable the Subsidiary Body to provide timely advice to the Conference of the Parties;

(d) Due attention should be given to activities that enable a scientific and technical assessment of the effects of types of measures taken in accordance with the provisions of the Convention (Article 25, paragraph 2 (b));

(e) Activities should not lead to a duplication of efforts and overlaps with other ongoing activities;

(f) Activities that respond to the needs of multiple clients should be prioritized;

(g) Where possible, the Subsidiary Body should coordinate its requests with those from other partners (e.g., through mechanisms such as the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions (BLG), meetings of the chairs of the scientific advisory bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions and other partnerships);

(h) The number of requests to IPBES should be limited to avoid overburdening IPBES and IPBES would be expected to inform clients in a timely manner as to whether and in which way it has decided to respond to requests;

(i) A request to IPBES should give due consideration to possible alternative approaches (e.g. activity by the Secretariat, a consultant or a partner organization; in-depth review; expert meeting etc.);

(j) The Subsidiary Body should be aware of the time needed for IPBES to conduct its work and respond to a request;

(k) The Subsidiary Body should review the outcomes from activities undertaken by IPBES at the earliest possible opportunity.

Annex II

ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNICAL ADVICE IN MEETING ITS MANDATE[13]

Function of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (Article 25)	Actions taken to fulfil its function	Outstanding issues and analysis
Provide scientific and technical assessments of the status of biological diversity (paragraph 2 (a))	• In response to decision V/20, paragraph 26 and recommendation VI/5, the Subsidiary Body undertook a number of pilot assessments (the status and trends of forest biological diversity; socio-economic and ecological impacts of invasive alien species on island and inland water ecosystems; interlinkages between biodiversity and climate change; and development of rapid assessment methods for the biodiversity of inland water ecosystems and for marine and coastal biological diversity). It also developed methods and modalities for scientific assessment (recommendation X/2). • SBSTTA reviewed the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (decision VII/6, recommendation X/3) and reviewed the implications of the findings of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment for the future work of the Convention (decision VIII/9, recommendation XI/4) • The Subsidiary Body has completed reports on the status and trends of and threats to biodiversity for all thematic programmes of work in line with the schedule of in-depth reviews. • Upon the Subsidiary Body's recommendation, COP adopted a framework for evaluating progress towards the 2010 target, including a set of indicators for measuring the status and trends of biodiversity (recommendation IX/13, decision VII/30), consolidated that framework (decision VIII/15, recommendations X/4 and X/5) and developed an indicator framework for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (recommendation XV/1). • The first edition of Global Biodiversity Outlook was endorsed by the seventh meeting of SBSTTA and the Open-ended Inter-sessional Meeting on the Strategic Plan, National Reports and Implementation of the Convention. SBSTTA provided guidance on the content of GBO-2 (recommendation X/6) and reviewed	• The Subsidiary Body has given limited time to considering the assessments developed by AHTEGs and partner conventions, institutions and organizations. SBSTTA needs to prioritize the identification of research and assessments necessary to facilitate implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and to identify partners that can help fill gaps. • Scientific and technical assessments of the status of biodiversity are likely to increase once Parties have developed national targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and are reporting on progress made towards their achievement. The process for identifying new and emerging issues related to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the effectiveness of the Subsidiary Body in addressing them should be reviewed.

[13] This table was initially prepared for the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention and has been updated to capture developments since 2005.

Function of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (Article 25)	Actions taken to fulfil its function	Outstanding issues and analysis
	the report (decision VIII/7, recommendation XI/3) and considered lessons learned from its preparation (recommendation XII/4). GBO-3 was launched at SBSTTA-14, which considered its implications for the future implementation of the Convention (decision X/4, recommendation XIV/7) • In response to decision VIII/10 the Subsidiary Body has considered a number of possible new and emerging issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.	
Prepare scientific and technical assessments of the effects of types of measures taken in accordance with the provisions of this Convention (paragraph 2 (b))	• SBSTTA has guided research related to indicators and the study on scenarios for the twenty-first century (CBD Technical Series No. 50) which were undertaken to assess the achievement of the 2010 Biodiversity Target and are summarized in the third edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook.	• The Subsidiary Body has not played an active role in identifying the key research that needs to be undertaken in order to implement the Strategic Plan. • The impacts of specific types of measures are difficult to determine in isolation from other reinforcing or mitigating factors; however the overall impact of measures and other drivers will be assessed through trends in the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.
Identify innovative, efficient and state-of-the-art technologies and know-how relating to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and advise on the ways and means of promoting development and/or transferring such technologies (paragraph 2 (c))	• Work under the Subsidiary Body has led to the development of technical advice on the planning, establishment and management of protected areas (CBD Technical Series No. 15, 24, 35, 36, 44), aspects related to integrated marine and coastal area management (CBD Technical Series No. 12, 13, 14, 22, 37), facilitating conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity (CBD Technical Series No. 9), sustainable management of non-timber forest resources (CBD Technical Series No. 6), climate change and biodiversity (CBD Technical Series No. 10, 29, 41, 42, 43, 51). REDD+ (CBD Technical Series No. 59), indicators (CBD Technical Series No. 32, 53, 58) and ecosystem restoration (CBD Technical Series No. 62). • Work under the Subsidiary Body has also led to the development of technical advice on the ecosystem approach (decision V/6), the sustainable use of biodiversity (decision VII/12), invasive alien species (decision VI/23), integrating biodiversity-related issues into environmental impact assessments and EIA legislation (decisions VI/7 and VIII/28), biodiversity and tourism development	• The Subsidiary Body has identified some technologies for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity; however, whether they have been innovative and state-of-the-art technologies is debatable. Further the extent to which the Subsidiary Body has enabled the transfer of these technologies is unclear. • As the Convention enters its implementation phase, support and training on the application of tools and technologies relating to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity at the national and

Function of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (Article 25)	**Actions taken to fulfil its function**	**Outstanding issues and analysis**
	(decision VII/14) and incentive measures (decisions VI/15 and VII/18). • SBSTTA has identified technologies for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/9/INF/13) and mountain biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/8/7/Add.1). • SBSTTA has responded to the call for assessments of technologies that may have negative impacts for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity (geo-engineering, biofuels, genetically modified trees, etc.). • On the advice SBSTTA, COP adopted a programme of work on technology transfer and technological and scientific cooperation (decision VII/29). • The Subsidiary Body has advised on ways and means of promoting development and transfer of technologies through the clearing-house mechanism (recommendation X/7).	(sub-) regional levels will have to increase to ensure technologies and know-how can be used.
Provide advice on scientific programmes and international cooperation in research and development related to conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity (paragraph 2 (d))	• The Subsidiary Body has developed cooperative relationships with international experts and bodies addressing scientific and technical issues and has advised the Conference of the Parties on developing relationships with such bodies. Scientific cooperation is facilitated through workshops, peer review and participation in ad hoc technical expert groups (decision IV/16). • The Chair of the Bureau of the Subsidiary Body participates in meetings of scientific bodies of relevant conventions, institutions and processes (decision VI/29), and there are regular meetings of the Chairs of Scientific Advisory Bodies of the Biodiversity-related Conventions (decision X/20). • The Subsidiary Body has provided advice on the role of the clearing-house mechanism in promoting technical cooperation (recommendation X/7). • The Subsidiary Body has provided advice on terms of reference for ad hoc technical expert groups and rosters of experts (recommendation V/14).	• The provision of advice on scientific programmes has been mostly ad hoc. • Advice on regional cooperation has been limited and could help to facilitate implementation of the Convention. • The Subsidiary Body has provided little advice to the Conference of the Parties on the implementation of Article 18 of the Convention on scientific and technical cooperation.

Function of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (Article 25)	**Actions taken to fulfil its function**	**Outstanding issues and analysis**
Respond to scientific, technical, technological and methodological questions that the Conference of the Parties and its subsidiary bodies may put to the body (paragraph 2 (e))	• The Subsidiary Body has responded to requests and questions from the Conference of the Parties.	• This function has been the primary focus of the Subsidiary Body's actions. • Responses are often submitted in a timely manner; however, due to time and resource constraints, they are not always based on thorough assessments, and may not be based solely on scientific and technical considerations.
