



## **Convention on Biological Diversity**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/CHM/IAC/2008/1/2  
21 February 2008

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**MEETING OF THE INFORMAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE TO THE CLEARING-HOUSE  
MECHANISM OF THE CONVENTION ON  
BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY**

Bonn, 18 May 2008

**REPORT OF THE INTERSESSIONAL CONSULTATION HELD AT THE MARGINS OF THE  
THIRTEENTH MEETING OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND  
TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE**

### **I. VENUE AND AGENDA**

1. At the initiative of the Chair, some members of the Informal Advisory Committee briefly met at the margins of the thirteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice. The meeting was held at the Gabon Room of the FAO headquarters in Rome, on 21 February 2008, from 2 to 3 pm. Members who were not physically present in Rome were invited to attend through a Skype conference call.

2. The main objective of the meeting was to collect the views of the members in preparation for the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Given the short duration of the meeting, the agenda was limited to the following points:

1. Structure of the draft document for the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
2. Draft decision.
3. Resource implications of the CHM implementation.

### **II. ATTENDANCE**

3. The following participants attended the meeting:

- Mr. Asghar Mohammadi Fazel (AF), Iran (Chair)
- Mr. Han de Koeijer (HdK), Belgium (through Skype conference call)
- Mr. Soumayila Bancé (SB), Burkina Faso
- Ms. Krista Blackborow (KB), Canada
- Dr. Jan Plesnik (JP), Czech Republic
- Ms. Rania S. Spyropoulou (RS), European Community (through Skype conference call)
- Mr. Horst Korn (HK), Germany

/...

In order to minimize the environmental impacts of the Secretariat's processes, and to contribute to the Secretary-General's initiative for a carbon-neutral UN, this document is printed in limited numbers. Participants are kindly requested to bring their own copy to the meeting.

- Dr. Linus Spencer Thomas (LS), Grenada
- Ms. Beatriz Torres (BT), GBIF
- Ms. Gladys Cotter (GC), IABIN
- Ms. Bonnie C-Carroll (BC), IABIN
- Olivier de Munck (OdM), SCBD (through Skype conference call)
- Ms. Sandra Meehan (SM), SCBD (Rapporteur)
- Mr. Vince Gopez (VG), SCBD (Conference Services)

### **III. OPENING AND INTRODUCTION**

4. The meeting was opened by the Chair at 2 pm. He welcomed the participants and outlined the agenda to review the draft note by the Executive Secretary on the proposals for the implementation of the Strategic Plan of the CHM (UNEP/CBD/COP/9/23), prepared for the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. To introduce the discussion, the Secretariat made a brief presentation to highlight the main points of the document. Then, the Chair opened the floor for comments and requested that in the short time available the group focus on the key points of the document as well as on the draft decision.

### **IV. SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE ON DRAFT DOCUMENT UNEP/CBD/COP/9/23**

5. The breadth of the mandate should be directly related to the amount of resources available. Therefore, there needs to be a decision to find additional resources or to narrow the scope (GC).

6. An issue raised during the Secretariat's retreat was the gap in the feedback on implementation on the ground (SCBD).

7. The challenges associated with the lack of capacity of both country Parties and the Secretariat need to be strengthened in the document (SB).

8. There was a proposal to find a way to solicit feedback through NBSAP or reporting process - perhaps through setting targets (BT).

9. Paragraph 10 <sup>1/</sup> is very important. It should include the notion of making the CHM more focused (RS).

10. In section V, the table of services should be prioritized (RS).

11. The document should resist asking other Parties to identify and submit information. Rather, we should build up on regional approaches using common tools based on common software e.g. through a pilot phase or programme (RS).

12. Some comments were submitted in a separate document to be shared with the CHM-IAC members. There was a question regarding asking for new developments as previous COP decisions carry no obligation (HdK).

13. It could be useful to include a summary of prior COP decisions related to the CHM (KB).

14. We could address issue of the mandate of the IAC by providing suggestions, such as "assist ES to prioritize actions" or "reflect upon previous COP decisions and provide guidance" (KB).

---

<sup>1/</sup> Paragraph 10 has become paragraph 9 in the final version of UNEP/COP/9/23.

15. For the CHM-IAC, there was a suggestion of creating a table of possible actions based on:

1. Business as usual.
2. Possibilities with a small budget.
3. Possibilities with an increased budget.

This could be a more realistic approach to illustrated added value of having a budget allocation (HK).

16. The chair then asked if paragraph 25 sufficiently addressed this idea.

17. Paragraph 25's (a) (b) yes, but not (c) or (d). 2/ Rather a new (c) that would be developed along a middle ground (HK).

18. The Strategic Plan should be operationalized into a one page action plan so it looks more like a work programme related to available resources (SB).

19. The CHM-IAC should focus on what is most needed to improve the IAC, e.g. more fund for meetings and other ideas (SCBD).

20. The CHM-IAC could have a role in capacity-building e.g. helping the Secretariat help developing countries (KB).

21. The chair suggested that the lack of clarity stems from the lack of knowledge or advice on how to pinpoint activities. Therefore, attention should be given to developing the annex on resource implications. The Secretariat highlighted paragraph 24 (f) related to further empowering regional networking.

22. Attention was drawn to paragraph 2 (d) regarding mobilizing and allocating resources for sustaining national CHMs – 3 options should be given – also highlighted past joint regional meetings that also included collaboration with GBIF (BC).

23. The CHM should promote sharing of success stories and link to technology transfer (JP).

24. There was a question if there would also be an information document (KB), Secretariat replied that there is a consensus to try and reduce the overall number of documents so no need if all points are contained in 1 official document.

25. Belgium would like to have the report of their brainstorming meeting on CHM cooperation as an information document (HdK).

26. The priorities for a Strategic Plan/Action Plan should be in this order:

1. Each Party has a CHM.
2. Knowledge Base.
3. Planning and Reporting Facility.
4. National Information & Websites.
5. Not sure if collaboration tools are a priority (RS).

---

2/ Paragraphs 25 (c) and (d) have been deleted in the final version of UNEP/COP/9/23.

27. The chair then asked for comments on paragraph 25 (d) <sup>3/</sup> that contains merging the CHM-IAC with another committee as an option. The chair asked why a Party may choose to provide support to CEPA and not CHM.

28. CHM is based more on technology so these are two different issues (HK).

29. Having participated at recent CEPA-IAC, KB expressed view that websites are considered a communication tool. Therefore, perhaps CHM-IAC could be a part of CEPA.

30. Another question asked was if the Secretariat operates these two programmes under one unit or as separate (BC). The Secretariat explained that as a result of the management review many processes were being analyzed with a view to finding synergies.

31. Merging should not be recommended as CHM is primarily a tool for knowledge sharing and under climate change this is seen as both an emerging issue and a stand alone issue (RS).

32. There are three reasons for agreeing:

1. Questions whether such a merger would increase capacity of both.
2. CEPA concentrates on Biodiversity message to all stakeholder groups whereas the CHM role is to assist parties.
3. Under CHM, this is a role of the focal points (JP).

#### **IV. CONCLUSION AND CLOSURE**

33. The chair asked for final comments as time ran out and explained that the draft minutes of this meeting would be circulated to the participants for verification and further elaboration and then the final draft of the document would be prepared by the Secretariat to be posted on the website of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The Secretariat advised participants that the deadline for COP documents was early March.

34. The meeting adjourned at 3:05 pm.

-----

---

<sup>3/</sup> Paragraph 25 (d) has been deleted in the final version of UNEP/COP/9/23.