



Biodiversity Indicator Partnership Steering Committee Teleconference

Summary Minutes

08 February 2013, 14:00 UTC

Present: Alessandra Alfieri (UNSD), Sarah Brooks (BIP Secretariat, UNEP-WCMC), Anna Chenery (BIP Secretariat, UNEP-WCMC), Linda Collette (FAO), Nick Davidson (Ramsar), Braulio Dias (CBD Secretariat), Robert Hoft (CBD Secretariat), Jon Hutton (UNEP-WCMC), Diego Juffe on behalf of Jane Smart (IUCN), Youn-Ho Lee (Korea Institute of Ocean Science and Technology), Kieran Noonan-Mooney (CBD Secretariat), Anne Teller (EC) and Matt Walpole (UNEP-WCMC/GEO BON).

Apologies: Tanya Abrahamse (SANBI), Neville Ash (UNEP), Brigitte Baptiste (Humboldt), Joji Carino (IIFB), Jane Smart (IUCN) and Spencer Thomas (Govt Granada).

1. Welcome and opening remarks

The meeting was opened by Braulio Dias, Executive Secretary (ES) of the CBD and newly appointed chair of the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership. Braulio welcomed the members of the re-established Steering Committee, who were recently invited to join the Steering Committee by the CBD Executive Secretary and Director of UNEP-WCMC, Jon Hutton. He explained that the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP) has been further integrated into the CBD. As such, the CBD Secretariat will chair the Steering Committee with UNEP-WCMC continuing in its role as host to the BIP Secretariat.

In his opening statement, the chair reaffirmed his full commitment to work on indicators in order to monitor progress towards the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. He noted that despite progress being made, there are still some Aichi Targets without indicators. Major challenges also lie in engaging with Partners to facilitate access to the underlying indicator data.

The Steering Committee briefly discussed the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). There was agreement that IPBES, despite being in its early stages of establishment, is an important process for the BIP. The Steering Committee should continue to monitor its development to ensure that opportunities for cross-linkages with the BIP are identified.

2. Role of the BIP Steering Committee

Members reviewed the draft Terms of Reference for the Steering Committee. It was agreed that the main role of the BIP Steering Committee would be to provide advice and guidance to the BIP Secretariat. Specifically the Steering Committee would, as appropriate:

- Provide guidance on strategic direction and implementation of the BIP's work;
- Provide guidance on outcomes, activities and deliverables of the BIP;
- Assist in monitoring activities, outputs and outcomes of the Partnership;
- Make recommendations for the development of BIP materials and documentation;
- Oversee the review of documents and other outputs prepared under the aegis of the Partnership;
- Contribute as appropriate to workshops, meetings or other events organized by the BIP;
- Assist in the resolution of disputes for issues that might occur during the implementation of the BIP's objectives.

The Terms of Reference were approved by the Steering Committee and are available to view from the BIP website:

http://www.bipindicators.net/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=DSpF_f8DMqQ%3d&tabid=376&mid=4051

3. Role of Partners

Steering committee members reviewed the guidance document produced by the BIP Secretariat for global indicator Partners. This guidance was created to assist potential global indicator Partners in understanding the benefits of being an indicator partner, the criteria for acceptance and details of what being a Partner entails. Although initially created for potential new Partners the guidance is also applicable for existing Partners. As such indicator Partners were asked for their comments on the guidance at the BIP Technical Partnership Meeting in December 2012. The Steering Committee accepted the document and were happy with the outlined expectations of indicator Partners. The expectations include:

- Work with the BIP Secretariat to raise the profile and communicate the indicator/s via the Partnership website – this would involve the generation of content for the indicator webpage, including updates to the indicator information as and when appropriate.
- Contribute indicator information to, and review content for, the production of key BIP outputs, ranging from strategic information/position documents for Multilateral Environmental Agreements (e.g. CBD, Ramsar, CITES) to publications demonstrating progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.
- Submit indicator information through the conduit of the BIP to the Secretariat of the CBD for inclusion in the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-4) as requested by CBD SBSTTA 16 in [Recommendation XVI/2](#).

The Guidance for new indicator partners is available from the BIP website:

<http://www.bipindicators.net/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=48KdsYjZFaw%3d&tabid=158&mid=1575>

4. Challenges of monitoring implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and of assessing progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets

The Steering Committee discussed the challenges of monitoring progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. In Decision XI/3, the BIP is requested to support the Executive Secretary to *‘Further develop the global indicators identified in annex I ... with a view to ensuring that each Aichi Biodiversity Target can be monitored by at least one global indicator by 2014, taking into account indicators that are already in use by, or relevant to, other conventions, regional agreements and processes.’* In order to identify where gaps existed, the indicators brought together by the BIP for monitoring progress towards the 2010 Biodiversity Target were mapped to the new framework of Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Eleven of the 20 Aichi Targets could be monitored by at least one existing indicator which is classified as developed, and a further three Targets could be monitored by one or more existing indicators that are still in development.

In 2012, the BIP Secretariat mobilized efforts to identify existing global indicators (or indicator ready data sets) which could be utilized to fill gaps for monitoring the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Six new indicators and partners have already been brought in by the BIP Secretariat in 2012, including the Marine Stewardship Council with the Number of MSC Certified fisheries indicator covering Target 6. The other five indicators cover Targets 1, 8, 10 and 18.

The Steering Committee discussed how the remaining Aichi Target gaps could be filled. There was consensus amongst members that it is important to look beyond the traditional biodiversity partners in order to fill the monitoring gaps. It is also important that the indicators are not just meaningful for the environment community, but for agriculture, health, development, etc.

5. BIP Technical Partnership Meeting 2012

The Steering Committee was updated on the BIP Technical Partnership Meeting, which took place from 10-12 December in Cambridge, UK. The meeting provided the first opportunity for BIP Partners (existing, new and potential) to come together since the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. The main objectives of the meeting were to:

1. Report on progress of the BIP (Global and Regional-national component)
2. Review global indicator development status, opportunities and future requirements
3. Review CBD COP 11 decisions of relevance to the BIP
4. Develop a plan for supporting the CBD and other multilateral environmental processes
5. Consider the future direction and opportunities for the BIP

The meeting was well attended by BIP Partners who demonstrated clear ambition to monitor progress towards the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. The items covered during the partnership meeting included:

1. Updates on the BIP since 2010
2. Individual indicator updates and progress
3. Mapping indicators to Aichi Targets and identifying opportunities to fill gaps
4. How the BIP responds to CBD Decisions and requests
5. Update on regional and national capacity building work

6. Fundraising
7. Next steps

The major challenges communicated by Partners at the meeting were the lack of funds to support their indicator production and maintenance. The BIP Secretariat also noted the lack of funds for Secretariat functions and the coordination of global level activities. Fundraising was highlighted as a key priority for the Partnership and Partners requested that this be discussed by the Steering Committee.

The Minutes of the 2012 BIP Technical Partnership meeting are available to view online:

- Minutes: <http://www.bipindicators.net/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=OwxZenLXD58%3d&tabid=377&mid=4048>
- Annexes: <http://www.bipindicators.net/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=IPaMf5uk8FQ%3d&tabid=377&mid=4048>

6. BIP activities and future direction at global, regional and national levels

Steering committee discussions centered around the BIP Information Document (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/55), submitted to CBD COP11 to communicate what the BIP is currently doing and could do to respond to CBD SBSTTA 15 Recommendations (adopted at CBD COP 11), subject to available resources. In general, the Steering Committee was in agreement with the identified direction and activities for the BIP as set out in the Information Document. Key discussion points raised included the need to monitor the effectiveness of the BIP's regional and national capacity building work, and the need for this work to link to the work being carried out by different organizations.

The BIP Information Document for CBD COP 11 can be viewed online:

<http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/cop/cop-11/information/cop-11-inf-55-en.pdf>

7. Current funding situation and possible suggestions from the Steering Committee

The Steering Committee discussed and reviewed the list of unfunded activities produced by the BIP Secretariat. The document was produced to help identify the activities, both requested by the CBD and identified by the BIP Secretariat, for which funding needs to be found. The document should be seen as a first step in developing the fundraising strategy requested by BIP Partners at the 2012 Technical Partnership Meeting. The BIP currently has EC funds (ENRTP) for its capacity building work, but little for its global activities, and there is a need for creativity.

The Steering Committee felt that GEF-6 may provide useful funding opportunities, particularly for global level indicator development and communication. There was agreement that a mixed strategy is needed; identifying one or two major funding sources for global indicators and for national engagement, and some smaller sources for other activities. The Steering Committee will continue to review fundraising opportunities and will alert the BIP Secretariat of any developments.

Close of Meeting