



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/CHM/IAC/2019/1/3
16 July 2019

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REPORT ON THE MEETING OF THE INFORMAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CLEARING-HOUSE MECHANISM OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, 17-19 JUNE 2019

Summary

The Informal Advisory Committee to the Clearing-House Mechanism met in Montreal, Canada, from 17 to 19 June 2019. It provided recommendations to the Executive Secretary concerning: (a) award for national clearing-house mechanisms (CHM Award); (b) the online reporting tool; (c) support to national clearing-house mechanisms; (d) knowledge management; and (e) technical and scientific cooperation. These are provided in section I of the report.

The Informal Advisory Committee also reviewed and further developed the draft terms of reference for an informal advisory committee on technical and scientific cooperation, pursuant to paragraph 3 of recommendation SBI-2/8 of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. The revised draft terms of reference are contained in annex I under section I of the report.

The Executive Secretary may wish to take into account, as appropriate, the advice contained in the recommendations in the implementation of decisions of the Conference of the Parties and in the preparation of documents for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Cooperation at its twenty-third meeting, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting and Conference of the Parties at its fifteenth meeting.

The account of the proceedings of the meeting appears in section II of the report.

I. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

A. Award for national clearing-house mechanisms

1. Update the criteria issued for the second award process based on the feedback received from members of the Informal Advisory Committee to the Clearing-House Mechanism.
2. Convene a meeting of the CHM Awards jury before the end of August 2020, subject to the availability of resources, to select the Award winners.

B. Online reporting tool

3. Seek feedback from Parties on their experience using the online reporting tool and fix any technical issues, with a view to informing the development of the seventh national report format.
4. Fully utilize the expertise of the Informal Advisory Committee to the Clearing-House Mechanism in developing and testing any new features and improvements to the functionality of the online reporting tool.

C. Support to national clearing-house mechanisms

5. Continue to prioritize the development and implementation of the Bioland tool and provide support to Parties that wish to use the tool to develop their national clearing-house mechanism websites or redesign and improve existing ones.
6. Keep under review the level of support available to Parties as usage of the tool increases.
7. Increase, through interoperability and Application Programming Interfaces, the incorporation in the Bioland tool, of relevant information existing in different repositories, working with partner organizations, as appropriate.
8. Leverage regional organizations to support Parties to use the Bioland tool to establish or improve their national clearing-house mechanism websites.
9. Fully utilize the expertise of the sub-committee on Bioland of the Informal Advisory Committee to the Clearing-House Mechanism in the ongoing development and testing of the Bioland tool.

D. Knowledge management

10. Take into account the work of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services task force on knowledge and data in the development of the knowledge management component/strategy¹ for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
11. Consider the interlinkages between knowledge management, capacity-building, and technical and scientific cooperation when developing the above knowledge management component/strategy to ensure alignment and consistency.
12. Consult with biodiversity-related Conventions, the Rio conventions, and relevant organizations to ensure that the needs of the biodiversity community are reflected in the knowledge management component of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
13. Review and incorporate relevant elements of existing reports on knowledge management and information sharing submitted to the Conference of the Parties and its subsidiary bodies into the knowledge management component/strategy.²
14. Ensure that the language used in the draft knowledge management component/strategy is sensitive to indigenous peoples and local communities and their knowledge. For example, use of such terms as “knowledge capture” in reference to indigenous knowledge should be avoided.

E. Technical and scientific cooperation

15. Further develop the strategy to strengthen technical and scientific cooperation in support of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
16. Further consider the role of the Consortium of Scientific Partners on Biodiversity and other relevant groups and networks in development and implementation of the proposed strategy on technical and scientific cooperation.
17. Consider the updated draft terms of reference of the informal advisory committee on technical and scientific cooperation contained in annex I below and make them available for the consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting and the Conference of the Parties at its fifteenth meeting.

¹ The CHM-IAC members agreed to further consider and make a recommendation on whether to call the new document a knowledge management component or knowledge management strategy.

² CBD/SBI/2/INF/33, UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/8, for example.

*Annex I***Revised draft terms of reference of the Informal Advisory Committee on Technical and Scientific Cooperation³****1. Background**

1. Article 18 of the Convention on Biological Diversity requires Parties to promote technical and scientific cooperation in the field of conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, including cooperation in human resources development and institution building, development and use of relevant technologies (including indigenous and traditional technologies), training of personnel, exchange of experts, and establishment of joint research programmes and joint ventures for development of relevant technologies.

2. In decisions XIII/23, XIII/31, XII/2, X/16, IX/14, VIII/12 and VII/29, the Conference of the Parties adopted a number of measures and provided guidance on various aspects relating to technical and scientific cooperation and technology transfer.

3. In decision 14/24, the Conference of the Parties decided to consider establishing, at its fifteenth meeting, an informal advisory committee on technical and scientific cooperation, to be operational at the end of the mandate of the current Informal Advisory Committee to the Clearing-house Mechanism in 2020, to provide the Executive Secretary with advice on practical measures, tools and opportunities to promote technical and scientific cooperation for the effective implementation of the Convention.

2. Purpose

4. The Informal Advisory Committee on Technical and Scientific Cooperation shall provide advice to the Executive Secretary on ways and means to promote and facilitate technical and scientific cooperation, technology transfer, capacity building, knowledge management, and the clearing-house mechanism in support of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. In particular, the Informal Advisory Committee shall provide advice, guidance and recommendations on:

(a) Practical measures and approaches to promote technical and scientific cooperation for the effective implementation of the Convention;

(b) Measures to enhance collaboration with other biodiversity-related conventions and relevant organizations with respect to technical and scientific cooperation and technology transfer initiatives;

(c) Strategic and programmatic implementation of technical and scientific cooperation initiatives and programmes established under the Convention;

(d) Monitoring the implementation of the strategies on technical and scientific cooperation, capacity building and knowledge management in support of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to ensure coherence and consistency;

(e) Development and implementation of tools and mechanisms to promote and facilitate technical and scientific cooperation, capacity building and knowledge management;

(f) Matters relating to the clearing house-mechanism, and in particular, on how to improve its effectiveness as a mechanism to promote and facilitate technical and scientific cooperation and exchange of information;

(g) Potential opportunities for mobilizing technical and financial resources to promote and sustain technical and scientific cooperation activities.

5. The Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity will support the work of the Informal

³ Based on the draft contained in annex II of recommendation SBI-2/8: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/recommendations/sbi-02/sbi-02-rec-08-en.pdf>

Advisory Committee, including the provision of necessary logistical and secretarial support for its work.

3. Membership

6. The Informal Advisory Committee will be composed of experts nominated by Parties, with due regard to equitable regional representation and gender balance, as well as experts from indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations. The number of experts from organizations shall not exceed the number of experts nominated by Parties. Members shall be selected on the basis of the following criteria, as evidenced in their curriculum vitae:

(a) At least five years of working experience on technical and scientific issues related to the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and/or other biodiversity-related conventions;

(b) Expertise relevant to technical and scientific cooperation, capacity-building, and knowledge management and the clearing-house mechanism;

(c) Demonstrated experience with regional or international cooperation processes and programmes related to Biodiversity.

7. Members of the Informal Advisory Committee shall be selected through a formal nomination process based on the above criteria. The Executive Secretary may select experts knowledgeable in specific issues or thematic areas to be discussed at each of the Informal Advisory Committee meetings, ensuring a balance of experts on matters related to the Convention. The members shall serve in their personal capacity and not as representatives of a government, organization or other entity.

8. Members of the Informal Advisory Committee shall serve for a term of two years, with a possibility of renewal for one additional two-year term.

4. Modus operandi

9. The Advisory Committee will meet face-to-face at least once per year, subject to the availability of resources, wherever possible in the margins of other meetings. The frequency of meetings may be adjusted by the members as the need arises. The Committee will work intersessionally, as appropriate, via electronic means;

10. The Advisory Committee may, as appropriate, establish sub-committees to support it in addressing specific issues or thematic areas and co-opt relevant experts to assist;

11. The Advisory Committee members shall not receive any honorarium, fee or other remuneration from the United Nations. However, costs for the participation of Committee members nominated by developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition will be covered, in line with the rules and regulations of the United Nations;

12. The Informal Advisory Committee shall elect a Chair to steer its meetings on a rotational basis.

13. The working language of the Committee shall be English.

II. ACCOUNT OF PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION

1. The Informal Advisory Committee to the Clearing-House Mechanism met at the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Montreal, Canada, from 17 to 19 June 2019.

Attendance

2. The meeting was attended by the following members and observers:

No.	Party	Member
1	Belgium	Mr. Han de Koeijer - Chair
2	Canada	Mr. Charles Shulman ⁴
3	Jamaica	Ms. Suzanne Davis ⁵
4	Morocco	Mr. Mostafa Madbouhi
5	Serbia	Mr. Slaviša Popović
6	Ukraine	Ms. Yuliya Bondarenko
7	Sri Lanka	Ms. H. M. H. E. Herath
	Partner organization	Member
8	ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity	Ms. Sheila Vergara
9	UNEP-WCMC	Mr. Jerry Harrison
		Observer
9	Canada	Ms. Dana Dinardo
9	Global Biodiversity Information Forum	Mr. Tim Hirsch

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

3. The meeting was opened at 9.30 a.m. on Monday, 17 June 2019, by Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp, Director of the Implementation Support Division of the Secretariat. She welcomed everyone on behalf of Ms. Cristiana Paşca Palmer, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity. She informed participants that the Secretariat was engaged in consultations with multiple stakeholder groups and working tirelessly to prepare the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

4. Ms. Mathur-Filipp noted that the meeting was being held at a critical time in the history of the Convention and its Protocols as we wound down the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and embarked on preparations for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. She recalled that at its last meeting, the Conference of the Parties made several requests to this committee to provide further advice to the Executive Secretary in support of efforts to, not only accelerate implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, but also to prepare the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

5. Therefore, the Executive Secretary was anticipating advice on the implementation of the clearing-house mechanism work programme and, in particular, guidance on the ongoing development, deployment and use by Parties of the Bioland Tool and on the preparation of the final round of awards for national clearing-house mechanisms. In this regard, she extended gratitude to the Awards Jury for the

⁴ Attended remotely via Skype on 17 and 18 June 2019.

⁵ Attended remotely via Skype on 17 and 18 June 2019.

successful second round of Awards that were presented last year at the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Also, members would be providing advice on matters relating to technical and scientific cooperation, including draft terms of reference for an informal advisory committee on technical and scientific cooperation as well as views and suggestions on the proposed draft strategy to strengthen technical and scientific cooperation in support of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Finally, in line with decision 14/25, the committee was invited to provide advice on the development of a knowledge management component as a part of the preparatory process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

6. At the 1st session of the meeting, on 17 June 2019, chaired by Mr. Han de Koeijer (Belgium), the Informal Advisory Committee to the Clearing-House Mechanism took up consideration of the agenda of the meeting.

7. The Committee adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda prepared by the Executive Secretary (CBD/CHM/2019/1/1):

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
 - 2.1. Adoption of the agenda;
 - 2.2. Organization of work.
3. Updates on standing items:
 - 3.1. Award for national clearing-house mechanisms;
 - 3.2. Web strategy for the Convention and its Protocols;
 - 3.3. Online reporting tool;
 - 3.4. Interoperability;
 - 3.5. Support to national clearing-house mechanisms;
 - 3.6. Partners' contributions to the clearing-house mechanism.
4. Issues for in-depth consideration:
 - 4.1. Technical and scientific cooperation (decision 14/24);
 - 4.2. Knowledge management under the Convention and its Protocols (decision 14/25);
 - 4.3. Additional issues.
5. Others matters.
6. Conclusions and recommendations.
7. Conclusions and recommendations.

8. The Secretariat suggested that deliberations on item 3.2 on the Web strategy for the Convention and its Protocols, be deferred for discussion until later in the proceedings pending the return from mission of the substantive staff member responsible for this item.

ITEM 3. UPDATES ON STANDING ITEMS

3.1 Award for national clearing-house mechanisms

9. At the 1st session of the meeting, on 17 June 2019, the Informal Advisory Committee took up agenda item 3.1 on award for national clearing-house mechanisms. In considering the item, the Committee had before it a note by the Executive Secretary providing a progress report and updates on the clearing-

house mechanism (CBD/CHM/2019/1/2) with an annex containing the feedback provided by the Awards Jury based on their deliberations during the second round of Awards that concluded at the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Committee members discussed the process for the third round of clearing-house mechanism awards that would take place at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Chair thanked the United Nations Environment Programme's World Conservation Monitoring Centre for hosting the Jury during its deliberations for selecting winners for the second round of the Award. Mr. Jerry Harrison of the UNEP-WCMC extended an invitation to host the jury deliberations for the third round.

10. The Secretariat reminded the Committee that the notification to announce the third round of national clearing-house mechanism awards would have to be issued by 31 July 2019 to allow Parties sufficient time to apply for the awards. The Chair invited Committee members to send comments on the criteria for assessing the Award applications to the Secretariat before the end of the meeting.

11. The Committee then considered the overall success of the award process. The Chair invited award winners present to provide feedback, including the impact the award process had on the development and maintenance of their respective national clearing-houses. Overall, it was reported that the process had a positive effect, including increased awareness and visibility of their national clearing-houses. It was noted that such increased awareness and visibility was crucial to securing the ongoing allocation of resources to maintain their national clearing-houses. However, one member observed that the slow progress with the development and roll-out of the Bioland tool to develop or migrate existing clearing-houses to the tool had had a negative impact as countries await the availability of the tool to develop or migrate existing clearing-houses to the tool and/or update content and information.

12. A draft recommendation was prepared for review by the Committee at its fifth session, on 19 June 2019.

3.2 Web strategy for the Convention and its Protocols

13. The Committee considered agenda item 3.2 on the web strategy for Convention and its Protocols during its second and fourth sessions. Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp of the Secretariat provided an update on the new Convention website. She reported that it was hoped that the new home page would be launched prior to the opening of the first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework to be held in August 2019. She outlined the steps the Secretariat had taken to make this happen including the recruitment of an individual contractor specifically to assist with the migration of content and she provided other human resource related recruitment updates.

14. Mr. Frédéric Vogel of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, who had attended the InforMEA Steering Committee meeting the previous week in Switzerland, updated members on the meeting outcomes, including updates on the InforMEA activities, the Data and Reporting Tool (DART) project and use of the Akoma-Ntoso⁶ format adopted for United Nations documents. He noted that the meeting coincided with its tenth anniversary and the launching of the second phase of the InforMEA project.

15. Mr. Vogel also made a presentation of the new CBD website and outlined the plan to migrate content to the new platform.

3.3 Online reporting tool

16. During the first session of the meeting, the Committee also took up agenda item 3.3. In considering the item, the Committee had before it a note by the Executive Secretary (CBD/CHM/2019/1/2). As well, the Secretariat provided a verbal update of the enhancements made to the tool in support of the online submission of the sixth national reports. Some of the enhancements included

⁶ Akoma Ntoso (Architecture for Knowledge-Oriented Management of African Normative Texts using Open Standards and Ontologies) is an international technical standard for representing executive, legislative and judiciary documents in a structured manner.

enabling Parties to share draft versions of their report with anonymous users which allowed for multiple updates. Another feature was to allow a Party to publish this as one document instead of a series of documents. The Secretariat reported that it had by then received 60 reports online and 20 offline.

17. Committee members shared their experience in using the tool to submit their sixth national reports, including the technical difficulties encountered. This feedback provided the basis of the recommendation to the Executive Secretary on this agenda sub-item.

3.4 Interoperability

18. The Secretariat, referring to the information provided in document CBD/CHM/2019/1/2, noted the progress in the development and use of the Application Programming Interface (API). It was reported that several Parties were using the API developed by the Secretariat on their Access and Benefit-Sharing Clearing-house. In the subsequent discussion, Committee members noted that the API available through InforMEA and Bioland still needed further work.

3.5 Support to national clearing-house mechanisms

19. The Secretariat introduced this item with a presentation on the current status of the ongoing development of the Bioland tool, supplementing the information provided in document CBD/CHM/2019/1/2. It was reported that the subregional workshop on National Clearing-House Mechanisms for Member States of the Gulf Cooperation Council held in Saudi Arabia in April 2019 provided useful feedback for version 3 of the Bioland tool, including on the new “contributor role” feature⁷ and on the translation features.

20. Another recent development reported was the approval by the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) of the project: “Use of the clearing-house mechanism infrastructure and network to strengthen biodiversity data acquisition and data sharing”. The project would be implemented by France (Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle) and Belgium (Royal Institute of Natural Sciences) with support from the CBD Secretariat. Through the project, 10 Parties⁸ would migrate their existing national clearing-house mechanism websites to the Bioland tool. Additional interoperability features would be developed in the Bioland tool that would allow for individual countries’ biodiversity information from GBIF to display on their national CHM website.

21. During the discussion, Committee members expressed their disappointment that the Bioland sub-committee was not fully utilized in the development and testing of newer features of the Bioland tool. It was agreed that the sub-committee would further review and test the new features so that version 3 of the Bioland tool would be available as soon as possible. A recommendation related to support to national clearing-house mechanisms is provided above.

3.6 Partners’ contributions to the clearing-house mechanism

22. During the afternoon session, the Committee heard reports from the partner members and observers present regarding their recent activities supporting the clearing-house mechanism services and the development of national clearing-house mechanisms.

23. Mr. Tim Hirsch, Deputy Director, Head of Participation and Engagement at GBIF, who had been invited as an observer to the meeting, described in more detail the GBIF project outlined in paragraph 20 above. He noted that the main objective of the project was to establish closer links between the GBIF community and national nodes and the national clearing-house mechanisms, particularly in relation to mobilization and facilitation of access to primary species data which GBIF specializes in. He noted that creating better links between national clearing-house mechanisms and the information already available

⁷ This feature allows authorized users to populate the national CHM website with draft content for review and approval by the administrator before it is made public/published.

⁸ The 10 countries are: Belgium, Benin, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, France, Guinea, Madagascar, Mauritania, Niger and Togo.

through the GBIF Integrated Publishing Toolkit (IPT) would enhance the global network of biodiversity information.

24. Mr. Jerry Harrison briefed the meeting on various ongoing work streams at the United Nations Environment Programme's World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC). In addition to the activities described in the previous presentations, he referenced the ongoing work related to the UNEP world situation room.⁹ He also reported that UNEP-WCMC was working closely with the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) taskforce on support tools noting that this platform was only just coming together. He also referenced a technical scientific cooperation project with Morocco to build a national biodiversity platform. UNEP-WCMC was also working on capacity-building projects on ecosystem assessments in 8 countries. Mr. Harrison informed the Committee that he had taken part in the consultation workshop of biodiversity-related conventions on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, held in Bern, from 10 to 12 June 2019. He noted that participants had expressed much interest in working across conventions on enabling issues, such as resource mobilization, capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation, and communication.

25. Ms. Sheila Vergara, a Committee member from the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Biodiversity Centre, made a presentation on the overall situation of ASEAN member States regarding the development of national clearing-house mechanisms. She noted that both Malaysia and Indonesia had won an award for their national clearing-house mechanisms. There was interest from member States in using the Bioland tool to migrate their existing national clearing-house mechanisms or develop new ones. In that regard, she requested the Secretariat to provide her technical staff with access to the Bioland tool to enable them to provide support for countries in the region. ASEAN had established a regional clearing-house mechanism and was considering options to better support the development of the ASEAN biodiversity outlook, which would be published after all members had submitted their sixth national reports. She gave a report on the status of submission of the sixth national reports.

ITEM 4. ISSUES FOR IN-DEPTH DISCUSSION

4.1 Technical and scientific cooperation

26. The Committee took up agenda item 4.1 on technical and scientific cooperation during the fourth and fifth sessions of the meeting. Prior to the deliberations on the item, a representative of the Secretariat made a presentation of the draft proposed strategy to strengthen technical and scientific cooperation in support of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework based on a zero-draft note prepared in response to paragraph 9 of decision 14/24.¹⁰ The note also contained draft terms of reference for a new informal advisory committee on technical and scientific cooperation that the Conference of the Parties will consider establishing at its fifteenth meeting.

27. Discussions started with the consideration of the draft strategy for technical and scientific cooperation. Members of the Committee noted that there might be potential overlaps between the proposed technical and scientific cooperation strategy and the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020 being developed by the Secretariat pursuant to decision 14/24, paragraph 1. Concerns were raised about potential confusion over issues of responsibility, funding and reporting that such overlaps might create. They stressed the need for alignment of the proposed technical and scientific cooperation strategy with other relevant strategies under the Convention, including the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and the knowledge management component of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (see item 4.2 below).

28. Members also discussed the potential role of the Consortium of Scientific Partners on Biodiversity (CSP) in the development and implementation of the proposed strategy, as well as its relationship with other networks. It was noted that many communities of practice were active on different biodiversity-

⁹ https://environmentlive.unep.org/media/html/situation/situation_room.html#

¹⁰ The presentation is available at: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/822f/646e/7c4458b10a6193b8143a9ea7/chm-iac-2019-01-tsc-presentation-en.pdf>.

related topics and attention should be given to how they could be mobilized to work together in support of the proposed strategy.

29. It was noted that many recent technical and scientific cooperation initiatives under the Convention (such as the Life Web Initiative, the Bio-Bridge Initiative, and the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative) had been established as stand-alone legacy initiatives of the respective COP presidencies and did not fit into an overarching strategy. It was also noted that many activities were being developed but not scaled up. Reference was also made to areas of focus of the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN), which included biodiversity and ecosystems. It was recommended that cooperation with CTCN and other relevant multilateral environment agreements (MEAs) and networks should be explored and strengthened, as appropriate.

30. A number of comments were made regarding the need to scale up projects and actions that had proven to work while identifying new innovative solutions. In that regard, the importance of promoting indigenous technologies was also stressed.

31. Another important issue discussed was the question of funding. Members emphasized the need for the draft strategy to clearly articulate different streams of work that would require funding. For example, it was recognized that, for matchmaking between Parties requiring assistance and providers of technical assistance to work, substantial funding would be required to sustain partnerships, as the experience of the Bio-Bridge Initiative and the IPBES Matchmaking Facility had demonstrated. The need for adequate staffing to facilitate and support technical and scientific cooperation was also highlighted.

32. Members also discussed in detail the proposed institutional arrangements for promoting technical and scientific cooperation in support of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including the envisaged establishment of advisory and operational entities. Members requested the Secretariat to further clarify in the draft strategy how the proposed entities would interact with one another and with the Secretariat, including the reporting lines. They also requested clarification from the Secretariat on whether the operational entity would be an entirely new and autonomous body or whether an existing partner organization would be designated or contracted to serve as the operational entity.

33. Members also discussed the draft terms of reference for the new informal advisory committee on technical and scientific cooperation, in line with recommendation SBI 2/8, paragraph 3. The Secretariat noted that several informal advisory committees had been established on different thematic areas over the years, thus stretching the limited resources of the Secretariat. It was also noted that the proliferation of committees and other bodies increased the risk of working in silos and duplicating efforts. Members reviewed the terms of reference section by section and recommended various improvements. Among other things, it was suggested that the Advisory Committee could, as appropriate, establish subcommittees to support it in addressing specific issues or thematic areas, such as technical and scientific cooperation, capacity-building, the clearing-house mechanism, and knowledge management, and co-opt relevant experts to assist, as needed.

34. The chair requested the Secretariat to update draft terms of reference based on the initial round of feedback and circulate the revised version to all members for their final comments before making them available for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting. The revised terms of reference are presented in section I above.

35. The members of the Committee recommended that membership of the Committee be expanded beyond 15 to cover such a broad range of issues. This would help foster synergies and coherence among different work streams while reducing the number of informal advisory committees to improve efficiency.

4.2 Knowledge management

36. The Committee took up agenda item 4.2 on knowledge management under the Convention during the fourth session of the meeting. Prior to the deliberations on this item, a representative of the Secretariat made a presentation on draft elements of the proposed knowledge management component of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework based on a zero-draft note prepared in response to paragraphs 4(h),

4(g) and 4(h) of decision 14/25.¹¹ It was noted that the draft component was intended to be global in scope and would potentially provide strategic direction for knowledge management until 2050. The Secretariat described the rationale for developing a long-term knowledge management strategy, identified potential challenges for its implementation and outlined possible draft elements of the knowledge management component. At the end of the presentation, the Secretariat invited members of the Committee to provide advice on the following questions, among other issues:

(a) Should the knowledge management component be in form of a strategy with concrete actions and deliverables or a framework document to guide knowledge management in the post-2020 period?

(b) What elements of the proposed draft knowledge management component are missing? What gaps still need not addressed?

(c) What tasks should be carried out by the Secretariat and which ones should be carried out by Parties and partner organizations?

(d) What should the role of the CHM-IAC or its successor with respect to knowledge management in the post-2020 period?

(e) How should other key stakeholders, such as the Global Biodiversity Information Facility, the Digital Observatory for Protected Areas (DOPA), UNEP, UNEP-WCMC, Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), academic institutions, and others be engaged for advice and input?

37. Following the presentation, Committee members raised a number of points for further consideration by the Secretariat. They agreed that the knowledge management component should be global in scope and should incorporate or cross-reference the knowledge management work done by other biodiversity-related Conventions and relevant organizations. This would make the component inclusive and aligned with international priorities. It was also recognized that implementation of the component would be a responsibility of not only the Secretariat but also Governments, relevant organizations and stakeholders dealing with biodiversity. In that regard, it was recommended that the responsibilities of the various actors should be identified in the document.

38. Members advised the Secretariat to review relevant reports on knowledge management and information sharing submitted by relevant organizations to the Conference of the Parties and its subsidiaries for reference and incorporation, as appropriate into the new component. For example, it was noted that UNEP-WCMC had produced a compendium of guidance for capturing, managing and using biodiversity data and information and a compendium of guidance on key global databases related to biodiversity-related conventions. The IPBES task force on knowledge and data was also highlighted as a relevant and potential collaborator, especially regarding the knowledge-sharing aspect. On that point, members emphasized that findability of information and effective discovery mechanisms were crucial elements of the proposed knowledge management component.

39. Furthermore, members encouraged the Secretariat to consider the interconnection between knowledge management, technical and scientific cooperation, and capacity-building strategies under the Convention. It was noted that those elements were frequently grouped together in documents prepared for the meetings of the Conference of the Parties and advised that internal alignment between strategies would bolster cohesion. The Committee also discussed the future relationship between the draft knowledge management component and the clearing-house mechanism.

40. Committee members also highlighted the need for sensitivity in the use of terminology, especially in relation to indigenous and local knowledge. For example, it was noted that such terms as “gathering” and “capturing” knowledge could be inappropriate and unproductive when referring to indigenous and

¹¹ The presentation is available at: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/4668/fed6/de8f425c116468ee98da0e77/chm-iac-2019-01-km-presentation-en.pdf>.

local knowledge. In that regard, such terminology as “knowledge generation”, “maintenance”, and “support” was preferable. It was noted that indigenous peoples and local communities were important generators and keepers of knowledge relating to biodiversity and its conservation and sustainable use.

41. With regard to the question whether the knowledge management component should be referred to as a knowledge management strategy, members agreed to submit their views later in writing.

ITEM 5. OTHER MATTERS

42. Under this agenda item, the chair reviewed the deadlines for providing further input on various agenda items and requested the Secretariat to email the dates to the members so that they would have them immediately at the close of the meeting.

43. The chair asked which members would be present at the forthcoming twenty-third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and eleventh meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions, to be held in November 2019. Given that at least five members of the Committee would be present, it was agreed that a face-to-face meeting of the Committee would be held in the margins of the Subsidiary Body meeting, with any members not present being linked remotely.

ITEM 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

44. Under this agenda item, the Committee reviewed the draft recommendations prepared by the Secretariat and made adjustments.

ITEM 6. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

45. The chair closed the meeting on 19 June 2019 at 1 pm.
