



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/EW.DCBI/2/3
1 October 2010

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SECOND EXPERT WORKSHOP ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY BIODIVERSITY INDEX

Singapore City, 1-3 July 2010

REPORT OF THE SECOND EXPERT WORKSHOP ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY BIODIVERSITY INDEX

Note by the Executive Secretary

INTRODUCTION

A. *Background*

1. At its ninth meeting, held in Bonn in May 2008, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted decision IX/8, in paragraph 8 (r) of which it proposed that the activities supporting the national biodiversity strategy and action plan (NBSAP) processes might make use of or develop, as appropriate, regional, subregional or subnational networks to support implementation of the Convention. More specifically, through its decision IX/28, the Conference of the Parties recognized the role of cities and local authorities and the fact that the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) requires close collaboration with subnational levels of government.

2. In light of the above, the Minister for National Development of Singapore and host of the World Cities Summit of June 2008, Mr Mah Bow Tan, proposed the establishment of an index to measure biodiversity in cities, at the high level segment of the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in Bonn, on 27 May 2008. Following up on his announcement, the first expert workshop on the development of the City Biodiversity Index (the "Singapore Index") took place from 10 to 12 February 2009, at the Singapore Botanic Gardens, and was co-organized by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the National Parks Board of Singapore (NParks). The framework was developed with 25 indicators grouped under three components – Native Biodiversity in the City, Ecosystem Services Provided by Native Biodiversity in the City, and Governance and Management of Native Biodiversity in the City.

3. Since the first expert workshop, the City Biodiversity Index (CBI) was presented at various forums including:

(a) Urban Nature Forum organised by ICLEI-Local Governments for Sustainability on 14-18 June 2009 in Edmonton, Canada. The draft User's Manual for CBI was posted at the CBD website in November 2009 (<http://cdn.www.cbd.int/doc/groups/cities/user-manual-singapore-index-2009-11-21-en.pdf>).

(b) Second Curitiba Meeting on Cities and Biodiversity held on 6-7 January 2010 in Curitiba, Brazil. The cities of Curitiba, Montreal, Nagoya and Singapore shared experiences on their preliminary testing of CBI. The CBI was highlighted as one of the tools which cities could use for local biodiversity management and monitoring in the Towards Aichi/ Nagoya: Second Curitiba Declaration on Local Authorities and Biodiversity (<http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/city/mayors-02/official/mayors-02-02-en.doc>).

(c) ASEAN Workshop on CBI held on 27-29 April 2010, in Singapore. The workshop hosted by NParks in collaboration with the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity promoted the use of CBI to participating cities in the ASEAN Initiative on Environmentally Sustainable Cities. A total of 17 cities participated and shared their preliminary experience on testing CBI.

(d) URBIO2010 (Urban Biodiversity and Design Conference) with the theme “Urban Biodiversity in the Ecological Network” was held on 18-22 May 2010 in Nagoya, Japan. The CBI was presented to the scientific network in a dedicated workshop on CBI.

4. The second expert workshop on the development of CBI took place on 1-3 July 2010, at the Singapore Botanic Gardens, and was co-organized by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and NParks. The workshop was organized in close consultation with the members of the Global Partnership on Cities and Biodiversity.¹

5. The objectives of the workshop were to:

- (a) Review comments by cities which have test-bedded the index;
- (b) Refine and improve the indicators of CBI; and
- (c) Finalize the User’s Manual for CBI.

6. The workshop was held in English.

B. Attendance

7. A total of thirty-two technical experts on urban biodiversity conservation and planning as well as city representatives responsible for implementation and/or management of biodiversity and urban projects and programmes attended the workshop. The list of participants is available as annex I.

ITEMS 1 AND 2. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP AND ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

8. The workshop opened at 9 a.m. on 1 July 2010 at the Singapore Botanic Gardens. Dr. Leong Chee Chiew, Deputy Chief Executive Officer of NParks welcomed the participants, followed by Mr. Oliver Hillel, Programme Officer of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD), who briefly highlighted the background and objectives of the workshop.

9. Participants adopted the agenda with minor amendments prepared by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/EW.DCBI/2/1) as follows:

- 1. Opening of the workshop.
- 2. Organizational matters:

^{1/} For more information on the Global Partnership on Cities and Biodiversity, please see <http://www.cbd.int/authorities/Gettinginvolved/GlobalPartnership.shtml>.

- 2.1 Adoption of the agenda;
 - 2.2 Organization of work and overview of the objective and programme.
 3. Presentation of the results of the test-bedding and review of the indicators of the City Biodiversity Index.
 4. Conclusion and the way forward: next steps and responsibilities.
 5. Closure of the workshop.
10. Dr. Lena Chan of NParks and Mr. Oliver Hillel of SCBD acted as Co-chairs of the workshop.

ITEM 3. PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE TEST-BEDDING BY CITIES AND REVIEW OF THE INDICATORS OF THE CITY BIODIVERSITY INDEX

The city representatives of Brussels, Curitiba, Edmonton, Montreal, Nagoya, Waitakere City and Singapore presented results of their respective test-bedding of CBI. Ms. Wendy Yap of NParks reported the key outcomes of the ASEAN Workshop on CBI. The presentations highlighted both common and specific challenges that cities faced when testing CBI. The common concerns include the need for more clarity by providing definitions and clear explanations to guide users in testing the indicators; need to adjust the threshold and range for some of the scoring; lack of data availability, accessibility and reliability to score some of the indicators. The specific concerns of the respective cities are highlighted below.

11. Ms. Machteld Gryseels, Brussels, Belgium, noted that one of the concerns, also shared by cities in the temperate zone, was the lower level of biodiversity present in such areas in comparison with cities in the tropical zone, which may have an impact on the overall score.
12. Mr. Alfredo Trindade, Curitiba, Brazil, suggested a review of Indicator 3 to better reflect fragmentation measures as Curitiba despite having a large forest area within the city scored zero point.
13. Mr. William Grant Pearsell, Edmonton, Canada, highlighted that the objectives of the index had to be clearly stated. He added that there was a need to engage non-technical people such as the members of the city council and city residents to secure their involvement in biodiversity conservation efforts. He also mentioned that cities that consistently score poorly might lack motivation to use CBI for future assessment.
14. Mr. Daniel Hodder, Montreal, Canada, noted that they had yet to complete the test-bedding as they are still in the process of data collection. He shared that CBI is being used as a tool in Montreal's new Biodiversity and Greening Strategy, and echoed Mr. Pearsell's comment on the need to include a broader range of non-technical stakeholders in implementing urban biodiversity conservation efforts.
15. Mr. Masashi Kato, Nagoya, Japan, shared in great detail the scoring results and comments and also proposed improvements to the index, such as recalibrating the scoring thresholds. They advocated flexibility in using the index by proposing a small number of common, core indicators as well as allowing cities to develop their own additional indicators.
16. Dr. Graeme Herbert Campbell, Waitakere City, New Zealand, raised the usage of species extinction rate as a possible indicator.

17. Dr. Lena Chan, Singapore, clarified terminologies and scoring thresholds for some of the indicators.

18. Ms Gwendolyn Hallsmith, Montpelier, Vermont, USA commented that CBI could also be used as a communication tool which could provide guidance for cities to start new initiatives to support and protect biodiversity.

19. Participants contributed detailed feedback on each indicator which resulted in some of the indicators substantially amended. The amended CBI is attached as annex II. There were concerns about discrepancies in scoring due to inherent differences among cities which , but it was decided that the quantitative scoring as well as the ‘traffic light’ system continue to be used. The participants agreed that the index was intended as a self-assessment tool and should not be used to compare between cities. Although there were some concerns expressed on using a quantitative method due to inherent differences among cities, it was agreed that the quantitative method of scoring would be maintained along with a “traffic light” system as they could be used to communicate CBI as a monitoring tool. There were also good ideas and proposal for new indicators which may be considered and further developed for the next phase of CBI. -.

ITEM 4. CONCLUSION AND THE WAY FORWARD: NEXT STEPS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

20. Participants noted that cities would be encouraged to test-bed the amended CBI before the tenth Conference of Parties (COP-10) of CBD. A number of participants agreed to assist with getting more cities to test-bed CBI. Additionally, participants also noted the need to engage a broader range of stakeholders to support the test bedding of the index by cities. The participants were requested to visit CBD’s website (<http://www.cbd.int/authorities/>) for more information on the Global Partnership on Cities and Biodiversity, CBI and the draft CBD Plan of Action on Cities, Local Authorities and Biodiversity 2011-2020. The revised version of User’s Manual for the City Biodiversity Index has been developed reflecting discussions at and after this workshop. The electronic version is available at: <http://www.cbd.int/authorities/doc/User%27s%20Manual-for-the-City-Biodiversity-Index27Sept2010.pdf>

21. Participants were informed of the following key meetings, where there will be opportunities to communicate on CBI:

- (a) September 2010 (to be confirmed) - Meeting with key partners to discuss the draft CBD Plan of Action on Cities, Local Authorities and Biodiversity in Montpellier, France
- (b) 18-29 October 2010 – COP-10
 - 24-26 October 2010 – City Biodiversity Summit
 - 27-29 October 2010 – High-Level Segment of COP-10

22. Participants noted that CBI has potential broader applications, for example to support the economic evaluation of ecosystems services provided by biodiversity. The proposals in terms of the implementation of CBI in the longer term included:

- (a) Biennial meetings;
- (b) Standing item in future City Biodiversity Summits which is planned back to back with COPs;
- (c) CBI reporting as part of future World Cities Summits;

- (d) CBI reporting to be included as part of Parties' national reporting process to the CBD every 4 years.
23. NParks arranged a field trip to the Sungei Buloh Wetland Reserve on 3 July 2010.

ITEM 5. CLOSURE OF THE WORKSHOP

24. The workshop was closed at 5.45 p.m. on 3 July 2010.