



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/CSAB/3/3
19 October 2009

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CHAIRS OF THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BODIES OF BIODIVERSITY-RELATED CONVENTIONS

Third meeting
Nairobi, 4 October 2009

REPORT OF THE THIRD MEETING OF CHAIRS OF SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BODIES OF BIODIVERSITY-RELATED CONVENTIONS

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

1. The meeting was opened by Mr. Linus Spencer Thomas, Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), who welcomed participants, referred to a tight agenda for the meeting, and invited the representative of the President of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Mr. Jochen Flasbarth, to share his thoughts.

2. Mr. Flasbarth underlined the importance of scientific advice for decision-making and said that cooperation between bodies was essential for the effective delivery of policy-relevant science. He considered that the idea of an Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), which would be discussed over the following days, would support and strengthen the work of the conventions' scientific advisory bodies by streamlining information for political decision-making. He referred to the science on climate change and the need for clearer understanding of the links between biodiversity and climate change to inform decisions about the establishment of a mechanism to Reduce Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) or REDD+. He welcomed the preparations for the International Year of Biodiversity (IYB), which already generated visibility for biodiversity, and considered this an outstanding opportunity for the biodiversity-related Conventions to put biodiversity high on the political agenda. And while the celebrations and outreach efforts were important it was essential to remain founded on a sound science basis. In this sense, the third edition of Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-3) would provide a solid updated assessment of status and trends in biodiversity and threats to biodiversity as well as a review of progress in implementation. He referred to the meetings of Chairs of Scientific Advisory Bodies (CSAB) as a mechanism that could ensure that biodiversity science goes beyond the remit of the CBD and encouraged that more meetings of CSAB be held in the future.

3. Mr. Thomas thanked Mr. Flasbarth for his remarks and for his exceptional efforts as the representative of the President of the Conference of the Parties, noting that no less than six meetings of the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties had been held since the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

4. Mr. Ibrahim Thiaw, Director of the Division of Environmental Policy Implementation of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP/DEPI), which also coordinates work in the Priority Area on Ecosystem Management, welcomed participants to the meeting. He made reference to the [forthcoming IPBES meeting](#). He also drew attention to a meeting on the follow-up to the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, which was being held in parallel. He reported that the Senior Management Team of the

/...

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) had decided to allocated US\$ 500,000 for IYB-related activities and that additional funds could be expected. He said UNEP is ready to contribute to the IYB activities and that the Year represented an opportunity for UNEP to enhance its communication capacities. He also made reference to the meeting of the Ad hoc Working Group of the Whole on the “assessment of assessments” of the marine environment held in New York from 31 August to 4 September and the call for a regular process for the reporting and assessment of the state of the marine environment, including socio-economic aspects.

5. Ms. Maryam Niamir-Fuller, Director of the Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination (UNEP/DGEF), made reference to the Global Environment Facility fifth replenishment and the discussions on strategic priorities for the GEF. While the GEF already supports individual conventions she saw opportunities to increase the impact of GEF support if synergies between conventions are fully realized. In this context, she encouraged the continuing interaction with the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) for the GEF, which is hosted by UNEP.

6. Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaif, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity thanked UNEP for hosting the meeting and for facilitating the participation of the other conventions. He thanked the representatives of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) and the Ramsar Convention for their presence. He said that while there was a need to reform the system of global environmental governance, all efforts and small steps should be undertaken to optimize work and outcomes within the current system. He recalled that the [seventh meeting of the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions \(BLG-7\)](#) had reconfirmed CSAB as an important coordination mechanism and had called for this meeting. He thanked Tone Solhaug for her commitment to SBSTTA and the support of Norway for activities both under the Convention on Biological Diversity and in favour of coordinated efforts of biodiversity instruments more generally. He paid tribute to Spencer Thomas for his role in guiding SBSTTA and his contributions in the joint meetings of the Bureaux of SBSTTA and COP. He recalled that the first joint meeting (Berlin, 27 November 2008) had adopted the Nagoya Roadmap, while the second meeting on 7 November 2009 would consider the draft GBO-3 and the progress in updating the Strategic Plan. He said that although the Strategic Plan is for the Convention on Biological Diversity, the targets should embrace the interests and priorities of the entire biodiversity community, be relevant to all partners and engage them in the implementation of the post-Nagoya compact. He then welcomed Constanza Martinez (IUCN) and thanked IUCN for the support and inputs in the various CBD processes, including the facilitation of regional consultations on the Strategic Plan. He said the International Regime on Access and Benefit-Sharing (ABS) would pose fundamental challenges also to scientific community and expressed his hope that the second meeting on IPBES would lead to concrete results. In closing he introduced Ms Louise Vachon from Montréal International which supports the international organizations located in Montreal and thereby greatly facilitates the work of the Secretariat and the Convention.

ITEM 2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

7. The meeting agreed to proceed on the basis of the proposed agenda.

ITEM 3. DEVELOPMENT OF POST-2010 BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

8. Mr. Robert Hoft reported on the status of preparations of the new Strategic Plan and post-2010 targets. He recalled decision IX/9 which lays out a time table and process for updating the Strategic Plan and referred to the consultations undertaken to date, including an electronic forum, a range of meetings, and written submissions from Parties organizations and other stakeholders. In June 2009 these had been reflected in a [Synthesis/Analysis of Views on the Updated and Revised Strategic Plan for the Convention after 2010](#). Review comments had been invited on this document and additional meetings were held since early June which would be reflected in an update of that note to be issued after the joint meeting of SBSTTA and COP Bureaux in early November 2009. He made reference to the meeting of 2 and 3

October in post-2010 targets and thanked UNEP for arranging and hosting this meeting. Based on suggestions from the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the meeting had for the first time discussed concrete proposals for a 2050 vision, 2020 target(s) and concrete measurable subtargets. While the purpose of the meeting had not been to agree on text, the group felt a formulation for a 2050 vision could be along the following lines: “Biodiversity is maintained and restored, to secure a healthy planet and to deliver essential benefits for sustainable development and human wellbeing for all”. Good progress had also been made on possible 2020 targets and subtargets with support for the ideas that: (i) targets should be relevant beyond the Convention on Biological Diversity and facilitate engagement with other partners and stakeholders; (ii) they should be hierarchically linked from a limited number of concrete subtargets, through an overall 2020 target or targets to the 2050 vision, be clearly founded in science and be measurable; (iii) it is helpful to arrange targets and indicators along a Driver-Pressure-State-Impact/Benefits-Response/Supporting framework as suggested by the [expert meeting on 2010 indicators \(Reading, United Kingdom, 6-8 July\)](#). The outcomes of the meeting would be reflected in the update of the synthesis/analysis document, which would serve as a basis for a series of regional consultations, a regionally representative global meeting jointly hosted by the United Kingdom and Brazil (London, 18-19 January 2010) and considered by the [sixth Trondheim Conference on Biodiversity \(1-5 February 2010\)](#). Additional inputs are derived from the assessment of implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity by Parties derived from the analysis of fourth national reports prepared for GBO-3.

9. In the ensuing discussion, the meeting agreed that it was essential to reach out beyond the biodiversity community and to generate a sense of ownership among stakeholders. Consultations, as well as the review of a draft strategic plan for the Convention on Biological Diversity and the draft GBO-3, would therefore benefit from involving participants beyond the constituency of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The scientific bodies of other biodiversity-related conventions could be encouraged to participate in the development of post-2010 biodiversity targets through notifications forwarded by the respective secretariats to their focal points as well as through an invitation to participate from the Chair of SBSTTA to the Chairs of the other biodiversity-related conventions. The issue should also be included in the agendas for forthcoming meetings where possible (Standing Committees, Science Bodies, COPs, IUCN Council). This would ensure that the 2050 vision is shared and enable inputs, including proposals of specific targets of particular relevance to partner conventions. Updates of strategic plans of other conventions due in the coming decade could then be made compatible with the Strategic Plan under the Convention on Biological Diversity.

10. At the same time it is important to recognize the relevance of existing processes, such as the work on indicators for inland and coastal waters under the Ramsar Convention, and to reflect this in the review framework for the Strategic Plan. CMS has aligned its current Strategic Plan with that of the Convention on Biological Diversity and would be expected to do so again for its next Plan. CITES could consider suggesting a specific target to be included into its new Strategic Plan.

11. The post 2010 biodiversity target will be presented at the High level segment of the 65th session of UNGA. The biodiversity-related conventions were encouraged to use the new biodiversity targets as a conduit to promote their own agendas.

12. The meeting was informed of the efforts to update the pan-European target as part of the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy (PEBLDS). Generally, with more effective implementation of the conventions national and regional targets are expected to become increasingly important.

ITEM 4. OPTIONS FOR IMPROVING COLLABORATION AND SYNERGY ON ISSUES OF COMMON INTEREST

13. Ms. Heather MacKay, Chair of the Ramsar Scientific and Technical Review Panel, introduced the analysis contained in the document on [options for improving collaboration and synergy on issues of](#)

[common interest across the biodiversity-related conventions and MEAs \(UNEP/CBD/CSAB/3/2\)](#). She said that in the two previous meetings, the need for increased synergy in areas of common interest was noted and that approaches such as joint work programmes and the joint development and use of guidance had been discussed in general terms. The Ramsar Convention had offered to prepare a more detailed analysis, looking at correspondences among the work plans of the different conventions and offering suggestions based on STRP experiences related to collaboration. The following experiences and suggestions are derived from the analysis (see: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/csab/csab-03/other/csab-03-options-ramsar-en.pdf>):

(a) **Development of a matrix listing common themes** from which opportunities for collaboration could be derived: The idea had been to map the current activities of other conventions and to identify overlaps and correspondences. It turned out that it was extremely complex to attempt identifying matching tasks, and although matching thematic areas of work could be identified (for example priorities with regard to work on invasive species) the specific tasks in each Convention differed greatly in scope and objective. Nevertheless, it was useful for Ramsar to start on the basis of the tasks listed for the Ramsar STRP and to examine other work programmes against this list. This might be a useful exercise for other conventions as well;

(b) **Retrospective harmonization of a specific piece of guidance or scientific product:** This is a relatively simple and opportunistic way to make use of existing products across conventions and thereby to add value. An example are the [Guidelines for incorporating biodiversity-related issues into environmental impact assessment legislation and/or process and in strategic environmental assessment \(CBD decision VI/7 annex\)](#), which were subsequently annotated and endorsed by the [Ramsar Convention \(Resolution VIII.9\)](#) and [CMS Resolution 7.2](#). These were more recently completed and complemented with guidelines on Strategic Environmental Assessment ([CBD decision VIII/28](#)) and again annotated and endorsed by the [Ramsar Convention on Wetlands \(Resolution X.17\)](#). The advantage of this approach is a harmonized product relating to a specific issues, which would facilitate application/implementation by Parties;

(c) **Mapping existing guidance and scientific products onto the MA framework:** The rationale for doing this is that the MA framework is commonly accepted and facilitates a causal analysis of what drives biodiversity loss and the consequences for the provision of ecosystem services and human well-being. Such an exercise could be useful for Parties as it could demonstrate how guidance from different conventions can be used to generate integrated MA response strategies at various levels, including national and local. Moreover, the analysis could reveal correspondences in the existing suite of Conventions' materials that are not easily found by a single-issue search, similarly to the Tematea modules. While the idea appears straightforward, the secondary analysis and commentary would require substantial effort and that locating all relevant materials from other Conventions on a particular issue, including supporting scientific background documentation, is complex and time consuming. Nevertheless, in terms of finding a common platform for implementation across the Conventions, this could provide a good starting point;

(d) **Joint reporting of implementation in areas of common concern/interest:** It requires significant thought and effort to develop common reporting frameworks, in particular because of the need for a careful analysis to cross-match indicators and targets. Nevertheless, there would be significant advantages for Parties in a reduced reporting burden as well as for users of the reports (coherent data and analysis). It can take a substantial amount of time to implement joint reporting procedures, due to the different timing of COP cycles amongst conventions;

(e) **Proactive collaboration on a specific project/task/issue** already identified as a priority by one or more conventions: This is a simple concept that requires ongoing communication and good relationships. It is particularly effective if the task is designed from the beginning in such a way that the outcomes fulfil the needs of all partners. This requires careful development of the terms of reference. An example is the joint work of Ramsar and the African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA) on the

impacts of mining and extractive industries, where there is a common interest with complementary focus (impact on wetlands and on flyways, respectively). It is also possible to consider a partial collaboration, e.g. a review of the mining and energy sectors with regard to their relationship with biodiversity, which would then be followed by convention-specific elaboration. In this way value could be added by bringing in different complementary perspectives and the outcome would be more integrated and multi-faceted, thereby reflecting the complexity of ecosystems. An Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services could be relevant in this context.

14. In conclusion the following observations were made:

(a) It would be helpful if the work programmes each convention's scientific advisory bodies were easily accessible down to the level of specific tasks/activities;

(b) Equally, it would be useful if existing scientific products and supporting scientific information and documentation developed by each convention could be more easily located;

(c) A good working relationship and direct communication between the scientific bodies of biodiversity-related conventions is a precondition for the identification and joint design of possible products;

(d) Any activity should start with a thorough search of what the other conventions are doing or have done in relation to the specific area;

(e) The CSAB mechanism, in particular the meetings, should facilitate identification of priority issues or tasks of common interest;

(f) Themes that might lend themselves for the proactive design of joint projects/programmes include those that currently feature as priorities in one or more of the conventions' scientific work programmes:

(i) Guidance on ecosystem restoration;

(ii) Specific climate change-related questions;

(iii) Hunting and harvesting;

(iv) Tourism and ecotourism;

(v) Urbanization;

(vi) Invasive species.

15. The meeting expressed its appreciation for the analysis undertaken by the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and welcomed the suggestions. It noted that in the past side events had been the main mechanism to bring new developments to the attention of Parties from other conventions. The following observations were made:

(a) CITES and CMS are actively working on the harmonization of nomenclature of species on their respective annexes. While this activity at the technical level is driven by the secretariats, it is done with a mandate from the Scientific Council of CMS, which requested that the action be expedited;

(b) The CITES Plants Committee has regularly collaborated with the Convention on Biological Diversity, particularly on the development of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC) and the implementation of relevant GSPC targets. Also the CITES Animals Committee has been working on invasive alien species;

(c) At its ninth meeting, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted a decision on [promoting engagement of cities and local authorities \(decision IX/28\)](#), on the basis of which a plan of action on urban biodiversity, including an index of urban biodiversity, has been developed. It could be useful for other conventions to engage in this process;

(d) Interaction and collaboration through means other than face-to-face meetings should be explored (e.g. internet fora). CITES offered to examine with the CITES Secretariat whether the CITES website platforms might host these interactions and virtual meetings;

(e) The work to substantiate non-detriment findings under CITES could be relevant to the larger theme on sustainable use. The CITES Scientific Committee Chairs suggested that CITES could take the lead in synergic collaboration among biodiversity-related conventions on sustainable use, hunting and harvesting, given its focus and work on this subject. Non-detriment findings is the mechanism CITES uses to ensure that any extraction from the wild/export of CITES listed species is indeed sustainable for the species in question;

(f) Thematic guidance serves to enhance implementation, promote the science-policy interface and underpin policy development;

(g) The [Tematea modules](#) are a good example of adding value to information from individual conventions by setting it in relation to guidance from other conventions. It might be worthwhile to consider investing in updating Tematea;

(h) Collaboration should not be seen as a magic solution and it is important to carefully evaluate the transaction costs and avoid numerous additional meetings. In this context it is important that science bodies make existing guidance widely available and facilitate the participation of the most suitable/qualified experts;

(i) A proposal for the proactive design of joint projects/programmes should be developed for the next meeting. The Ramsar Convention on Wetlands suggested that they could take a similar lead on identifying possible opportunities for collaboration in relation to guidance for ecosystem restoration.

ITEM 5. CELEBRATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

16. Mr. Djoghlaif gave an overview of the preparations for the International Year of Biodiversity. Proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) in resolution 61/203, the International Year of Biodiversity (IYB) will be celebrated in 2010. This year coincides with the 2010 biodiversity target adopted by the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and by Heads of State and Government at the World Summit for Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002.

17. At the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, in Bonn, Parties called for a meeting of Heads of State or Governments, which had been endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly. It has been decided that at the sixty-fifth session, in 2010, a one-day high-level meeting of the General Assembly, with the participation of Heads of State and Government will discuss the urgent need to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity and to provide access to and share benefits from the use of genetic resources in the coming decade.

18. He said that the [IYB implementation strategy](#) has been sent to our global partners and was on the website of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The [website dedicated to the International Year of Biodiversity](#) will be launched officially at the upcoming eighth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing to be held in Montreal from 9 to 15 November 2009. The IYB will provide a unique opportunity to raise awareness about the importance of biodiversity and the consequence of its loss. If climate change was considered to be the predominant environmental problem, then we must demonstrate that biodiversity was part of the solution. Despite the limited budget allocated for communications UNEP and GEF had provided generous support and their full cooperation to the Year.

19. Some of the main messages for the International Year include:

(a) To stress the fact that without biodiversity we cannot survive;

(b) To highlight the accomplishments to date that communities and governments have achieved in their efforts to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity and its components and to promote the equitable sharing of benefits from the use of genetic resources;

(c) To promote dialogue among stakeholders for steps to be taken in post-2010 period.

20. The success of the Year rests with all our partners: the IYB will be marked by celebrations not only at the national level, but also at the international level. A [list of events is being maintained on the CBD website](#) and it is excellent to see that CMS has already prepared its IYB calendar. Some important events include:

(a) Berlin, Germany, 11 January 2010: Official launch of the International Year with the newly re-elected Chancellor Angela Merkel;

(b) Curitiba, Brazil, 8 January 2010: Brazil launches the IYB followed by a meeting on cities and biodiversity;

(c) Paris, France, 21-22 January 2010: UNESCO will launch the biodiversity travelling exhibition. This will be a high-level event, including Heads of State, including the Presidents of Mexico and France and Prince Albert of Monaco. The travelling exhibition will be reproduced by UNEP and the Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle. This event will be followed by a week-long scientific conference, which aims to provide further evidence and additional backstopping to the work of the Convention in the post-2010 period. Among the issues identified are: climate change, the new generation of taxonomy and systematics and financing for biodiversity;

(d) Paris, France, 20 January 2010: Ceremony to launch the children's photo exhibition by National Geographic and Airbus in partnership with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity;

(e) London, UK, January 2010: The Royal Society's 350th anniversary IAP General Assembly meeting & scientific conference. The conference will address themes related to biodiversity and the 2010 Target. A concept note is being developed focusing on the relationship between ecosystem services, biodiversity and human well-being;

(f) Madrid, January 2010: Meeting on "Delivering Biodiversity Targets: 2010 and Beyond /Protected Areas and Ecological Networks in Europe", organized by the Council of Europe and the Ministry of the Environment, Rural and Marine Affairs of Spain;

(g) Trondheim, Norway, February 2010: Sixth Biodiversity Conference, which will address the issues and visions for the period post-2010;

(h) Bali, Indonesia, February 2010: Global Ministerial Environment Forum. The themes and activities will be determined in collaboration with UNEP, but will seek high-level engagement on the biodiversity agenda;

(i) Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, February 2010: IYB to be celebrated and marked during the second meeting of the Group of the Friends of the Co-Chairs on Liability and Redress in the context of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

(j) Cartagena, Colombia, March 2010: IYB event at the Congress of trilateral meeting involving Mexico as host of UNFCCC COP-16;

(k) Nairobi, Kenya, May 2010: SBSTTA-14 and WGRI-3: Launch of GBO-3; panel of scientists on biodiversity science; Bioersivity International event; GEO-BMZ Biodiversity Day events; Announcement of the winners of the Equator Initiative Prize finalists;

(l) World Environment Day, June 2010: Announcement of results of painting competition and photo competition. Statement by the Secretary0General of the United Nations, the Executive Director of UNEP, and others;

- (m) Montreal International Economic Forum, 8 June 2010;
- (n) New York, July 2010: High-level segment of ECOSOC: Demonstrate the importance of biodiversity to the achievement of the MDGs; introduce the parameters for a post-2010 target(s) and initiate a dialogue on the relationship between development and biodiversity;
- (o) Nagoya, Japan, October 2010: IYB Celebrations at High-Level Segment
- (p) Kanazawa, Japan, December 2010: Closing of the IYB and launch of the International Year of Forests for 2011. This will ensure continuity for the Decade of Biodiversity coinciding with timing of the new Strategic Plan of the Conventions.

21. As we get closer to the International Year, preparations are well under way:

- (a) The IYB logo was launched during the UNCCD COP in Buenos Aires;
- (b) A similar unveiling was held with the Mayor of Montreal and both Quebec and Canadian authorities including the Diplomatic Corps in Montreal;
- (c) A Memorandum of Understanding was signed with the World Tourism Organizations to collaborate on a video on sustainable tourism which targets visitors to vacation destinations rich in biodiversity;
- (d) A meeting will be held with major airline companies in Toulouse, France, to discuss ways in which they can promote the IYB, including through promotional in flight videos and information packages to be given to passengers;
- (e) A press conference was held at the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity about a multi-media performance on the theme of biodiversity, to premiere 26 January 2010 at Place des Arts in Montreal as a contribution to the International Year of Biodiversity. Created by Jean Lemire (Mission Antarctica), Dominic Champagne (Cirque du Soleil's Beatles show, LOVE), and Daniel Belanger (musician/singer/songwriter), the show entitled "Paradis Perdu" (Paradise Lost) will be one of the first major arts events contributing to the International Year of Biodiversity in 2010. The Secretariat is a partner and technical advisor to the performance. The press conference gathered the presence of major local TV and radio news stations, and relevant partners in Montreal.
- (f) The Secretariat in close collaboration with Mr. Jean Lemire biologist and filmmaker better known for his Arctic voyage, which raised awareness on climate change, will now do the same for biodiversity. The vessel will set sail in July 2010 and the Secretariat had close discussion with him and his team to decide the destinations and activities;

22. The meeting discussed how the special session on biodiversity at UNGA might feed into the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. The meeting was informed that a Chair's summary, rather than a formal decision, was expected to be prepared on the basis of the discussions at the three panels (post-2010 targets; biodiversity and climate change; and biodiversity, sustainable development and poverty reduction). This summary should represent a message for Nagoya, which might also depend on the status of discussions on the International Regime on Access and Benefit-sharing. Prior to UNGA, the Global Ministerial Environment Forum in Bali is particularly important as it enables environment ministers to focus on biodiversity and as it involves ministers from countries that are not yet Party to the Convention.

ITEM 6. OPTIONS FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE-POLICY INTERFACES ON BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES

23. Mr. Thiaw expressed his hope that the forthcoming second ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services (IPBES-2, Nairobi, 5–9 October 2009) would conclude with a tangible outcome. The Executive Director would report to the Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GMEF) on the outcomes of the meeting and the GMEF would decide on the next steps. Also, following [decision IX/15](#) of the

Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, which welcomed the IPBES discussions and requested the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation (WGRI-3) to make recommendations to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. He expected that a third meeting would be necessary to conclude the negotiations and this would likely take place before UNGA and the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

24. He explained that the IPBES meeting is a multi-stakeholder meeting in which the secretariats and science bodies of conventions as well as science network had been invited. Naturally, decisions would be made by Governments. Some of the areas to be clarified included the linkages with ongoing assessments, including the marine assessment of assessments under UNCLOS, the follow-up to the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and the Global Environment Outlook.

25. He encouraged the scientific advisory bodies as major stakeholders in the process to prepare a message to be issued to the meeting. Such a statement coming from their Chairs could add value to the IPBES meeting, in particular to the discussions about the needs for such a mechanism, considerations how it might interface with the scientific advisory bodies and hence how it should be set up.

26. In response, the CITES Plants Committee chair noted that both CITES committees had taken note of the progress for the establishment of IPBES. Both committees had provided input for the gap analysis of IPBES and submitted this information as a contribution to the finalization of the analysis. CMS clarified that as advisory body to their COP it was not their role to make recommendations to Parties, unless such recommendation are backed by science. The meeting agreed that the Chairs of the scientific advisory bodies would have informal exchanges to consider how they could engage in the IPBES discussions. The statement prepared by the Chairs of the scientific advisory bodies of biodiversity-related conventions is attached in annex II.

ITEM 7. DATE AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

27. The meeting noted that the fourth meeting of the Chairs of Scientific Advisory Bodies of Biodiversity-related Conventions would be held on 20 January 2010 in Paris. This date had previously been agreed for a BLG meeting and would now be combined with a CSAB meeting.

ITEM 8. OTHER MATTERS

28. No other matters were discussed.

ITEM 9. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

29. Mr. Thomas thanked participants for their contributions to a very productive meeting. He specifically recognized the efforts by the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands in preparing the analysis of options for possible joint activities among the conventions. The meeting was closed at 2 p.m. on 4 October 2009.

*Annex I***LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

Margarita África Clemente Muñoz – Chair, CITES Plants Committee

Ahmed Djoghlaif – Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity

Jochen Flasbarth – Representative of the CBD COP-9 President

Robert Höft – Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

Heather MacKay – Chair Ramsar STRP

Carlos Martin-Novella – CBD COP-9 Presidency

Constanza Martinez - IUCN

Rodrigo A. Medellín – Vice-Chair CITES Animals Committee

David Morgan – CITES Secretariat

John Mshelbwala – Chair CMS Scientific Council

Maryam Niamir-Fuller – Director UNEP/DGEF

Tone Solhaug – CBD SBSTTA Bureau member, Norway

Doug Taylor – UNEP GEF-STAP

Ibrahim Thiaw – Director of the Division of Environmental Policy Implementation of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP/DEPI)

Linus Spencer Thomas – Chair, CBD SBSTTA

Louise Vachon – Montréal International

Melanie Virtue - Secretariat of the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS)

*Annex II***STATEMENT MADE BY THE CHAIR OF CBD-SBSTTA ON BEHALF OF THE CHAIRS OF THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BODIES OF BIODIVERSITY-RELATED CONVENTIONS AT THE OPENING OF THE SECOND 2ND AD HOC INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND MULTI-STAKEHOLDER MEETING ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL SCIENCE-POLICY PLATFORM ON BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES***5 October 2009*

Mr. Chairman

I make this statement on behalf of the Chairs of the Scientific Advisory Bodies of the Biodiversity (CSAB) related Conventions.

Mr. Chairman, the CSAB held its third meeting yesterday wherein we discussed as an agenda item - options for strengthening science policy interfaces on biodiversity and ecosystem services.

The Chairs of the scientific bodies of CITES, CMS, RAMSAR, STAP and CBD were present.

The group welcomes the process including the gap analysis and current dialogue aimed at establishing the intergovernmental platform-IPBES while recognizing that the decision to establish and the modalities of any mechanism to strengthen science policy interfaces lie with the Parties.

We believe that IPBES founded on United Nations rules and on decisions of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity can be critical for leveraging biodiversity at the global, regional and national levels and can facilitate the uptake of credible, autonomous and comprehensive peer-reviewed science by our policy makers.

The group submits that IPBES must strengthen, be directly linked and not replace the current scientific advisory bodies of the Conventions and that these bodies must be recognized as major stakeholders in the dialogue.

In this regard the strengthening of science-policy interface will be on the agenda of the CBD meetings to be held here in Nairobi in May 2010, in accordance with decision IX/15 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, which calls for consideration towards establishing an efficient international science policy interface on biodiversity ecosystem services and human well being.

We look forward to a successful outcome of this meeting which includes the framework for a strengthened science policy interface.
