



## **Report of the Fifth Meeting of the Chairs of the Scientific Advisory Bodies of the Biodiversity-related Conventions (CSAB), Dublin, Ireland, 25 March 2012**

### **ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING**

1. The fifth meeting of the Chairs of the Scientific Advisory Bodies of the Biodiversity-related Conventions (CSAB), took place on Sunday, 25 March 2012 at the Dublin Castle, 2 Palace Street, Dublin, at the invitation of the Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES).
2. The Chairs of the scientific advisory bodies of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), CITES (both the animals and plants committees), the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar Convention) were present as well as a representative of the Chair of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the Global Environment Facility (GEF/STAP). The Chair of the World Heritage Committee (WHC) was also represented by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) which provides an advisory role for WHC. In addition representatives of the Secretariats of the CBD, CITES and CMS attended, as well as representatives of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and IUCN. A list of participants is provided as Annex 1.
3. The meeting was co-chaired by Carlos Ibero Solana, Chair of the Animals Committee of CITES, Margarita Clemente, Chair of the CITES Plants Committee and Senka Barudanovic, Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) of CBD.
4. The meeting was opened at 9.30 a.m. by Co-chair Carlos Ibero Solana, who welcomed participants to the meeting. Co-chair Senka Barudanovic, noted that the group was growing in importance, in part, due to the need to develop coordinated positions with regard to IPBES and to provide useful inputs to that process.

### **ITEM 2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK**

5. Participants adopted the agenda of the meeting and the organization of work (CSAB/5/1). Participants also took note of the minutes of the previous meeting (13 February 2011, Gland, Switzerland)<sup>1</sup>.

### **ITEM 3. INTERGOVERNMENTAL SCIENCE-POLICY PLATFORM ON BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES**

6. Under this agenda item, the meeting considered the opportunities arising from the establishment of IPBES. The Chair of CBD SBSTTA and the Chair of the Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP) of the Ramsar Convention provided their reflections on the outcome of the first session of the plenary meeting to determine modalities and institutional arrangements for IPBES (Nairobi, 3–7 October 2011). They noted that while there was relatively little recognition of the potential role of the biodiversity-related Conventions for IPBES in the early discussions, this recognition had increased during the week. The potential role of the

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/csab/csab-04/official/csab-04-02-en.doc>

MEAs, including the biodiversity-related Conventions, for IPBES was now quite well reflected in documents for the upcoming second plenary session. Thus, the biodiversity-related Conventions will need to consider how to present their needs to the IPBES plenary.

7. Neville Ash, representative of the UNEP interim IPBES secretariat, briefed the meeting on the preparations for the second session and the issues expected to arise at that session (16-21 April 2012 in Panama City, Panama)<sup>2</sup>.

8. Margarita Clemente noted that the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CITES Plants Committee, held just prior to the CSAB meeting, developed recommendations on the relationship between CITES, its Animals and Plants Committees and IPBES.

9. Participants agreed to prepare a joint statement for submission to the second plenary session of IPBES and discussed the contents of that statement, noting the following points:

- An overall, positive message regarding the establishment of IPBES and the reflection of the role of the biodiversity-related Conventions
- Seek to clarify role and participation of biodiversity-related Conventions in IPBES processes at next meeting
- Underline need for timely responses to requests by the biodiversity-related Conventions
- Highlight the umbrella function of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020
- Caveat regarding the different mandates and processes of the biodiversity-related Conventions
- Emphasize potential for synergies between IPBES and the biodiversity-related Conventions with regard to work at the sub-global level and capacity-building
- Stress need for coordination between IPBES and the biodiversity-related Conventions on the level of national focal points
- Highlight potential role of scientific advisory bodies to the core business of IPBES
- Identify issues of common concern, including from the work programmes of the biodiversity-related Conventions

10. The participants also noted recommendations that would need to be made to the scientific advisory bodies themselves:

- The need for a mechanism to identify processes to submit requests to IPBES
- The need to identify ways to submit joint requests by the biodiversity-related Conventions to IPBES

11. The final statement was drafted by the CITES and CBD Secretariats on the basis of this discussion and finalised following review by CSAB members. The statement as delivered is attached as Annex 2.

#### **ITEM 4. THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020, THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS AND THE UN DECADE FOR BIODIVERSITY**

12. David Cooper briefly introduced the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, noting that, following a meeting of the Secretariats of the biodiversity-related conventions in September 2010, the plan had been developed as framework for action for the entire biodiversity community and the UN system as a whole. Participants agreed that the Strategic Plan presented opportunities for the biodiversity-related conventions for joint efforts to mainstream the biodiversity agenda into the broader development context and to collaborate on addressing the scientific and technical challenges arising from the Strategic Plan. Margarita Clemente noted that the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CITES Plants Committee, held just prior to the CSAB meeting, in reviewing the CITES Strategic Vision 2008-2020, had proposed amendments to contribute to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

#### **4.1 Preliminary cross-map of the strategic plans, priorities and targets of the biodiversity-related conventions and the Aichi Biodiversity targets**

---

<sup>2</sup> see <http://www.ipbes.net/plenary-sessions/second-session-of-plenary.html> for documentation

13. The representative of IUCN, Dena Cator, provided an update on the intersessional exercise to review and cross-map the various strategic plans, priorities and targets of the biodiversity-related conventions and the conclusions from this analysis. The meeting agreed that this analysis is a very useful starting point, but that further analysis would be needed, in particular to highlight the most important linkages. It was noted that this work should be coordinated with the broader mapping exercise underway under the auspices of the Environment Management Group.<sup>3</sup>

#### **4.2 Opportunities for the scientific advisory bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions**

14. The meeting considered the scientific and technical challenges arising from the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and the opportunities for the scientific advisory bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions to coordinate their efforts to address these. Participants raised as potential areas for further collaboration scientific and technical work in relation to the following issues:

- Aichi Biodiversity Target 9 (invasive species);
- Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 (protected areas), 12 (species) and 13 (genetic diversity);
- Aichi Biodiversity Target 15 (see agenda item 5.1).

15. It was also agreed that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets provide a useful framework for the harmonization of reporting. More generally, it was suggested that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets provide a useful framework to facilitate a consolidated approach to the work programmes of the scientific advisory bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions.

### **ITEM 5. OTHER OPPORTUNITIES FOR COOPERATION**

16. The meeting received updates on the following issues and considered options and opportunities for further cooperation.

#### **5.1 Ecosystem restoration**

17. Given the on-going work on ecosystem restoration under the CBD in preparation for COP-11, the meeting agreed that Chair of the SBSTTA of the CBD will assume the lead on this issue area. The CBD would keep the CSAB informed about the work under the CBD.

#### **5.2 Harmonization of species nomenclature (CMS/CITES)**

18. David Morgan, CITES Secretariat, and Fernando Spini, CMS Scientific Council, updated the meeting on work to harmonize species nomenclature across the two conventions, noting that this had been completed for mammals and was in progress for birds. They noted the challenges to this process and need to keep in mind the work of the IOC World Bird List of the International Ornithologist's Union which was due to make an update in 2014. David Cooper, CBD Secretariat, drew attention to the work under way for plant names in the context of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation under the CBD, and the work of the Global Taxonomy Initiative and GBIF. Neville Ash drew attention to the WCMC databases and the IUCN Red List. Fernando Spini highlighted the need to bring together all those responsible for taxonomic issues across the conventions.

#### **5.3 Sustainable use, wise use and non-detriment findings (CITES)**

19. Margarita Clemente noted on-going work to consider the relevance of CITES work on "Non-detriment findings" with the concepts of "sustainable use" and "wise use", drawing upon a recent expert group meeting in Mexico.

#### **5.4 Emerging issues and horizon-scanning**

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://ieg.informea.org/>

20. Participants discussed ways to address new and emerging issues relevant to the respective mandates of the conventions, including in the light of how this function may be developed under IPBES. The horizon scanning exercise undertaken by UNEP's Chief Scientist was highlighted<sup>4</sup>. The meeting also noted the experience within the CBD as reflected in documentation for SBSTTA-16<sup>5</sup>.

21. Participants noted the following issues that may warrant further examination: novel ecosystems, including in the context of ecosystem restoration, and ecosystem services generated by new assemblages in such novel ecosystems.

22. It was suggested that the CSAB might prepare for future meetings by compiling potential new and emerging issues.

### **5.5 Options for improving collaboration and synergy on issues of common interest (ALL).**

23. Potential areas that may warrant closer collaboration among the conventions identified by the participants included: Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs) (especially CMS and CBD), the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (especially CITES Plants Committee and CBD), sustainable use of timber species (CITES) and invasive alien species.

### **ITEM 6. UPDATE FROM THE LIAISON GROUP OF BIODIVERSITY-RELATED CONVENTIONS**

24. The meeting briefly noted the outcomes of the Special Meeting of the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions (Geneva, 13 April 2011) and concluded that more coherence between the work of the BLG and CSAB is required, for example by organizing back-to-back meetings of the two groups.

### **ITEM 7. UPDATE ON MEETINGS OF THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BODIES**

25. Under this agenda item representatives from the conventions' scientific advisory bodies and the Secretariats provided brief reports on recent meetings of the various scientific bodies.

### **ITEM 8. ORGANIZATION AND PREPARATION OF CO-HOSTED CSAB MEETINGS**

26. The lack of funding for CSAB meetings was noted as a constraint, as well as the limited continuity and follow-up between meetings.

### **ITEM 9. OTHER MATTERS**

27. No issues were raised under this item.

### **ITEM 10. DATE AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING**

28. The Chair of the Scientific Council of CMS offered to support the organization of the next CSAB meeting. Date and venue for the next meeting remained open.

### **ITEM 11. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

29. The meeting was closed at 4 p.m. on 25 March 2012.

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.unep.org/publications/ebooks/foresightreport/>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/sbstta/sbstta-16/official/sbstta-16-13-en.doc>

Annex 1

**List of Participants**

Chairs of Scientific Bodies:

**Senka Barudanovic**, Chair of SBSTTA, CBD, sebarudanovic@gmail.com

**Carlos Ibero Solana**, Chair of the Animals Committee, **CITES**, cites@atecma.es

**Margarita Clemente**, Chair of the Animals Committee, **CITES**, cr1clmum@uco.es

**Fernando Spina**, Chair of the Scientific Council, **CMS**, fernando.spina@isprambiente.it

**Heather MacKay**, Member, Scientific and Technical Review Panel, **Ramsar Convention on Wetlands**, mackayh@gmail.com

Secretariats:

**David Cooper**, Director Scientific, Technical and Technological Matters, CBD Secretariat, Secretary of SBSTTA, **CBD**, david.cooper@cbd.int

**David Morgan**, Chief, Scientific Support Unit, **CITES**, david.morgan@cites.org

**Borja Heredia**, Head of the Scientific and Technical Unit , **CMS**, bheredia@cms.int

Observers:

**Dena Cator** , **IUCN**, dena.cator@iucn.org (representing Tim Badman , UNESCO WHC, UNESCO WHC, tim.badman@iucn.org and Jane SMART, jane.smart@iucn.org)

**Michael Stocking**, Special Advisor to the Chair and interim Panel Member for Land Degradation, M.Stocking@uea.ac.uk (representing the Chair, **Scientific and Technical Advisory panel**, **GEF** thomas.hammond@unep.org)

**Neville Ash**, Chief of the Biodiversity Unit, Division of Environmental Policy Implementation, **UNEP**, and IPBES interim Secretariat, [neville.ash@unep.org](mailto:neville.ash@unep.org)

**Mr. Sergey Dereliev**, **CMS- AEWA**, sdereliev@unep.de

Annex 2.

**Joint statement<sup>6</sup> resulting from the 5th meeting of the Chairs of the Scientific Advisory Bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions (CSAB)<sup>7</sup> (Dublin, 25 March 2012)**

The chairs of the scientific advisory bodies of the biodiversity-related conventions<sup>1</sup>, meeting together with the Secretariats of the Conventions, at their 5th meeting in Dublin reiterate their support for the establishment of the IPBES, and highlight again the potential for the IPBES, once operational, to contribute to increasing synergies amongst the conventions and to achieving the conservation and sustainable use of and equitable benefits from biodiversity.

We note with satisfaction the positive progress towards operationalization of the IPBES since the Busan meeting, and are pleased to see that the roles and needs of the Conventions are reflected in several preparatory documents for the Panama IPBES meeting. As evidenced in several recent decisions, conclusions or reports of various governing bodies and subsidiary bodies (see document UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/INF/2), the conventions are engaging strongly with the IPBES establishment process.

The Conventions have an important role in setting the global agenda on biodiversity and ecosystem services, and in that context their governing bodies are key policy-making bodies which can direct requests to and benefit from IPBES. The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi targets provide a common “currency” around which the conventions can co-ordinate and collaborate. The scientific advisory bodies of the Conventions can provide useful and policy-relevant information to the work of the IPBES and their decision-making can be assisted by IPBES outputs. The work of the IPBES at the sub-global level and the implementation of the conventions at regional and national levels can and should be mutually supportive, strengthening the application of science at these levels and thereby implementation of the conventions.

Without prejudice to the possible efforts by any Convention to develop a particular model for engaging individually with the IPBES in future or governments’ negotiations on the details of the institutional structures and procedures within the IPBES, and noting that the Conventions do not all have the same mandates from their governing bodies, we wish to make the following contributions to the discussions in Panama in the hope that we can contribute to the effective operation of the IPBES in future:

- The Conventions’ governing and subsidiary bodies, including their scientific advisory bodies (and their associated agreements), can provide knowledge networks, information and data and expertise.
- The scientific advisory bodies and Secretariats, either individually or through the CSAB, could potentially:
  - facilitate identification of priority issues of common concern which might become joint proposals/requests from Convention governing bodies to the IPBES;
  - identify issues which are in the Conventions’ respective work programmes and coordinate those issues which have aspects that are common to several Conventions;
  - assist in scoping of responses by IPBES to requests from Convention governing bodies helping to avoid duplication and to enhance collaboration;
  - participate in reviews of IPBES products.
- It is important to ensure that the process for receiving and prioritizing requests allows clear, timely and predictable responses to requests from the Conventions.
- The IPBES needs to recognize the special role of Conventions (and their associated agreements) in its work programme, since they already represent views of Contracting Party governments. The IPBES should also recognize the roles of the Conventions as policy-making and policy implementation bodies.
- The IPBES should recognize the roles of Conventions as source of distinctive scientific knowledge and advice to the Contracting Parties, through the work of their scientific bodies.
- The IPBES meeting in Panama should give particular consideration to and agree on how Conventions (Secretariats/governing bodies as well as science advisory bodies) are represented in or participate in different bodies of IPBES, including plenary and subsidiary bodies. The meeting should also give consideration to how CSAB or the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions (BLG) could participate in the different bodies of the IPBES.
- IPBES focal points at national level (if they are established) should coordinate with Convention focal points at national level.

---

<sup>6</sup> Issued as IPBES document: **UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/INF/16 3**

<sup>7</sup> The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), 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), the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar), the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (WHC) and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA).

- Capacity building is an important activity for the Conventions already, especially at subglobal level, and in its work programme on capacity building the IPBES should work closely with existing Convention processes for capacity building to ensure coherence and avoid duplication.
- A more general point is that IPBES must draw existing processes together to improve consistency and complementarity, and work to avoid introducing another level of complexity to existing Convention processes and activities.

The chairs of the scientific advisory bodies of the Conventions have agreed to convey the following suggestions to their governing bodies.

We note that it is especially important for delegates representing their governments at IPBES meetings, including the IPBES plenary to co-ordinate with focal points of the Conventions in-country, to ensure that the needs of the individual Conventions at national level are adequately reflected and considered in the IPBES discussions. This is of particular significance in preparation for the Panama meeting, but should be ongoing in future.

We also commit to facilitating discussions within the processes of the various Conventions with a view to;

- (a) giving consideration to the internal procedures (which may be similar across Conventions) for preparation and submission of requests individually to the IPBES, especially to clarify the roles of their governing bodies and their scientific bodies; and
- (b) how they prepare and submit joint requests to IPBES on issues of common concern/interest, and what roles the Secretariats, the BLG and the CSAB can play in developing joint requests to the IPBES.

We are committed to working with the Convention Secretariats to enhance the contribution of the CSAB and the individual scientific advisory bodies of the Conventions in order for them to interface as effectively as possible with the IPBES work programme.

-----