



Biodiversity Indicator Partnership Technical Partner Meeting Minutes

10-12 December 2012, Selwyn College, Cambridge, UK,

Next Steps

Action	Responsible	Date
1 Use wall-mapping exercise to create indicator factsheets. Factsheet to include fields which support toolkit compilation	BIP Sec send templates for completion by Partners	Early January
2 Circulate meeting report – to include indicator mapping exercise and GBO-4 timetable	BIP Sec	Early January
3 Contact potential new Partners	BIP Sec	January
4 Develop Partner letters of intent	BIP Sec to draft basic letter for Partners to use and adapt	January / February
5 Formulate Steering Committee. Organise first meeting which includes agenda item on fundraising	BIP Sec	January
6 Draft Fundraising Strategy, including Partner costings for indicator development at various scales	BIP Sec to draft strategy and circulate costing templates for completion by Partners	February
7 Finalize communications strategy by incorporating Partners comments and prioritising outputs	BIP Sec	January
8 Develop plan for next version of Aichi Passport	BIP Sec	February
9 Circulate dates of regional capacity building workshops (already captured in BIPTPM2012/8 but re-circulate)	BIP Sec	January
10 Compile and circulate list of contacts from BIP capacity building workshops	BIP Sec	January
11 Circulate updates on opportunities for the BIP to engage with GBO-4, SDGs, GEO BON, IPBES, etc	BIP Sec	Ongoing
12 Organise Partner webinar after first meeting of Steering Committee	BIP Sec	1 st Quarter
13 Partners to review the short list of proposed indicators for use by all Parties (work led by CBD Sec)	BIP Sec to circulate. Partners to comment	When available
14 Share indicator lists with MEAs and highlight how indicators can contribute across MEAs	BIP Secretariat	February
15 Develop standard paragraph on the BIP that can support Partners' communication	BIP Secretariat	January
16 Develop standard presentation/video to assist Partners in communicating the BIP	BIP Secretariat	February
17 Remind Partners of the information the BIP Sec can profile for them on BIP communications outputs, namely the website	BIP Secretariat	February

18	CBD to share information with Partners on the Trondheim Conference on Biodiversity	CBD Sec via BIP Sec	January
19	Draft a pledge for BIP to become an official ' Biodiversity Champion '	BIP Sec Partners to make Sec aware if there are pledges for specific targets	January
20	Submit Biodiversity Champion pledge (see action 19) for review by Steering Committee and at Partner webinar (see action12)	BIP Sec	January/February

Table of Annexes

Number	Title
<i>Supporting Background Documents for Meeting</i>	
Annex 1.1	BIPTPM2012/1 - BIP Technical Meeting Agenda
Annex 1.2	BIPTPM2012/2 - BIP Relevant CBD COP 11 Decisions
Annex 1.3	BIPTPM2012/3 - BIP Information Document for CBD COP 11 – Updated with COP Decisions
Annex 1.4	BIPTPM2012/4 - Indicative List of Indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 - Annex to CBD COP Decision XI/3
Annex 1.5	BIPTPM2012/5 - Indicator mapping exercise conducted by BIP Secretariat
Annex 1.6	BIPTPM2012/8 - BIP Capacity Building Strategy
Annex 1.7	BIPTPM2012/9 - Guidance for Global indicator Partners
Annex 1.8	BIPTPM2012/10 - Guidance for National Indicator Partners
Annex 1.9	BIPTPM2012/11 - BIP Steering Committee ToR
Annex 1.10	BIPTPM2012/12 - Three tiered approach for enlarging the Partnership
Annex 1.11	BIPTPM2012/13- Proposed call out for new indicator Partners
Annex 1.12	BIPTPM2012/14 - BIP Communications Strategy
Annex 1.13	BIPTPM2012/15 - Rio+20 Briefing Note No.3: Biodiversity and ecosystem services indicators to track progress towards sustainable development
<i>Meeting presentations and outputs</i>	
Annex 2.1	Opening statement by the Executive Secretary of the CBD
Annex 2.2	BIP Technical Partnership Meeting: Participant List
Annex 2.3	Partners not present at the meeting
Annex 2.4	Monitoring implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2010 <i>presentation</i> (Robert Höft)
Annex 2.5	BIP Progress towards COP11 Decisions <i>presentation</i> (Anna Chenery)
Annex 2.6 (a-e)	Global Indicators Mapping Exercise Results
Annex 2.7	Update on BIP Regional-National Work <i>presentation</i> (Philip Bubb)
Annex 2.8	The NBSAP Forum and the BIP <i>presentation</i> (Sarah Brooks)
Annex 2.9	Partners' Roles and Responsibilities <i>presentation</i> (Anna Chenery)
Annex 2.10	BIP Communications Strategy <i>presentation</i> (Cristina Secades)
Annex 2.11	The BIP and the SDGs <i>presentation</i> (Cristina Secades)
Annex 2.12	Diagram of Post-2015 Development Agenda
Annex 2.13	Regional BON report back

Day 1

Introduction

This session began with an introduction by Nick Davidson, chair of the session, after which Robert Hoft of the CBD Secretariat read a statement prepared by Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, the Executive Secretary for the CBD (see Annex 2.1). Following a round-table of introductions (for participant list see Annex 2.2) and a quick overview of those who were not present at the meeting (Annex 2.3), Damon Stanwell-Smith of the BIP Secretariat gave an outline of the meeting's agenda (Annex 1.1), purpose and objectives before moving on to give a brief introduction to the BIP and its current funding status.

Discussion points:

- It would be useful to carry out a costing under various scenarios (bare minimum through to ideal) for the continued production of global indicators

Session 1: In at the Deep End – the BIP and the Broader Picture

The CBD Context

Robert Hoft began by giving a background to the context of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the implications at the national level, as well as the relevant outcomes from COP11 earlier this year (Presentation: Annex 2.4). Anna Chenery then presented an overview of relevant Decisions resulting from COP11 and the BIP's progress towards these, focusing on those relevant to the global indicators (Presentation: Annex 2.4; Supporting Documents: Annexes 1.2 and 1.3).

The BIP has made progress towards the following requests from COP:

Database: Indicators can be explored by target, by PSR framework or by headline indicator, and the database links back to the CBD website.

Develop Global indicators for each Aichi Biodiversity Target: The BIP has at least 1 indicator for 13 of the Aichi Targets, and has brought on board a number of new indicators and is actively seeking to fill gaps, while not limiting to one indicator/partner per target.

Provide Global indicator information: Each indicator has its own web page accessible through an online database, we hope that the partners will work with BIP Sec to ensure pages are up to date and reflect the current status of the indicators, and we launched the Aichi Passport.

Group Exercise: Responding to CBD requests

The participants then broke out into four groups to brainstorm ways in which the BIP can make progress towards the four requests from [Decision XI/3](#) (Section A, paragraph 12) that had not been addressed.

Feedback from Breakout Groups:

- 1. Identify indicators for consistent use across parties**
 - Achievable indicators using existing data
 - Identify using indicator frameworks

- CBD-led working group has already started investigating necessary criteria and is due to present an initial proposal, reporting early 2013
- Some global datasets and indicators may be disaggregated to national level, but are not owned and reported by countries
- Look at indicator frameworks – PSBR etc. and within that what are the topics and indicators that you would want countries to be developing and using?
- There is already a CBD-led working group that have started investigating the criteria to present an initial proposal, reporting early 2013
- These indicators can be used for national reports to the CBD, comparison across countries, to encourage the use of existing data and to report trends over time within countries
- Countries must buy into the indicators, and must receive assistance in generating and harmonizing data sets
- The BIP can make technical recommendations and highlight indicator/data gaps

2. Explore indicator harmonization across MEAs

- Step 1: Mapping different MEA targets to Aichi Targets – current monitoring/indicators
- Step 2: Working with MEAs to co-evolve MEA indicators with BIP Indicators

Role of BIP Sec:

- Lead initial indicator mapping with MEA secretariats, pair wise, in consultation with Partners
- Work with each Partner to identify relevant MEAs and possible disaggregations of data
- Dialogue with parties of different MEAs about evolving relevant indicators

3. Promote collaboration with other sectors

Different means for different sectors (different priorities, concerns, histories)

1. Develop a data-sharing mechanism including data and meta-data
2. Ensure transparency of methodologies to help others adopt/adapt it as appropriate
3. Implement engagement strategies (need to identify partners, priorities and incentives)

The other sectors that we are interested in are in many cases drivers of what's happening in the system but also rely very heavily on the system itself.

4. Develop practical toolkits

- Develop an online dashboard
- Communicate to broader audiences (incl. policy) the details of how it was developed, data sources, basic overview etc.
- Need to feed the data back into national governments, organisations, institutions
- Indicator use in national practice – show examples, why both with this indicator?
- Development of guidance documents for how indicators can be used at the national level
- Focus on the benefits of biodiversity
- BIP needs to engage with SCBD n in order to complement their available toolkits

Action point: BIP Sec to look back into what has been done previously regarding mapping MEA indicators and targets

- Back in 1997 at WCMC monitoring synergies were mapped

- Some MEAs have already mapped indicators and Aichi Targets that can only be modified through COPs/MOPs
- A superficial mapping has been attempted UN-Wide through the EMG

Session 2: Indicator Presentations

Current Indicator Partners

This session began with five-minute presentations from current Indicator Partners, covering the following topics:

- i) The indicator
- ii) Current status of indicator- last update and next update
- iii) Changes to indicator or institutional housing of indicator (2010 Partners)
- iv) Future plans/continuation of indicator
- v) What do you want from the BIP?
- vi) What can you give to the BIP?

These presentations are all available via the file-sharing platform, Basecamp and can be accessed at <https://shareddocumentsarea.basecampHQ.com/login> or via the 'shared documents area' on the BIP website. You should have received an invitation to join the BIP group – if you have any queries with regards to access to Basecamp, please contact Nadine Bowles-Newark on Nadine.bowles-newark@unep-wcmc.org. The speakers list for this session was as follows:

Speaker	Organisation	Indicator/s	Email
1 Albert Bleeker	Energy Research Centre of the Netherlands (ECN)	Nitrogen Deposition & Loss of reactive nitrogen to the environment	a.bleeker@ecn.nl
2 Alessandro Galli	Global Footprint Network	Ecological footprint	alessandro.galli@footprintnetwork.org
3 Bastian Bertschy	UNEP-WCMC	Coverage of protected areas	bastian.bertschy@unep-wcmc.org
4 Beate Scherf	FAO	Genetic diversity of terrestrial domesticated animals	beate.scherf@fao.org
5 Bernhard Lehner	McGill University	River fragmentation & flow regulation	bernhard.lehner@mcgill.ca
6 Dirk Zeller	University of British Columbia	Marine Trophic Index	d.zeller@fisheries.ubc.ca
7 Ehsan Dulloo	Biodiversity International/FAO	Ex situ crop collections	e.dulloo@cgiar.org
8 Steve Bachman	Kew	Sampled Red List Index (Plants)	s.bachman@kew.org
9 Jonathan Loh	WWF (on behalf of Terralingua)	Index of Linguistic Diversity and VITEK	jonathan@livingplanet.org.uk
10 Louise McCrae	WWF	Living Planet Index	louise.mccrae@ioz.ac.uk
11 Karin Kuechler	Union of Ethical BioTrade	Biodiversity Barometer	karin@ethicalbiotrade.org
12 Leticia Pina	FAO	Extent of forests and forest types	leticia.pina@fao.org

13	Marc Hockings	The University of Queensland	Management effectiveness of protected areas	m.hockings@uq.edu.au
14	Marion Karmann	Forest Stewardship Council	Area of forest under sustainable management: certification	m.karmann@fsc.org
15	Megan Tierney	UNEP-WCMC	Wild commodities index	megan.tierney@unep-wcmc.org
16	Melodie McGeoch	Monash University	Trends in invasive alien species	melodie.mcgeoch@monash.edu
17	Nicolas Gutierrez	Marine Stewardship Council	Number of MSC certified fisheries	nicolas.gutierrez@msc.org
18	Richard Robarts	NHRC	Water Quality Index for Biodiversity	richard.robarts@ec.gc.ca
19	Serena Heckler	UNESCO	Status and trends of linguistic diversity	s.heckler@unesco.org
20	Steven Katona	Conservation International	Ocean Health Index	steven.katona1@gmail.com
21	Stuart Butchart	BirdLife International	Red List Index and Global Wild Bird Index	stuart.butchart@birdlife.org
22	Teresa Mulliken	TRAFFIC	Biodiversity for food & medicine	teresa.mulliken@traffic.org

Discussion points following presentations:

- Having the BIP name behind an indicator can help secure funding, although can hinder it as donors may assume that funding is dealt with through the collective.
- SCBD would be willing to support funding requests through letters of endorsement.
- Freshwater Trophic Index (equivalent to MTI) now has some data behind it, but the quality is far inferior to the data behind the MTI.
- The majority of indicators do have data available and publicly available methodologies, although there hasn't been an audit to verify. This links to the toolkit, to help parties understand how to use the indicators at the national level.
- Having data, or just mapping what is available and who you contact for it, could be very useful.
- Just providing raw data may not be sufficient if data must be transformed, but providing transformed data prevents people 'seeing the real thing'.
- Need to make some sort of study to analyse the interaction amongst indicators and the trends they show
- We need to exploit the valuable datasets which underpin a range of indicators in more depth
- There is a COP call to disaggregate information for plant conservation and for gender when collecting information for GBO-4.

Day 2

Day 2 was opened by Matt Walpole of UNEP-WCMC.

Session 2 (continued): Indicator Presentations

Possible new indicators/partners

This session concluded with five-minute presentations on possible new indicators by both current and potential new partners. Again, these presentations can be accessed via Basecamp (<https://shreddocumentsarea.basecampHQ.com/login> or via the 'shared documents area' on the BIP website) and the speakers list is below:

	Speaker	Organisation	Possible indicators	Email
23	Brian O'Donnell	AidData	Possible takeover of 2010 indicator: Official development assistance in support of the CBD/ Finance for biodiversity indicators	bodonnell@aiddata.org
24	Michael Bruford	Cardiff University	Wild genetics indicators	brufordmw@cardiff.ac.uk
25	Piero Genovesi	Invasive Species Specialist Group	Invasive alien species indicators	piero.genovesi@isprambiente.it
26	Szabolcs Nagy	Wetlands International	Waterbird indicator and other wetland indicators	szabolcs.nagy@wetlands.org
27	Diego Juffe	IUCN	IUCN Knowledge Products	diego.juffe@iucn.org
28	Wendy Foden	IUCN	Climate change indicators	wendy.foden@iucn.org
29	Samy Gaiji	GBIF	Biodiversity knowledge indicators	sgaiji@gbif.org
30	Hannah Thomas	UNEP-WCMC	Report back from IndiSeas Indicator workshop	hannah.thomas@unep_wcmc.org

Session 3: Global indicators – mapping, gaps and future reporting requirements

Indicator Mapping Exercise

This session began with each partner being asked to note down details of their indicator(s), next update etc. and stick it/them (pink cards) on the wall under the Aichi Target(s) to which it/they map. Partners were then split into four groups based loosely around clusters of Targets and asked to discuss within the group whether there are novel ways to use the indicators or underlying data (disaggregation's, combinations sub-indicators) to fill indicator gaps (blue cards). Lastly, Partners were asked if there are any existing or potential indicators currently outside the BIP that map against the Aichi Targets (green cards). The results of the indicator mapping exercise are available in Annex 2.6 (a-e).

Discussion points:

- It will be interesting to link the traditional knowledge indicators to Targets 2 and 5; there are currently 4 under development.
- It would be useful to develop a questionnaire for Parties to identify whether they have relevant databases

- It would be interesting to explore the costs of effectiveness for Protected Areas
- It would be worth exploring by sector the incentives put in place for protected areas
- Ex-situ crop collections indicator may be able to be disaggregated and linked to the Red List
- Further work is need on in-situ biodiversity indicators.
- 3 indicators related to use and trade of species link to LPI; these linkages could be further explored
- GBO-4 should use positive stories – Partners should work with BIP Sec comms strategy
- Could look into the trophic balance among different trophic levels to assess ecosystems
- Important to keep improving PA data as this underpins a lot of other indicators
- Could link Targets 9 and 11 – how management effects the pressure & response components of the IAS indicator
- The survey and questionnaire needs to be carefully expanded and targeted at different audiences
- Questionnaires would be useful for certification schemes (level of uptake and costs)
- An indicator for Target 2 could be the number of countries engaged in TEEB national studies and the World Bank WAVES initiative. There are other national initiatives that could be tracked too.
- Another indicator could be the number of schools with biodiversity values in the curriculum
- Target 3 is difficult, involves a lot of political issues and there are a lack of experts
- For Target 4, different breakdowns on National Footprint (by production & consumption, land use) could be used and are available
- Other options include Planetary Boundaries Assessment and Net Positive Impact Framework

Global Biodiversity Outlook 4

Robert Höft (CBD Secretariat) took Partners through the timeline for the production of the 4th edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-4):

Product	Date
GBO-4 Advisory Group constituted	September 2012
Draft outline	December 2012
First peer-review of selected sections	October 2013
Revision of selected sections	January 2014
Second peer review of all sections	May 2014
Revision of drafts	June 2014
Typesetting in English	July 2014
Translation into official UN languages	July 2014
Printing and dispatch to launch events	September 2014
Launch of main GBO-4 report	October 2014

Mapping Exercise:

Partners were asked to revisit the indicator mapping exercise and indicate if the following applied to any of the indicators:

Examples of/potential for global indicator use at:

- National level – blue sticker
- Regional level – yellow sticker

Indicator can be disaggregated for

- Plants – green sticker
- Gender – red sticker

The results of the exercise can be viewed in Annex 2.6 (a-e).

Aichi Passport

Participants broke out into small groups to discuss a number of questions relating to the Aichi Passport:

What should be included in the passport?

- New name
- App should have a news section - could deliver updates and link to the website
- Print version: Have a fold-out that maps indicators to targets and shows trends
- Website/app: have tools for indicator mapping
- Section on how different actors could help or engage
- Intro about the CBD should be in more lay-person terminology
- Multilingual
- Website: Indicator toolkits for regional/national partners
- Explain relationship amongst indicators – complementary, not competing
- Website and app must be seamlessly integrated
- Website and app must direct the user to where they find more information
- Website: Filter by what is available for each country/indicator & link to data on host website
- Highlight gaps - provide links to national guidelines
- Translation (in-kind support from governments?)
- More operational indicators and examples of how they are applied
- Global, regional and national examples for each target to show relevance to national users
- If no indicator, say something about why it is difficult and has no data; give a regional/national example instead
- Show not just 'A' indicators but also those under development
- Linkages and how one indicator could contribute to several targets
- Partner branding/logos – even if indicator not included (back cover?)

How do you ensure fairness of indicator representation?

- Website/app: All indicators at all times; should be kept fully up to date.
- Print version: Just include a selection of the most pertinent indicators to that meeting but links to all others.
- Print version: Different editions could focus on a story and on cross-cutting indicators
- Print version: All indicators at least listed against the target
- Showcase/highlight updated indicators in the given year
- Show different indicators in different versions
- Pick specific examples to tell a story and to capture the different dimensions (national/regional/plants/gender)

How often to print the hard copy?

- The hard copy is only really there for meetings etc

- Print version: provides a snapshot; limited number at any time
- Hard copy for big meetings
- Hard copy difficult for keeping up to date and for version control

Other Ideas:

- Other formats - USB sticks
- Downloadable graphics
- Canned BIP powerpoints/prezzis or short videos for partners to use
- Celebrity endorsement – donor/spokesperson (if we are targeting the public!)

Audience:

- Parties - CBD National Focal Points & colleagues developing NBSAPs
- Could target other audiences such as scientific community
- Donors

Take Home Message:

- Indicators are important
- They can be applied
- The BIP is a 1-stop shop that provides the ammunition to track progress on targets

Discussion points

- CBD Focal points will want 2 main things – the most up-to-date information available on indicators and how they can be applied at a national level and also something to take to ministries, a quick and easy demonstration – this cannot be resolved in a single product.
- This is a 2-way partnership; some indicators have very significant communications platforms which should be utilised to raise the profile of the partnership.

Action point: BIP Sec to produce a proposal for the future of the Aichi Passport and consult with Partnership

[Session 4: Regional-National Progress and Plans](#)

BIP Sec's Regional-National Work

This session began with a presentation by Philip Bubb, updating on the Regional-National component and its activities, outputs and strategy (Presentation: Annex 2.7; Supporting Documents: Annex 1.6) , and by Sarah Brooks on the NBSAP Forum, a new initiative aiming to support Parties in updating and implementing their NBSAPs (Annex 2.8).

Discussion points:

- Performance measures for capacity building and for how this has led to target countries using indicators are obtained through feedback forms at the end of the workshops as a crude measure of how participants have engaged with the materials, and also through the terminal evaluations as well

as through countries actually producing indicator reports following the workshops. NBSAPs will be the main measure of success.

- Successful examples of similar fora to the NBSAP Form include Friends of PoWPA and the CBD's many different support materials and tools.
- Community of Practice is an open term that is about bringing together people involved in one common practice/enterprise and facilitating their knowledge of one another for communication and support.
- The NBSAP Forum is including people at the centre of regional platforms in discussions.

Regional Initiatives

Then followed a series of three presentations on regional/national initiatives of BIP Partners. These presentations are available via Basecamp (<https://shareddocumentsarea.basecampHQ.com/login>) or via the 'shared documents area' on the BIP website) and the speakers list is below:

	Speaker	Organisation	Regional Initiatives	Email
30	Katarzyna Biala	European Environment Agency	SEBI	katarzyna.biala@eea.europa.eu
31	Mike Gill	Canadian Wildlife Service	Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Programme	mike.gill@ec.gc.ca
32	Xuemei Han	NatureServe	National Indicator Dashboard project	xuemei_han@natureserve.org

Day 3

Day 3 was opened by Robert Höft of the CBD Secretariat.

Session 4 (continued):

Group Exercise: How Partners can support countries

To conclude this session, participants broke out into working groups to discuss how global Partners can support countries to have indicators for NBSAPs and how BIP regional-national engagement can assist global indicator production and use.

Group feedback:

- Need to consider countries' needs
- Responsibility lies primarily with CBD focal points and there is a high likelihood that they themselves do not know what is going on within their country, or more broadly – what other agencies are doing, relevant data being collected etc.
- Need to codify the status of national level information (whether there is already a feed of information coming up for aggregation, where it is coming from and also where there is no data but it is needed) – suggestion of a passport to document what is going on at the national and broader scale, who is responsible and the different data flows.
- Simple and clear guidance consistent with advice at the global level
- Provide materials for workshops
- 1-on-1 support is needed to help with technical issues and questions – the NBSAP Forum will provide a helpdesk; BIP could also offer an indicator helpdesk which directs countries to the right person within the partnership
- Create a simple table populated by BIP Partners – what the indicator is, which target it informs, what is available nationally, what training is available – map what is on offer
- BIP partners could offer practical toolkits, information documents or target mapping
- BIP Partners could help link with the CBD CHM networks to avoid duplication and strengthen this initiative
- Partners could identify variables that parties need to measure and help develop workflows towards achieving targets
- Partners could be involved in reviewing draft NBSAPs or in workshops/websites
- The BIP Website could provide a window to reach partners' website and for partners to announce developments
- Partners could be involved in side events focusing on sharing expertise and experiences
- Opportunities for BIP and GEO-BON on further capacity building and providing advice on NBSAPs, CHMs etc.
- Include in toolkit lessons learned by those who develop global indicators and work with nations to create national indicators – criteria on how to build national databases and create national indicators in cooperation with global indicators
- Need to ensure consistency of global methodologies at national level
- Need a national commitment to produce the indicator over time and to share data with global partner
- Must determine which global indicators are practical for national application

- Need to know which data exists
- GEO-BON has developed 'Essential Biodiversity Variables' and would like to use this to help nations and advise on core variables that should be included in monitoring so we have sufficient and consistent data. Need to populate and map EBVs to indicators, and develop a simple and consistent framework for what nations should be monitoring.
- Would be useful to know who BIP has already trained for those working at the national level

Session 5: The Way Forward

Partners' Roles and Responsibilities

Anna Chenery (BIP Secretariat) presented on the possible roles and responsibilities of new as well as existing BIP Partners (Presentation: Annex 2.9; Supporting Documents: Annexes 1.7 and 1.8). Partners were then asked for their views on the proposed roles and responsibilities.

Discussion points:

- Due to different partners and different countries having different restrictions on data availability, it is desirable that partners' data be freely available but it is recognised that it is not always achievable.
- Collaborative opportunities (such as the Science paper) are very beneficial and it may need to be BIP Secretariat's responsibility to seek these out
- Need to address issue of partners who are working on indicators under development
- Asking partners for a letter of commitment to the BIP is difficult as some projects are dependent on having funds to provide indicators and therefore contribute to BIP
- Could be phrased as a letter of intent that could help with funding activities – a two-way tool that can help the organisations demonstrate their role in the partnership
- A letter of commitment to the Partnership would not be a commitment to provide indicators forever
- A letter of agreement was signed in 2010 for the funding received, but this expired with the funding.
- It could be worded more as a letter of support
- Will be a challenge for Partners without guaranteed funding to commit to cooperate in order to help maintain the BIP

Action point: BIP Sec to draft a letter and distribute to Partners who will be invited to amend their letter as appropriate to their organisation

The BIP Steering Committee

Damon Stanwell-Smith (BIP Secretariat) talked Partners through the Terms of Reference for the BIP Steering Committee (Annex 1.9).

Discussion points:

- Structure and function of the Steering Committee may evolve
- In order to make it more efficient, the size of the steering committee has been reduced and instead there is a 'Users Group', which is more inclusive and representative, making it easier to include relevant bodies such as the World Bank.
- Some concern was raised at the lack of consultation on Steering Committee members

- It was noted that it is important to include reference to the role of the Steering Committee in fundraising

BIP Communications Strategy

Cristina Secades (BIP Secretariat) presented on the BIP's proposed communications strategy (Presentation: Annex 2.10; Supporting Documents: Annex 1.12). Following the presentation, Partners were asked for their views on the strategy.

Discussion points:

- The BIP's target audience so far has been technical specialists, rather than the general public – although if this is considered to be important then it could be addressed.
- Donors and CBD Focal points are important target audiences
- The Scientific community is an important audience – worth tracking peer reviewed papers
- Could include reference to GEO-BON and other linkages in pursuit of the CBD
- A video or a canned Prezi might be important comms tools as Partners could include these on their website
- Partner twitter accounts could be linked, although BIP Twitter feed is currently inactive
- The BIP needs to find a balance between remaining open to new Partners and ensuring that any expansion is purpose-driven
- It would be great if BIP could populate the information on national indicators, although this is a huge job – could involve national partners in this to update them themselves

The BIP and the Sustainable Development Goals

Cristina Secades (BIP Secretariat) presented on how the possible synergies between the BIP and the SDGs process (Presentation: Annex 2.11; Supporting Documents: Annex 1.13). The diagram presented which demonstrates how the SDGs fit into the post-2015 development agenda is available in Annex 2.12.

Discussion points:

- There should be discussion included in the BIP Network on the Trondheim Conference as this engages government individuals and is a great opportunity

The BIP and IPBES

Robert Höft (CBD Secretariat) introduced Partners to the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). IPBES will have their first Plenary Meeting in January, with a second meeting later in the year, which will focus on processes, assessments and linkages, and will consequently be highly relevant to the BIP. A number of BIP Partners may also be connected to IPBES, and BIP Sec will share any relevant updates with the Partnership.

The BIP and GEO-BON

Damon Stanwell-Smith (BIP Secretariat), Melodie McGeoch (Monash University) and Mike Gill (Canadian Wildlife Service) were all present at a GEO-BON all-hands meeting the previous week in California. Each presented on the relationship between BIP and GEO-BON (Annex 2.13).

The presentations highlighted that Working Group 9, on Biodiversity Indicators is highly relevant to the BIP with several deliverables identified, such as handbooks on capacity building, making existing data accessible, a series of reports being collated to assist in NBSAPs and other national reporting requirements against targets. There are currently 4 Regional BONs (RBONs), and these represent a strong opportunity to bring forward some of BIP's capacity building work with GEO-BON. We need to ensure that GEO-BON Working Groups and RBONs are collecting relevant data for BIP indicators, to determine if EBVs map well to indicators and to allow the BONs to influence/communicate potential new indicators to BIP. It is also important to collaborate on capacity building approaches and to ensure open-access to interoperable data.

Discussion points:

- There was a consensus that one priority deliverable is to pull together all the different deliverables by Aichi target to inspire additional data that may be relevant to each target.
- GBIF is a member of GEOBON and leading one of the work packages but GEOBON is very much a way to unify efforts and to really aggregate multiple organisational efforts
- GEOBON is bit like BIP trying to pull people together, have a group that can pull together capacity building materials to give to the regional BONs. GEOBON is less formalised than BIP
- GEO-BON is about the core scientific community on the ground trying to harmonise their efforts at the global scale (both remotely and in situ) and if they're successful, we have better data for our indicators. The CBD and the Aichi Targets are now a strong focus and the BIP is well known.
- GEO-BON is developing a multi-chapter handbook that explains how to set up a GEO network that people can use to promote the development and uptake of GEO-BON. There will be a chapter on indicators, including a mapping between EBVs and the Aichi and other Biodiversity Targets
- Melody: there will be a chapter on indicators in the GEO-BON handbook, and one of the deliverables that came up was mapping between EBVs and Aichi Targets and future/potential BD targets. This section is likely to be led on by the BIP.
- There will be a report available in January/February on core indicators which should be shared with the group to ensure integration.

Session 6: Fundraising

Group Exercise: BIP fundraising ideas

Participants broke out into different groups to discuss fundraising needs, possibilities and ideas for the BIP.

Feedback from Breakout Groups:

Activities that need funding:

- Capacity building
- National level monitoring
- Data collections and analysis
- Gathering data; knowledge products, communicating
- Essential databases underpinning multiple indicators
- BIP Sec
- BIP Partners' work

What we need:

- Costing study (what do we need) x incremented costs
- More clarity on fundraising operations for Partners
- Clarify role of steering committee on fundraising
- Develop the business case for maintenance (not development) of indicators (what does the donor want and what does the donor get) - Cluster by theme/region/etc to address donors
- Marketing the BIP & publicity: why is it important – a one-liner.
- Build strategic alliances e.g. GEO-BON, collaborate with countries
- Develop funding proposals for each target
- Use capacity-building as a 'hook'
- Allocation of funds to projects and regional & national levels
- Use PhD students

BIP Sec to:

- ID funding opportunities
- Lead successful funding bids
- E.g. Clinton foundation, Coca Cola Foundation, MAVVA → launching global pages
- BIP Sec to coordinate fundraising plan/activities
- Lead on consortium to institutional donors e.g. governments (not only European e.g. Korea), UN agencies, EU → a Steiner synergies, CBD Secretariat
- Road map linked to products → funding
- Steering Committee

Section 7: Next Steps

A group discussion was held on Next Steps for the BIP Secretariat and Partners. These are included on page 1 of this document. Suggestions for holding the next Technical Partnership Meeting included a similar time next year, or holding it around a big meeting or event that many of the Partners would already be attending in order to minimise funding and travel requirements.