



CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/11/12
20 September 2005

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

Eleventh meeting

Montreal, 28 November – 2 December 2005

Item 6.2 (a) of the provisional agenda*

BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY OF INLAND WATER ECOSYSTEMS

Proposals on matters identified in paragraphs 3 and 16 of decision VII/4 relating to national reporting, other information requirements and the identification of priority activities under the programme of work

Note by the Executive Secretary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The present document provides a brief outline of issues and needs in relation to paragraphs 3 and 16 of decision VII/4 of the Conference of the Parties and draws attention to relationships with other decisions and recommendations for the information of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA). The subjects of targets, sub-targets, indicators, monitoring and reporting, addressing threats and the review of implementation are linked and should be considered collectively and in relation to each other. Various ongoing processes are also relevant in terms of responding to these decisions, and the Executive Secretary will be presenting more detailed proposals that take these considerations into account to the Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting.

The note draws the attention of the Subsidiary Body to the need for an ad hoc technical expert group (AHTEG) to assist Parties at the national level in, *inter alia*, identifying priority activities in the programme of work to counteract priority threats to the conservation and sustainable use of inland water biological diversity. A critical part of this process is to identify which stakeholders produce the threats and, therefore, those that need to undertake relevant activities under the programme of work in order to enhance the effectiveness of implementation as a significant contribution towards achieving the biodiversity targets. This need is clearly identified in the decisions in question, but the AHTEG would also directly and indirectly address related needs for indicators, monitoring and improving reporting mechanisms. The establishment of the AHTEG would be an integral part of the proposals on ways and means to address the relevant decisions presented to Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting. The outputs of the AHTEG (after the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties) would assist Parties in the implementation of those proposals in order to achieve significant progress at the national level in addressing the requirements in the decisions, progress towards targets, improving cooperation between stakeholders, streamlining information flow and reporting on progress. The note includes a summary of

* UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/11/1.

the technical reasons for proposing the establishment of an AHTEG, and draft terms of reference for its operation are included in the draft recommendations.

SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION

The Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice may wish to:

1. *Note with appreciation* document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/11/12;
2. *Decide* to establish, subject to the availability of the necessary voluntary contributions, an ad hoc technical expert group with the terms of reference in annex I below to provide advice to Parties, the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, international organizations, the Executive Secretary, and other stakeholders; and
3. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, in relation to paragraphs 2, 3, and 16 (a), (b) and (c) of decision VII/4 of the Conference of the Parties, and recommendation X/4 of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice:
 - (a) To take into account the relevant outcomes of the Ad-Hoc Open-Ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention, the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on the Review of Implementation of the Programme of Work on Forest Biodiversity, the relevant outcomes of the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties to the Ramsar Convention, and other relevant on-going initiatives, bearing in mind the opportunities for identifying further progress through the proposed AHTEG should it be convened; and
 - (b) To note in this work the implications of SBSTTA recommendation X/4 that invites the Ramsar Convention to: (i) further develop the targets for the programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems, as appropriate, through *inter alia*, their quantification and application to specific wetland types and biogeographic regions, and to link those targets with the indicators currently being developed under the Ramsar Convention; and (ii) contribute to, *inter alia*, monitoring progress towards the targets that further consolidates the role of the Ramsar Convention, as established by decision III/21, as the lead implementation partner on wetlands for the Convention on Biological Diversity.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In paragraph 3 of decision VII/4, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to develop with the Secretariat of the Ramsar Convention a proposal, for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting, on streamlining and improving the effectiveness of national reporting on inland water ecosystems, taking into account the work of the Task Force on Streamlining Forest-related Reporting established in the framework of United Nations Forum on Forests and other initiatives for harmonizing biodiversity-related national reports.

2. In paragraph 16 of the same decision, the Conference of the Parties recognized the need for reliable baseline data and subsequent regular national assessments of the status and trends of, and threats to, inland water biodiversity as a basis for decision-making on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity of inland water ecosystems and, accordingly, requests the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with Parties and relevant organizations, in particular the Ramsar Convention, the World Conservation Monitoring Centre of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP-WCMC), the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and the Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA) among others, and making use of all available information, to prepare, for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting:

(a) A work plan with defined timeframe, ways, means, and capacity needs for assessing the extent, distribution and characteristics of inland water ecosystems, including, *inter alia*, biological characteristics and those chemical and physical characteristics relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, including necessary requirements for ecosystem based approaches, where possible using and not duplicating the efforts of other initiatives;

(b) A report on information, and sources of information, on the trends of inland water biodiversity, definition of agreed baselines, relevant indicators and frequency of the assessments; and

(c) A work plan with ways and means for assessing processes and categories of activities which have or are likely to have significant adverse impacts on the conservation and sustainable use of inland water biological diversity.

3. Two other paragraphs of decision VII/4 are also directly relevant to the subject-matter of the above-mentioned paragraphs namely:

(a) In paragraph 2 of the decision, the Conference of the Parties recognized that a major shortcoming in the review of the programme of work on the biological diversity of inland waters was the limited availability of recent information on each of the activities of the programme of work and the lack of financial resources to generate it, and further recognizing the usefulness of the national reports submitted under the Ramsar Convention for a global status of the implementation of the programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems, and, accordingly, requested the Executive Secretary to submit, for consideration at its eighth meeting, a proposal on ways and means for making the review more comprehensive; and

(b) In paragraph 14 (c) of the decision, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with relevant organizations and conventions, to develop cost-effective means to report on implementation of the programme of work as measured against the global targets defined in the Strategic Plan, in the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, and in the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, essentially using indicators and assessments at the global level by international organizations, or existing data, and propose these to SBSTTA prior to the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The specific requirements of this paragraph in relation

to the eleventh meeting of SBSTTA are outlined in an addendum to the present document (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/11/12/Add.1).

4. In addition, several related ongoing initiatives are relevant to all these considerations, including the Ad Hoc Open-Ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention and the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on the Review of Implementation of the Programme of Work on Forest Biodiversity established by decision VI/22.

5. SBSTTA recommendation X/4 is also highly relevant as it emphasizes in this context the linkages with the activities of the Ramsar Convention in view of the role of the Convention established by decision III/21 as the lead implementation partner on wetlands for the Convention on Biological Diversity. In particular, this recommendation invites the Ramsar Convention to: (i) further develop the targets for the programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems, as appropriate, through *inter alia*, their quantification and application to specific wetland types and biogeographic regions, and to link those targets with the indicators currently being developed under the Ramsar Convention; and (ii) contribute, *inter alia*, to monitoring progress towards the achievement of the targets.

6. The present document serves two main purposes:

(a) To provide information to SBSTTA on the status of the consideration of these related decisions, which will be considered in more detail at the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties; and

(b) In particular, to draw the attention of SBSTTA to the need for an ad-hoc technical expert group to complement proposals presented to the Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting with its outputs functioning as a means of implementation of the proposals at national level, subsequent to the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and therefore contributing significantly to addressing the longer-term requirements for these decisions.

7. Section II of the note addresses the general issues and needs amongst these related subjects. Section III draws conclusions and identifies a path forward.

II. ISSUES AND NEEDS

8. The aforementioned elements of decision VII/4 call for a systematic approach that: (i) links goals, targets, indicators, monitoring and reporting; (ii) clearly identifies the need to develop indicators to assess progress towards targets and means to report upon them (and hence reporting on the effectiveness of implementation of the programme of work); (iii) requires the identification of priority threats and hence priority activities to address them; and (iv) recognizes the existing and potential role of other conventions, international organizations and initiatives.

9. The programme of work is designed to achieve outcome-oriented sub-targets that contribute to the sub-targets for the Strategic Plan, ^{1/} including by addressing threats. The review of implementation of the programme of work should be against progress towards the targets set, including the extent to which threats are reduced. Relevant reporting considerations need to be aligned to this context. Reporting

^{1/} Technically the programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems was developed prior to the establishment of outcome-oriented sub-targets, but, in decision VII/4, paragraph 8, the Conference of the Parties recommended that the Strategic Plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, and their target of 2010 to reduce significantly the rate of biodiversity loss, should guide the implementation of the revised programme of work on inland water biological diversity. At the same time, decision VII/30, paragraphs 12 (c) and (d) and 13 (a) facilitate harmonization (if necessary) with targets and that future reviews will take those targets as the basis of measurement of progress.

mechanisms should be effective in providing reliable information enabling the progress towards targets to be assessed (via indicators) and facilitate the analysis of how the implementation of the programme of work has contributed to that progress (enabling improvements in effectiveness to be made). “Status and trends” information in the current context is required, *inter alia*, primarily to assess the effectiveness of the programme of work, and enable its subsequent revision in order to improve that effectiveness. In effect, data on status and trends are indicators of the effectiveness of the programme of work including progress towards targets.

A. Targets and sub-targets

10. A logical “hierarchy” of targets has been developed, with the overall 2010 target identified by sub-target under the Strategic Plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity, with onward application to the programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems (as already covered in recommendation X/4); likewise, for other programmes as they are either reviewed or developed (see decision VII/30, paragraph 12(c)). The Conference of the Parties has stressed the need to avoid the proliferation of the sub-targets in the programmes of work; otherwise, the process of reporting and indicators would become unmanageable.

11. However, targets, and indicators of progress towards them, in general, become more robust and measurable the more specific they become. This constraint (the need for specificity, without proliferation) is addressed by promoting the further development of more specific targets with partners, which in turn contribute to this hierarchical process.

12. Current partnerships with the Ramsar Convention are a case in point. That Convention has a mandate that is specific to wetlands and, therefore, is more competent at the development of robust targets, and indicators, which are more specific to wetlands (hence the relevant invitation to the Ramsar Convention in recommendation X/4). A similar argument applies to the activities of other conventions, international organizations and initiatives, within their particular mandates and fields of experience. For example, the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals is currently exploring how it can enhance cooperation and coordination with the Convention on Biological Diversity through the development of targets for migratory species, and relevant indicators, which contribute, *inter alia*, to the targets of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

B. Indicators

13. A similar reasoning applies to indicators for assessing progress towards targets. Indicators can apply to specific sub-targets (e.g., at the level of the programme of work, or for future Ramsar Convention targets) and also, where appropriate, contribute to assessments at high levels (i.e., sub-targets for the Strategic Plan).

14. What is important, in the current context, is how indicators feature (at various levels) within a strategic framework that links the achievement of targets at various levels under the umbrella of the 2010 target. In effect, the initiatives or stakeholders should operate in their appropriate context with the 2010 target as their beacon.

15. Cost-effective means to report on implementation of the programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems as measured against the global targets defined in the Strategic Plan are considered in the addendum to the present document (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/11/12/Add.1).

16. Potential indicators for the draft sub-targets applied to the programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/10/8/Add 2), focusing on assessments at the global level using existing data, were considered briefly at the expert group meeting on outcome-oriented

targets for the programmes of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems and marine and coastal ecosystems (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/10/INF/6).

17. The Ramsar Convention has undertaken considerable work on the development of outcome-oriented indicators for wetlands (see, for example, annex D – “Ecological 'outcome-oriented' indicators for assessing the implementation effectiveness of the Ramsar Convention”; http://www.ramsar.org/cop9_docs_index_e.htm#dr). The above-mentioned invitation by SBSTTA to the Ramsar Convention already notes the potential for consolidating linkages between the proposed wetland-specific targets and the indicators currently being developed under that Convention. Relevant considerations need to include how the Ramsar Convention and the processes of the Convention on Biological Diversity complement each other and maximize the considerable scope for synergies between the conventions in this regard (consistent with the spirit of decision VII/26). Similar considerations apply to other conventions, international organizations and initiatives.

18. When considering targets, indicators and a programme of work, three broad categories of indicators are required: (i) those that indicate trends towards outcome-oriented biodiversity targets (outcome indicators – which is the focus of the aforementioned consideration of indicators); (ii) those that provide information on the extent of implementation (process indicators); and (iii) indicators for trends in threats. All are required to effectively review the implementation of a programme of work - it is essential to know not only whether outcome targets are being achieved, but also which processes (activities) contribute to achieving them, including how and why threats have changed.

C. Threats to biodiversity

19. A programme of work for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity should address threats to that conservation and sustainable use. Therefore, threats are important in the current context because it is their removal, reduction, or mitigation, which leads to progress towards biodiversity targets. Hence, threats are intimately related to monitoring, indicators, reporting and the review of the implementation of the programme of work. Because of the importance of threats, there is also reasoning that it is often better to monitor trends in threats (and be vigilant for new ones) than to measure trends in biodiversity directly. This is a particularly compelling argument for inland waters because of weaknesses in direct measures of biodiversity. Indeed, many of the indicators adopted, or currently being considered, generate information on threats, not biodiversity levels directly (e.g., water quality, fragmentation of rivers). However, the subject of priorities for direct indicators of biodiversity *versus* indirect indicators (of threats) has not been systematically addressed for inland waters.

20. Major threats were used as a basis for the development of the revised programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems. However, the work programme addresses all threats equally. A much more detailed analysis is required if information on threats is to be used in practice to prioritize those activities which contribute the most towards reaching biodiversity targets (as required in paragraph 16 (c) of decision VII/4).

21. Assessing categories of activities having significant adverse impacts logically leads to the identification of priorities for activities for reducing threats and, hence, their prioritization on the basis of the likelihood of achieving the greatest progress towards biodiversity targets. Unfortunately, one does not automatically follow the other, since threats differ in the ease by which they can be addressed and the cost of doing so. There are also differences at national level in terms of the urgency or importance of threats, constraints to addressing them and capacity to act.

22. For threats to be addressed it is important to know who causes them, where and why. The “who” is particularly important in the current context because that is the entity that: (i) must undertake activities if the threat is to be addressed (i.e., implement the programme of work); and (ii) is likely the most

knowledgeable about the threat and, therefore, amongst the best placed to report on its trend (i.e., to develop and use appropriate indicators).

23. A particularly important point for inland waters is that the threats arise from a multitude of activities at sector level. “Inland waters” is not a sector itself. Water is the basis of a very complex ecosystem that the sectors have direct and indirect impacts upon. Often there is no agency or institution at national level with overall responsibility for inland waters (although often specialized agencies may deal with aspects of the subject— such as hydropower or irrigation). Frequently, environment agencies (ministries or equivalent) take on the role of stewardship of “inland waters” but they are rarely the source of threats and, hence, are only an intermediary in terms of addressing them, and for reporting.

24. Therefore, building appropriate partnerships with stakeholders (regarding reducing threats) is critical to both the effective implementation of the programme of work and reporting on progress towards targets.

D. Reporting

25. In the current context, reporting is a means by which, *inter alia*, information is communicated in a form which is useful for assessing progress towards targets (including generating and analysing outcome and process indicators), and which enables the implementation of the programme of work to be reviewed and subsequently modified in order to maximize its impact.

26. Reporting should operate from local through national to international levels, and by the multitude of stakeholders involved. Streamlining and harmonizing all of these current or potential reporting roles is the key to an effective reporting mechanism. Reporting by any stakeholder, at any level, therefore needs to be considered in the context of reporting undertaken by others.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSALS FOR THE WAY FORWARD

27. If harmony is to be achieved between goals, targets, indicators, reporting and reviews of implementation of the programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems, all of these elements need to be considered simultaneously and under a common framework. Activities may focus on one element, but if by doing so they lose oversight of the overall context and linkages (as described above), they will not only be less efficient but are likely to lead to tensions.

28. Likewise, effective coordination and cooperation between all relevant international conventions, organizations and bodies regarding the programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems, including their relevant activities relating to generating indicator information and reporting, will be best achieved if all stakeholders operate under a common framework. Having common goals and targets, or sub-targets and/or activities which contribute towards them, is the most logical means of enhancing these linkages. In short, harmony will be achieved if everybody “sings from the same sheet”. This is also a potentially effective means of clearer identification of areas for synergy between stakeholders (including between conventions).

29. These conclusions may equally apply to related considerations for other programmes of work. Needs can be addressed on a case-by-case basis for programmes of work. But a generic strategic approach may be more efficient which addresses common issues with the review of implementation across programmes of work, including the related subjects of reporting and collaboration between conventions, organizations and stakeholders. The most appropriate forum for this to emerge is through the Ad Hoc Open-Ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention. Outcomes of the AHTEG on the Review of Implementation of the Programme of Work on Forest Biodiversity (and other activities) are likely to also contribute to this process. Relevant considerations for the programme

of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems should be made subsequent to those outcomes, building upon them and focusing on issues or constraints and requirements, if any, of particular relevance to that programme of work. The timing of these related activities enables their outcomes to be considered by the Executive Secretary in an update of approaches and proposals in relation to paragraphs 2, 3, 16 (a)-(c), and 14 (c) of decision VII/4. This update consider these and related decisions collectively, as appropriate, and provide a synthesized proposal to the Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting, taking into account related ongoing activities.

30. In decision VII/4, Parties adopted a very comprehensive programme of work. Two major constraints to implementation will inevitably be that: (i) many Parties, without substantially increased capacity which may only be achieved in the longer term, cannot implement all necessary activities, and (ii) in many circumstances it is not clear which entities need to implement the programme of work, particularly in relation to addressing threats (nor indeed how to get those entities to adopt the programme of work).

31. Therefore, a critical step in enhancing the contribution of the programme of work to the achievement of relevant targets and sub-targets requires advice, based upon analysis, on which are the priority threats to be addressed, by whom and how. Hence, priority activities can then be identified, which will enable Parties to understand what efforts (or investments) will lead to the greatest gains. To achieve this aim, there is a need for a process that should include adequate attention to means for reporting on threats and progress towards outcome-oriented targets using indicators (and who should do this), because these subjects are related.

32. Given that Parties differ in capacity, levels of threats and the ability to deal with them, rather than being prescriptive, the process might more productively focus on mechanisms for undertaking such analyses at the national level.

33. Proposals made by the Executive Secretary at the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, on the subject-matter of the paragraphs in question, will stress that the identification of relationships between threats and priority activities under the programme of work, and stakeholders and their potential role in implementation and monitoring and reporting, together with ways an means to involve stakeholders better, are critical requirements in implementation and achieving significant progress in practice towards biodiversity targets.

34. It is suggested that an Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) could be established to assist Parties in this task.

35. The proposed AHTEG is unlikely to complete its work in time for its outputs to be considered by the Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting. However, the substance of most of the relevant decisions (and recommendation X/4) refers to the development of a process (e.g. “ways and means”, “proposals”) that will be ongoing beyond the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Its establishment, therefore, would form an important part of the process to address these relevant decisions (to be presented to the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties). It is not a substitute for, nor should it delay, the substance of the proposals to be considered by the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

36. The actual outcomes of the AHTEG (after the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties) would assist Parties to implement measures at national level that are required to effectively consolidated activities in response to these and related decisions and therefore significantly contribute towards the implementation of the programme of work, and reporting upon it and progress towards targets. It will directly and indirectly respond to the post-COP8 requirements of paragraphs 2, 3, 14 (c) and 16 of decision VII/4, as outlined in more detail in annex II below.

37. The proposal for the AHTEG is presented for consideration by SBSTTA at its eleventh meeting in order to expedite the process prior to the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
38. Draft terms of reference for the AHTEG are included in annex I below.

Annex 1

DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE PROPOSED AD-HOC TECHNICAL EXPERT GROUP

A. Objective

1. To enhance the contribution of the implementation of the programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems towards the achievement of the 2010 biodiversity target, sub-targets for the strategic plan, sub-targets for the programme of work and outcome-oriented targets elaborated for wetlands by the Ramsar Convention and other processes.
2. The AHTEG will be complementary to the process necessary to address paragraph 2, 3, 14 (c) and 16 of decision VII/4 by assisting implementation of that process at national level.

B. Outputs

3. Guidance on how to: (i) identify the stakeholders at national level whose activities most directly influence threats to the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems and hence those that should be implementing the programme of work; (ii) to prioritize activities in order, *inter alia*, to enable the implementation of the programme of work to be more effective in reaching targets; and (iii) to identify ways and means of assessing progress towards targets through involving key stakeholders in assessments and reporting.

C. Tasks

4. The Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group shall have the following tasks:
 - (a) Review the main threats globally to the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems including:
 - (i) The nature and extent of each threat;
 - (ii) The source of each threat, including the sector or activities from which it arises;
 - (iii) The relative degree of economic, social, institutional, political and other constraints to addressing each threat;
 - (b) Review how the activities in the programme of work address each threat, including the analysis of gaps and inconsistencies (if any);
 - (c) Provide guidance, that can be applied at the national level, on how to prioritize activities to reduce threats in order to maximize progress towards achieving targets;
 - (d) Identify mechanisms for the identification of the key stakeholders, including organizations and/or initiatives that support them, that are, or should be, involved in addressing each threat and hence identifying those stakeholders that are, or should be, implementing the programme of work and which may also contribute to reporting on progress on implementation using relevant indicators;
 - (e) Provide guidance on ways and means to promote the adoption of the programme of work by relevant stakeholders;

(f) Provide guidance on the development and use of indicators for outcome-oriented targets for inland water biodiversity, process indicators and indicators for assessing trends in threats to inland water biological diversity, within the context of stakeholders identified;

(g) Provide scientific and technical information on ways and means of how threats can be assessed, monitored and reported on by Parties using information provided primarily by stakeholders.

D. Duration

5. Subject to the availability of funding, the work of the Group will be completed before the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Group may sub-divide its tasks and meetings according to budget limitations. Ideally, the work should be divided into: (i) the identification of threats and key stakeholders; (ii) the prioritization of activities to reduce threats; (iii) ways and means to engage stakeholder involvement in implementation of the programme of work; and (iv) assessment, monitoring and reporting aspects.

E. Membership

6. In appointing members in accordance with the *modus operandi*, the Executive Secretary is requested to ensure geographical balance and representation of indigenous peoples. In addition, the key stakeholders (sectors) that are the source of threats, or the organisations that support them, and hence that are, or should be, implementing the programme of work must be well represented.

Annex II

**LINKAGES BETWEEN THE OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES OF THE PROPOSED AD HOC
TECHNICAL EXPERT GROUP AND REQUIREMENTS OF PARAGRAPHS 2, 3, 14 (c) AND 16
OF DECISION VII/4**

Paragraph of decision VII/4	Wording	Contribution of the AHTEG
2	“...a proposal on ways and means for making the review [of the programme of work] more comprehensive”	<i>Directly relevant:</i> by clarifying priority threats, activities to address them, stakeholders involved and how they might contribute to reporting in relation to the review
3	“...a proposal.... on streamlining and improving the effectiveness of national reporting on inland water ecosystems”	<i>Directly relevant:</i> Parties need a clearer understanding of who the stakeholders are regarding inland waters, priority threats, priority activities for reducing threats, progress by stakeholders in implementation and how stakeholders can participate in reporting on status, trends and progress through to the national level
14(c)	“...develop cost-effective means to report on implementation of the programme of work as measured against the global targets in the Strategic Plan....”	<i>Directly relevant:</i> by clarifying priority threats, activities to address them, stakeholders involved and how they might contribute to reporting on implementation; also, reporting against targets for the programme of work, and related targets for wetlands, including activities by stakeholders to reduce significant threats, should provide supportive information for assessing implementation in relation to achieving global targets in the Strategic Plan (see also document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/11/12/Add.1)
16 (a)	“...a work plan with defined timeframe, ways, means, and capacity needs for assessing the extent, distribution and characteristics of inland water ecosystems, including, <i>inter alia</i> , biological characteristics and those chemical and physical characteristics relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, including necessary requirements for ecosystem based approaches, where possible using and not duplicating the efforts of other initiatives”	<i>Indirectly relevant:</i> through the better identification of stakeholders at national level who might participate in the production of priority information
16 (b)	“.....a report on information, and sources of information, on the trends of inland water biodiversity, definition of agreed baselines, relevant indicators and frequency of the assessments”	<i>Indirectly relevant:</i> by helping identify those stakeholders who are dealing with (or impacting) inland waters directly and hence those that are a potential primary source of information on trends
16 (c)	“...a work plan with ways and means for assessing processes and categories of activities which have or are likely to have significant adverse impacts on the conservation and sustainable use of inland water biological diversity”	<i>Directly relevant:</i> this requirement is a direct output of the AHTEG under its proposed terms of reference