

**Convention on
Biological Diversity**

Distr.
LIMITED

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/L.1
11 November 2011

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC,
TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE
Fifteenth meeting
Montreal, 7-11 November 2011
Agenda item 7

**DRAFT REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE FIFTEENTH MEETING OF THE SUBSIDIARY
BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE**

Rapporteur: Mr. Nabil Hamada (Tunisia)

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

1. The fifteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (the Subsidiary Body) was held at the headquarters of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) from 7 to 11 November 2011.
2. The meeting was opened at 10.10 a.m., on 7 November 2011, by Ms. Senka Barudanovic (Bosnia and Herzegovina), Chair of the meeting, who welcomed participants to the first meeting of the Subsidiary Body to be held after adoption by the Conference of the Parties of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the declaration by the United Nations General Assembly of the period 2011-2020 as the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity. Although it was not the first time the Subsidiary Body met in circumstances of economic constraint, the current economic problems were critical and deeper rooted. At the same time, the new economic paradigm of “green growth” received considerable attention. Those difficult circumstances presented opportunities to promote the role of biodiversity in a more stable and sustainable economy. One of the key goals was to maximize the contributions of the Subsidiary Body by strengthening the science base for the implementation of the Strategic Plan. If the current deliberations were guided by the framework of the Strategic Plan, 2020 could be the light at the end of the tunnel. Giving a brief outline of the work before it, she said that, at its current meeting, the Subsidiary Body needed to review the updated technical rationales and indicators for the Strategic Plan, which would help assess progress in the implementation of the Plan and facilitate a better understanding, awareness and engagement by the full range of stakeholders that needed to be mobilized in order to achieve the vision of the Plan.
3. The adoption of the Strategic Plan on 29 October 2010 had been set against a background of drastic depletion of global assets of natural capital in urgent need of restoration and increasingly frequent and severe natural disasters. In many instances, those disasters were a result of environmental mismanagement. There was growing awareness of the direct correlation between intact and resilient ecosystems and human well-being, as recognized in many aspects of the Plan. While the convergence of

/...

the global environment, development and economic agendas was encouraging, a common language should be developed in recognition of the role of ecosystem restoration as a cost-effective solution. At its fifteenth meeting, the Subsidiary Body must consider ways to ensure the full contribution of restoration to the Strategic Plan, and discuss options for supporting the establishment of the International Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, which could help enhance the operational efficiency and quality of work under the Convention. She thanked Denmark, European Commission, Germany, Norway and Spain for sponsoring participants from developing countries to attend the meetings. Participants should take cognizance of their unique responsibility for the future of the world, given the key role of the Subsidiary Body in the success of the Convention which, like few other instruments, facilitated partnerships across the board. She urged the Subsidiary Body to conduct its work in that spirit.

4. Statements were made by the representative of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme, Mr. Carlos Martin-Novella, the German Minister of the Environment, His Excellency Mr. Norbert Röttgen, the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaif and the representative of the Society for Ecological Restoration, Mr. Steve Whisenant.

5. Mr. Carlos Martin-Novella, representing the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), said that the Subsidiary Body had an important role to play in providing advice to the Conference of the Parties on the architecture for the implementation of the Aichi Targets on Biodiversity. Work conducted by the United Nations Environment Forum in support of the Convention included monitoring activities by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC); ecosystem management through the Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI); activities of The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) study and the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services (IPBES); support provided to States in developing proposals for the Global Environmental Fund (GEF); and logistical support for the Sustainable Communities Programme Board (SCPB). More broadly, the Programme worked to enhance the integration of the work of the Convention into its Medium-term Strategy and Programme of Work and to promote the integration of biodiversity-related issues throughout the United Nations system. In order to further the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity, synergies between biodiversity-related instruments, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) must be enhanced. The Work of the Subsidiary Body would also provide essential input for the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity and the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development to be held in 2012.

6. The Chair then invited Mr. Norbert Röttgen, German Minister of the Environment, to report on the Bonn Challenge. Addressing the meeting by video, Mr. Röttgen said that the world was facing major challenges as a result of the global economic and financial crisis, but that ongoing climate change and the loss of biodiversity ultimately posed a greater threat to our survival. Forests were especially fundamental to life, yet 13 million hectares of forest were still being lost every year. New approaches to energy policy and resource use were required. As an investment in our future, deforestation had to be reversed and ecosystems restored.

7. During the Bonn Conference of September 2011, the German government and its partners, and the International Union for Conservation of Nature, had launched the Bonn Challenge – namely, to restore 150 million hectares of lost and degraded forests by 2020. The Challenge contributed both to the Aichi Targets of the Convention on Biodiversity and to the implementation of REDD+ mechanism of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. A Global Restoration Council had been established to support high-level policy-makers in their efforts to achieve the target and Germany's private stakeholders had announced their intention to make considerable investments. Overall, the conference had demonstrated that the restoration of forests and their ecosystems was ambitious but that it could, and must, be achieved.

8. Germany would support the ongoing development of the political, scientific and technical framework conditions for successful ecological restoration. The fifteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body was an opportunity to further efforts in that regard.

9. Welcoming participants, the Executive Secretary said that as the current meeting was the first one held since the adoption of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, it was fitting to focus on the scientific and technical aspects of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Translating the strategic plan into national and local reality was a challenge. To that end, Parties were invited to discuss the technical rationales and indicators for the Strategic Plan, and in that connection, revising national biodiversity strategies and action plans was matter of urgency that had to be given high priority.

10. He expressed his gratitude to the Government of Japan for establishing the Japan Biodiversity Fund which had allowed twelve regional or subregional workshops to be organized since the Nagoya meetings. Another three workshops would take place before the end of the year. Those workshops were designed to assist Parties and their partners in initiating the revision of their national strategy to integrate the Aichi Biodiversity Targets while identifying and agreeing on national biodiversity targets tailored to their specific needs and circumstances.

11. Ecosystem restoration was to be discussed by the Subsidiary Body for the first time, and Parties' guidance on the scientific and technical aspects of ecosystem restoration was vital to enable countries, Governments at all levels and other stakeholders, including the private sector, to make informed decisions so as to produce food and energy for a growing population without further accelerating biodiversity loss, thus achieving Aichi Targets 14 and 15 of the Strategic Plan.

12. One year had already gone by since the Strategic Plan had been agreed upon. Only nine years were left to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. He urged participants to keep in mind that it was critical to move forward, and to use the abundant guidance that existed to establish strategies, to plan and implement actions, to monitor progress and report on it at the Hyderabad Biodiversity Summit to be held in one year's time as a means of living up to the historic commitments made in Nagoya. In order to remind the international community of the urgency of the task ahead, the Secretariat had opened a new webpage indicating the number of days left before the deadline for the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets arrived.

13. He praised the leadership of Mr. Kalemani Jo Mulongoy, who had served with dedication at 12 meetings of the Subsidiary Body. As it was Mr. Mulongoy's last meeting before his retirement, he thanked him for his outstanding contribution to the scientific work of the Convention.

14. Finally, he informed participants that the post of Executive Secretary had been advertised and that he had been invited to apply for this position. Since 2006, and despite having been subject to unprecedented challenges, he had served the Convention with commitment and zeal. He informed the meeting that, after consideration, and in view of the many requests he had received from friends and colleagues, he had offered his candidacy for the post and if appointed, he would continue to serve this unique United Nations treaty, the sole objective of which was to protect life on Earth.

15. The statement by the Executive Secretary was followed by a round of applause from participants in the meeting, after which the Chair congratulated the Executive Secretary on his exemplary performance and assured him that he had the full confidence and support of all Parties.

16. Mr. Steve Whisenant, Chair of the Society for Ecological Restoration, announced that the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity had been selected as the winner of the Society's 2011 Special Recognition Award. The award recognized the vital work of the Convention on Biodiversity in promoting biodiversity through preservation and restoration. It acknowledged the 2011-2020 Strategic Plan, and Aichi Targets 14 and 15 in particular, as a significant advance in integrating ecological restoration into global biodiversity policy. Those, and corresponding national and regional targets, would significantly benefit the planet by restoring harmony between nature and culture.

17. Participants applauded as the award was handed to the Chair. The Chair thanked Mr. Whisenant on behalf of the Parties to the Convention and Mr. Djoghlaif gave him an apple marked with the logo of the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity.

18. Following the introductory statements, Mr. Kalemani Jo Mulongoy, Principal Officer for Scientific, Technical and Technological Matters at the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, made a keynote presentation on Mobilizing the Scientific Community for the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity. In his presentation Mr. Mulongoy said that the scientific community had to be better mobilized during the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity (the Decade) and that the tasks listed in the strategy for the Decade represented only some of the issues that should be addressed by the scientific community. All the scientific disciplines, including traditional knowledge and citizen science, should be involved, and not only those associated with Botanical Gardens, Zoos and Natural History Museums; institutions that were traditionally species centred and did not include microorganisms and ecosystems and their services, or the dynamic complexes formed, in space and time, which included human beings.

19. Some in the scientific community had already been mobilized through the Subsidiary Body which, pursuant to paragraph 1 of Article 25 of the Convention, was “to provide the Conference of the Parties and, as appropriate, its other subsidiary bodies with timely advice relating to the implementation of this Convention”. A wide range of scientific organizations attended meetings of the Subsidiary Body despite concerns regarding it being an initial negotiating platform where the scientific community was sometimes squeezed out of the discussions in favour of negotiation of texts while striving to reach a ‘delicate’ consensus.

20. Mr. Mulongoy also drew attention to the work of the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services (IPBES) which represented a promising mechanism to address the gaps in the science-policy interface on biodiversity, including ecosystem services. However, he noted IPBES was perceived as “intergovernmental” and that some scientists might feel out of place in such an intergovernmental set-up.

21. The mobilization of the scientific community required commitment from governments as well as the revision and adjustment of the criteria used by agencies and donors that fund scientific research to include relevance to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity among selection criteria. There were also a number of possible ways of mobilizing the scientific community, including at the national level, and it would be useful to collate that information and share it on the Convention’s clearing-house mechanism. However, many scientists who are carrying out research of relevance to the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 were not involved in the Convention processes and their mobilization required innovative strategies and incentives, while those scientists who were aware of the Convention processes, were often focused on their research “bubbles”.

22. In closing he said that the efficiency of Subsidiary Body could be improved and its role as the science-policy interface established under the Convention should be enhanced. The requests from the Conference of the Parties, which determined its activities, should include a request for the Subsidiary Body to develop its plan of action for the Decade and give it the means to intersessionally mobilise the scientific community. The sessions of the Subsidiary Body should have enough time to carefully review the assessments prepared for it and, where draft recommendations were needed they should be accompanied with the scientific rationales or drafted in the form of clear policy alternatives. The Subsidiary Body should also develop an indicative budget to cover its meetings and the proposed budget should be part of the budget to be discussed and adopted by the Conference of the Parties. The Subsidiary Body could contribute effectively to the mobilization of the scientific community but to do so it would have to fulfil its role of interface between the scientific community and policy and decision-makers.

23. At the 6th plenary session, on 9 November 2011, Mr. Mulongoy thanked participants warmly for their positive comments on his presentation. He thanked the past and present Chairs of the Subsidiary Body for their wisdom and excellent collaboration throughout his time of involvement.

ITEM 2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS, ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

A. Attendance

24. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following Parties and other Governments: *[to be completed]*
25. Observers from the following United Nations bodies, specialized agencies, convention secretariats and other bodies also attended: *[to be completed]*
26. The following were also represented by observers; *[to be completed]*

B. Election of Officers

27. In accordance with the elections held at the thirteenth and fourteenth meetings of the Subsidiary Body, the Bureau of the fifteenth meeting of SBSTTA comprised the following members:

Chair: Ms. Senka Barudanovic (Bosnia and Herzegovina)

Vice-Chairs: Mr. Alexander Shestakov (Russian Federation)

Ms. Tone Solhaug (Norway)

Ms. Gabriele Obermayr (Austria)

Mr. Ignatius Makumba (Zambia)

Mr. Nabil Hamada (Tunisia)

Ms. Larissa M. Lima Costa (Brazil)

Ms. Joyce Thomas Peters (Grenada)

Mr. Krishna Chandra Paudel (Nepal)

Mr. Monyrak Meng (Cambodia)

28. It was agreed that Mr. Nabil Hamada (Tunisia) would act as Rapporteur for the meeting.
29. In order to achieve staggered terms of office within the Bureau, the Subsidiary Body elected four new members to serve on the Bureau for a term, commencing at the end of the fifteenth meeting and ending at the end of the seventeenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body, to replace the members from Grenada, Nepal, Norway and Tunisia.
30. At the *[to be completed]* session of the meeting, *[to be completed]*

C. Adoption of the agenda

31. At its 1st plenary session, on 7 November 2011, the Subsidiary Body adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda prepared by the Executive Secretary in consultation with the Bureau (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/1/Rev.1).

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Election of officers, adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
3. Scientific and technical issues of relevance to the implementation of, reporting on, and follow-up to, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020:
 - 3.1 Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020: updated technical rationales and indicators;
 - 3.2 Ways and means to support ecosystem restoration;
 - 3.3 Draft comprehensive capacity-building strategy for the Global Taxonomy Initiative.

4. Matters arising from other decisions adopted at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties:
 - 4.1 Invasive alien species: proposals on ways and means to address gaps in international standards regarding invasive alien species introduced as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, as live bait and live food;
 - 4.2 Inland water biodiversity: implications of changes in the water cycle, and freshwater resources in the implementation of the programmes of work;
 - 4.3 Sustainable use of biodiversity: revised recommendations of the Liaison Group on Bushmeat, including options for small-scale food and income alternatives, and report on how to improve sustainable use in a landscape perspective;
 - 4.4 Arctic biodiversity.
5. Ways and means to improve the effectiveness of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.
6. Draft provisional agenda, and dates and venue for the sixteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.
7. Adoption of the report and closure of the meeting.

D. Organization of work

32. In considering the organization of work, the Subsidiary Body had before it a note by the Chair on improving the scientific, technical and technological debate during the present meeting (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/1/Add.2).
33. The Subsidiary Body decided to set up two open-ended sessional working groups for its fifteenth meeting as provided in annex I to the document entitled “Organization of Work” (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/Add.1/Rev.1).
34. At its 5th plenary session, on 9 November 2011, the Subsidiary Body heard progress reports from the Co-Chairs of the Working Groups.

E. Work of the sessional working groups

35. Working Group I met under the chairmanship of Ms. Joyce Thomas Peters (Grenada) and Mr Ignatius Makumba (Zambia) to consider items 4.1 (Invasive alien species: Proposals on ways and means to address gaps in international standards regarding invasive alien species introduced as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, as live bait and live food) and 4.3 (Sustainable use of biodiversity: revised recommendations of the Liaison Group on Bushmeat including options for small-scale food and income alternatives, and report on how to improve sustainable use in landscape perspective). The Working Group held (*to be completed*) meetings, from (*to be completed*). It adopted its report at its (*to be completed*) meeting, on (*to be completed*).
36. As decided by the Subsidiary Body at its 1st plenary session, on 7 November 2011, Working Group II met under the chairmanship of Mr. Alexander Shestakov (Russian Federation) and Ms. Gabriele Obermayr (Austria) met to consider items 4.2 (Inland water biodiversity: Implications of changes in the water cycle, and freshwater resources in the implementation of the programmes of work) and 4.4 (Arctic biodiversity). The Working Group held (*to be completed*) meetings, from (*to be completed*). It adopted its report at its (*to be completed*) meeting, on (*to be completed*).

F. Poster session

37. 5. At the 2nd plenary session, on 7 November 2011, Mr. Eric Chivian, Nobel Peace Prize winner and founder of the Center for Health and the Global Environment at Harvard Medical School,

introduced the poster session by giving a presentation on ecosystem restoration, human health and the objectives of the Convention on Biodiversity.

ITEM 3. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ISSUES OF RELEVANCE TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF, REPORTING ON, AND FOLLOW-UP TO, THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020

3.1 *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020: updated technical rationales and suggested indicators*

38. Agenda item 3.1 was taken up by the Subsidiary Body at its 2nd session on 7 November 2011. In considering the item, the Subsidiary Body had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on suggested indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/2); and on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020: Provisional technical rationales, possible indicators and suggested milestones for the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/3). The Subsidiary Body had also before it the Report of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/INF/6) and information notes by the Executive Secretary on adequacy of biodiversity observation systems to support the Convention on Biological Diversity 2020 targets (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/INF/8), national indicators, monitoring and reporting for global biodiversity targets (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/INF/9) and possible indicators for water and water-related ecosystem services for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/INF/10). It had also before it recommendation 7/7 of the Working Group on Article 8(j) on development of indicators relevant for traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use, the draft of which had been circulated as document UNEP/CBD/WG8J/7/L.7, which the Working Group had recommended should be brought to the attention of the Subsidiary Body.

39. Mr. Andrew Stott (United Kingdom), Co-Chair of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, also speaking on behalf of his fellow co-chair, Ms. Teresita Borges Hernandez (Cuba), outlined the key findings of the meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group convened from 20 to 24 June 2011 as contained in the report (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/INF/6).

40. The representative of the Secretariat informed participants that the indicators identified by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group had been compiled in a database that had been incorporated into the website on the Convention on Biological Diversity, which could be found under the heading: "Strategic Plan Indicator" (<http://www.cbd.int/sp/indicators/>).

41. Statements were made by representatives of Belgium, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela Brazil, Canada, China, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Switzerland, Thailand and Timor-Leste.

42. At its 3rd plenary session, on 8 November 2011, the Subsidiary Body resumed its consideration of agenda item 3.1.

43. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, France, Ghana, India, Jordan, Malawi (on behalf of the African group), Russian Federation (on behalf of the Central and Eastern Europe region), South Africa, Sudan, Uganda, and Uruguay.

44. A statement was also made on behalf of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

45. Statements were also made by representatives of the CBD Alliance, DIVERSITAS, International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB), and International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN).

46. Following the exchange of views the Chair established an open-ended contact group, chaired by Ms. Tone Solhaug (Norway) and Ms. Larissa Lima Costa (Brazil) to develop a common understanding of

how the indicators could be flexibly implemented and to revise the draft recommendations contained in document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/2.

47. At its 5th plenary session, on 9 November 2011, the Subsidiary Body heard a progress report from the Chair of the contact group.

48. At its 7th plenary session, on 10 November 2011, the Subsidiary Body heard a progress report from Ms. Larissa Lima Costa (Brazil), co-chair of the contact group, speaking also on behalf of her fellow co-chair, Ms. Tone Solhaug (Norway).

49. *[To be completed]*

Action by the Subsidiary Body

50. *[To be completed]*

3.2 Ways and means to support ecosystem restoration

51. Agenda item 3.2 was taken up by the Subsidiary Body at its 3rd plenary session, on 8 November 2011. In considering the item, the Subsidiary Body had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on ways and means to support ecosystem restoration (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/4).

An opening statement was made by Mr. Steve Whisenant, Chair of the Society for Ecological Restoration. After introducing the Society, he affirmed that conservation remained a global priority. While ecological restoration was addressing pressing challenges, it should not be seen as a justification for degrading or damaging ecosystems. Preventing further degradation and facilitating restoration involved both a continuum of biophysical activities and policies to shape human influences. The Society was ready to assist the Convention on Biodiversity in developing the ways and means to support ecosystem restoration, within the framework of the Aichi Targets and in line with its own vision for a sustainable future. He invited participants to consider and comment on the Society's call for action, from the 4th World Conference on Ecological Restoration (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/INF/13).

52. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, China, Colombia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, France, Guatemala, India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Jordan, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Thailand, Uganda and United Kingdom.

53. At its 4th plenary session, on 8 November 2011, the Subsidiary Body resumed its consideration of agenda item 3.2.

54. Statements were made by representatives of Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Ghana, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Sudan and Uruguay.

55. Statements were also made by representatives of the Center for International Forestry Research, Diversitas, ECOROPA, the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity and IUCN.

56. The Chair thanked the delegates for their interventions and advised that these would be taken into account within a Chair's text for their consideration. On the proposal of the Chair, it was decided to establish a group of the Friends of the Chair, co-chaired by Mr. Krishna Chandra Paudel (Nepal) and Mr. Horst Korn (Germany), to discuss the draft Chair's text. In addition to any other delegations that wished to participate, the Chair invited Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Uganda and United Kingdom to attend.

57. At its 7th plenary session, on 10 November 2011, Mr. Krishna Chandra Paudel (Nepal), co-chair of the group of the Friends of the Chair, speaking also on behalf of his fellow co-chair, Mr. Horst Korn (Germany), reported that the group had completed its work and the revised draft recommendation for consideration by the plenary would be made available shortly.

58. At its 7th plenary session, on 10 November 2011, the Subsidiary Body took up a draft recommendation submitted by the Chair.

59. Statements were made by representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Germany, Ghana, India, Jordan, Malawi, Mexico, Netherlands, Niger, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Senegal, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Trinidad and Tobago and Turkmenistan.

60. Following the exchange of views, the draft recommendation, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to the plenary session of the Subsidiary Body as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/L.2.

Action by the Subsidiary Body

61. [To be completed]

3.3 *Draft comprehensive capacity-building strategy for the Global Taxonomy Initiative*

62. Agenda item 3.3 was taken up by the Subsidiary Body at its 1st plenary session on Monday 7 November 2011. In considering the item, the Subsidiary Body had before it a draft comprehensive capacity-building strategy for the Global Taxonomy Initiative (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/5), the Standard Format for Taxonomic Needs and Capacity Assessments for Use by Parties (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/INF/4), the Terms of Reference for the Coordination Mechanism for the Global Taxonomy Initiative (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/INF/5), and the Report of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/INF/6).

63. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, India, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Malawi (speaking on behalf of the African Group), Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Poland, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand and Yemen.

64. At its 2nd plenary session, on Monday 7 November 2011, the Subsidiary Body continued consideration of the agenda item.

65. Statements were made by representatives of Colombia, the Cook Islands (speaking on behalf of the Pacific Small Island Developing States), Cuba, Ghana, Niger, South Africa, Saint Lucia and Syrian Arab Republic.

66. Statements were also made by representatives of the CBD Alliance, Diversitas, the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity and the World Federation for Culture Collections.

67. The Chair thanked the delegates for their interventions and advised that these would be taken into account within a Chair's text for their consideration.

68. At its 6th plenary session, on 9 November 2011, the Subsidiary Body took up a draft recommendation submitted by the Chair.

69. Statements were made by representatives of Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Cook Islands, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland and United Kingdom.

70. At its 7th plenary session, on 10 November 2011, on the proposal of the Chair, it was decided to establish a group of the Friends of the Chair to discuss the draft text.

71. At its 8th plenary session, on 10 November 2011, the Subsidiary Body continued consideration of the draft recommendation submitted by the Chair at the 6th plenary session.

72. The representative of the Secretariat reported that the group of the Friends of the Chair had completed its discussions and produced a non-paper containing proposed amendments to the draft Chair's text for consideration by the plenary.

73. Statements were made by representatives of Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ethiopia, Finland, France, India, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Peru,

Philippines, Poland, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (*to be completed*)

Action by the Subsidiary Body

74. [*To be completed*]

**ITEM 5. WAYS AND MEANS TO IMPROVE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE
SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND
TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE**

75. Agenda item 5 was taken up by the Subsidiary Body at its 5th plenary session, on 9 November 2011. In considering the item, the Subsidiary Body had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on ways and means to improve the effectiveness of SBSTTA (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/15).

76. The Chair invited Mr. Neville Ash, from the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), to introduce and summarize the 1st plenary session on the full operationalization of the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services (IPBES), held in October 2011 in Nairobi, Kenya.

77. Statements were made by representatives of Canada, Mexico, Switzerland and United Kingdom.

78. At its 6th plenary session, on 9 November 2011, the Subsidiary Body resumed consideration of agenda item 5.

79. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Ghana, India, Japan, Malawi, Moldova (on behalf of the Central and Eastern Europe region), Peru and Poland.

80. Statements were also made by representatives of the CBD Alliance, the ETC Group and IUCN.

81. The Chair informed participants that she would prepare a draft recommendation based on the comments received, for consideration in plenary.

82. At its 7th plenary session, on 10 November 2011, the Subsidiary Body took up a draft recommendation submitted by the Chair.

83. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, European Union, Finland, Guatemala, Kuwait, Liberia, Malawi, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, Uganda, and United Kingdom.

84. At its 8th plenary session, on 10 November 2011, the Subsidiary Body resumed consideration of the draft recommendation submitted by the Chair.

85. Statements were made by representatives of Canada, China, Colombia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, India, Malawi, Philippines, Switzerland and United Kingdom.

86. Following the exchange of views, the draft recommendation, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to the plenary session of the Subsidiary Body as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/L.5.

[*To be completed*]

Action by the Subsidiary Body

87. [*To be completed*]

ITEM 6. DRAFT PROVISIONAL AGENDA, AND DATES AND VENUE FOR THE SIXTEENTH MEETING OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

88. Agenda item 6 was taken up by the Subsidiary Body at its [*to be completed*] session on [*to be completed*]. In considering the item, the Subsidiary Body had before it the draft provisional agenda for the sixteenth meeting of SBSTTA (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/16).

[*to be completed*].

Action by the Subsidiary Body

89. [*To be completed*]

ITEM 7. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT AND CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

90. The present report was adopted, as orally amended, at the [*to be completed*] session of the meeting, on [*to be completed*], on the basis of the draft report prepared by the Rapporteur (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/L.1) and the reports of the working groups (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/15/L.1/Add.1 and 2).

91. At the closing session of the meeting, [*to be completed*]

92. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the fifteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice was closed at [*to be completed*] on Friday, 11 November 2011.
