



High-level Panel (Phase II)
First Teleconference
2 August 2013

**REPORT OF THE FIRST TELECONFERENCE OF THE HIGH-LEVEL PANEL ON
GLOBAL ASSESSMENT OF RESOURCES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE STRATEGIC
PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020**

1. The first teleconference of the High-Level Panel was held to summarize progress since the meeting in Trondheim, Norway on 30-31 May 2013, and to discuss the regional assessment approach proposed by the Research Team.
2. Mr. Carlos Manuel Rodriguez was the Chair of the teleconferences.
3. Owing to the broad geographic spread of the High-Level Panel members and observers, calls were made at 10:00 and 16:00 GMT to allow for full participation. This report compiles the discussions of both calls that made up the teleconference. A list of those that participated and on which call is provided in the annex.

SUMMARY

4. Mr. Carlos Manuel Rodriguez led the discussion on progress since the first High-Level Panel meeting, the regional assessment approach, peer review, the draft report outline, and the Panel's website. The plans for the second Panel meeting and future teleconferences were also covered.
5. The discussion focused largely on the regional approach, and considered options to ensure time- and cost-effective, coordinated and adequately reviewed assessments are carried out by the consultants. The Research Team will draw up methodological guidance for all consultants to follow, which will be shared for comment with the Panel. The High-Level Panel members will be asked to take on a leading role in reviewing the assessments within their regions.
6. The next meeting of the High-Level Panel will take place in Chennai, India, on 2-4 December 2013. The third day of the meeting will involve a joint session with the Expert Group on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development meeting that is due to be held in Chennai on 4-6 December 2013.

TELECONFERENCE REPORT

Report on progress since Trondheim

7. Mr. Carlos Manuel Rodriguez opened the teleconference by thanking the participants for their time, and inviting them to propose any further agenda items. None were proposed.
8. Mr. Rodriguez then introduced Mr. Tristan Tyrrell, the High-Level Panel Project Coordinator, who had started in the role in June 2013. Mr. Tyrrell has come to the role with a wealth of experience in this field, having worked in Africa and Asia, as well as at the international level at UNEP-WCMC and with a range of UN agencies.
9. Mr. Rodriguez stated that the research Terms of Reference had undergone review by the High-Level Panel, and the comments incorporated. Based on such Terms of Reference, contractual arrangements were underway with UNEP-WCMC to undertake the research required for the Panel. UNEP-WCMC will work primarily with ICF GHK, a UK-based economic policy consultancy, in order to provide the necessary research requirements. No comments were made by the participants on the contractual arrangements.

Research: Regional assessments

10. In order to undertake the preferred bottom-up approach within the time constraints, UNEP-WCMC explained the approach taken with regional assessments. By contracting consultants within the six identified regions – Africa, Asia, Europe, North America, Australasia and the Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean – it is hoped that greater understanding of the socio-political and economic realities, and the identification of relevant information, will be facilitated. In order to expedite the process, there would not be an open tender approach, and the High-Level Panel members and observers had been asked for suggestions on who could be approached. UNEP-WCMC said that more suggestions were needed for Africa, North America, and Australasia and the Pacific. It is expected that the regional consultants would work separately, although some identified researchers may be asked to collaborate as part of a group as appropriate.
11. The OECD raised concerns over possible diverging approaches taken by the different consultants, and the varying information gaps across the regions. In particular, questions were asked on whether there needs to be a degree of coordination across the regions, as well as guidance on how to answer the six research questions. UNEP-WCMC responded that methodological guidelines would be provided along with the questions, but cautioned that there remained a need for UNEP-WCMC and the relevant High-Level Panel members to ensure that the guidance was followed. It was acknowledged that further thinking was needed on ensuring coordination across the regions, with a focused teleconference with those researchers suggested as a possible approach. UNEP-WCMC suggested that an initial step be included in the consultants' workplans, whereby researchers would first identify the gaps and opportunities in their regions.
12. The UK said that, based on the experience with the first phase of the High-Level Panel, having a stated set of assumptions up front would help harmonize the approaches across all regions. The OECD agreed with this suggestion, and proposed that an indication be given of the expected end point. Korea suggested that a common template be provided to the researchers, to which UNEP-WCMC said they would develop and share with the Panel members.

13. The UK expressed concern over the expectations on the regional assessments to answer for all twenty Aichi Targets given the resources available. The UNDP suggested that, rather than seek to achieve the somewhat challenging wishlist in the current research Terms of Reference, the research team use examples for particular Targets from regions where the information is available, and to highlight gaps. The OECD proposed delaying the regional assessments until after undertaking a global review and gap analysis. ICF GHK responded that, while they agree with the points, the questions have been designed so as to be appropriate and relevant, and so they would be disappointed if some information would not be available from all regions.
14. Sweden stated that the Stockholm Resilience Centre should be able to help with resilience values, and enquired as to examining the distribution of benefits. UNEP-WCMC responded that they would follow up with Sweden on resilience values. ICF GHK responded that the identification of beneficiaries is in the research Terms of Reference, but perhaps the distribution of benefits should be stated more clearly. UNDP reminded the research team to also look at the BIOFIN approach.
15. The OECD enquired as to whether, in November 2013, the Research Team would provide a summary of the regional assessments or also provide an overarching global assessment. The research team responded that they would provide both, with ICF GHK adding that, according to the research Terms of Reference, they were not seeking a single global monetary figure. While some aggregation would be carried out where appropriate, there would be a greater focus on regionally-relevant assessments. The UK responded that some people will still look to add up the numbers, since there may be an expectation that this phase of the High-Level Panel will refine the global figure from the first phase.

Peer review

16. A concern was raised by UNEP-WCMC of the need to ensure that effective peer review is carried out while the regional consultants are under contract, since it will be difficult to engage them again later in 2014. In order to overcome this, it is hoped that the relevant High-Level Panel members will take a lead in their regions in the coming months on the review of the consultants' work.
17. A comprehensive peer review process is expected in March and April 2014 on the global report. Consideration of those to be invited to review the report will take place in early 2014.

Timetable

18. Mr. Rodriguez summarized the key milestones over the coming fourteen months. He noted that the process was currently one week behind schedule, and the most important item now was to get the research underway. Mr. Rodriguez also stated that the High-Level Panel members will be brought in as relevant and appropriate, and so their participation will not be 'passive'. Full participation at the meeting in India is especially important.
19. The first draft of the report is expected on 22 November 2013, in time for a full review at the second meeting of the Panel in India in December 2013. The report will subsequently be revised and made available for broader peer review on 17 March 2014, with a four-week period given for comments to be sought. The UK suggested that consideration on the key messages from the Panel should begin at the second Panel meeting.

20. The third High-Level Panel meeting is scheduled for April 2014. While the meeting was originally expected to be held in Quito, Ecuador, to avail of the opportunities arising from the second Quito Dialogue meeting, early discussions are underway to potentially have the meeting in Brazil, with some Panel members and observers also travelling to Quito. It was requested that those Panel members and observers who expect to be at the second Quito Dialogue meeting and Fifth Meeting of the Working Group on the Review of Implementation (WGRI-5) inform the CBD Secretariat.
21. A draft report and executive summary to be made available for WGRI-5 is to be submitted by 23 May 2014. In order to engage with the writing process of the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-4), the High-Level Panel is expected to submit input by 31 March 2014, and to provide subsequent comments on the overall draft GBO-4 by 30 June 2014.
22. It is not certain whether the fourth High-Level Panel meeting – currently scheduled to be held in Cambridge, UK, on 14-17 July 2014 – will be needed, owing to its proximity to the submission date of the final report (31 July 2014). However, the option is currently being left open, as the decision will depend on the progress with the research and the outcome of WGRI-5.

Report outline

23. Since the draft report outline had been circulated to all High-Level Panel members and observers for comment in advance, UNEP-WCMC provided a quick overview of the structure. No additional comments were raised on the report outline during the teleconference.
24. One point of clarification was raised on the difference between the terms ‘investment needs’ and ‘resources required’ used in the draft outline. Both ICF GHK and UNEP-WCMC responded that the resources required are not just monetary, but also include activities and a range of capitals (e.g., social, political, technological, etc.).

Website

25. At the first Panel meeting in Trondheim, Norway, the participants agreed that one way to raise the profile of the High-Level Panel and its work was to link the observer organizations with the Panel’s website. In order to facilitate this, work is underway to redesign the relevant pages on the CBD website. These will be made public in the coming weeks. The current page is available at <http://www.cbd.int/financial/strategy/hlp.shtml>.

Plans for next face-to-face meeting (2-4 December 2013, India)

26. The second meeting of the High-level Panel is expected to be held in India on 2-4 December 2013. The location was subsequently confirmed to be Chennai. All High-Level Panel members and observers will be invited to attend.
27. In addition, the Expert Group on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development is expected to meet on 4-6 December 2013. Noting that some individuals are common to both meetings, and that the two discussions are highly mutually relevant, it has been proposed that a joint half- or full-day session between the two groups will be held on Wednesday, 4 December 2013.

Tentative date and expected participants for next teleconference

28. It was proposed that the next teleconference be held towards the end of September. The UK noted that some participants may be in Montreal, Canada, around Sunday, 5 October, for a Bureau meeting, and that it may be useful to schedule the call around that date.
29. Owing the logistical challenges of coordinating the larger group, future regular teleconferences will just include the research team, and government and international organization observers. The High-level Panel will be represented by the Chair, Mr. Rodriguez. Special teleconferences with the all High-level Panel members will only be scheduled when specific discussions or decisions are needed.

ANNEX

Participants of the first teleconference of the High-Level Panel on Global Assessment of Resources for Implementing the Strategic Plan

2 August 2013

HIGH-LEVEL PANEL MEMBERS			
Chair			
<i>Mr. Carlos Manuel Rodriguez, Costa Rica</i>			
Africa			
Madagascar	Ms. Laurette H. Rasoavahiny	Director Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Areas Ministry of Environment and Forests	Second call
Europe			
Sweden	Ms. Maria Schultz	Director, SwedBio Stockholm Resilience Centre	First call
JUSSCANNZ¹			
Norway	Mr. Tom Rådahl	Secretary General Ministry of the Environment	First call
Canada	Dr U. Rashid Sumaila	Director, Fisheries Centre and Fisheries Economics University of British Columbia	First call
South Korea	Dr Tae Yong Jung	Professor, Korea Development Institute (KDI) School of Public Policy and Management	First call
Latin America			
Costa Rica	Mr. Carlos M. Rodriguez	Vice President and Senior Advisor, Global Policy Conservation International	Both calls
REPRESENTATIVES OF UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS			
World Bank	Dr Valerie Hickey	Biodiversity Specialist	Second call
UNDP	Mr. Nik Sekhran	Head of the Biodiversity Programme, Bureau for Development Policy	First call
UNEP	Mr. Alphonse Kambu	Programme Officer, Division of Environmental Law and Conventions	Second call
RESEARCH TEAM REPRESENTATIVES			
UNEP-WCMC	Ms. Sarah Smith	Senior Programme Officer, Conventions and Policy Support	Both calls
ICF GHK	Mr. Matt Rayment	Principal Officer	Both calls
	Ms. Mavourneen Conway	Senior Consultant	Both calls
SECRETARIAT OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY			
Mr. Ravi Sharma		Principal Officer, Technical Support for Implementation	Second call
Mr. Tristan Tyrrell		High-Level Panel Project Manager (Consultant)	Both calls

¹ JUSSCANNZ: Acronym for Japan, United States, Switzerland, Canada, Australia, Norway, New Zealand.

GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION OBSERVERS			
India	Mr. Hem Pande	Additional Secretary Ministry of Environment and Forests	First call
Germany	Dr Heidi Wittmer	Deputy Head of Department Department of Environmental Politics Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research (UFZ)	First call
United Kingdom	Mr. Jeremy Eppel	Deputy Director International Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Evidence Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs	First call
	Mr. James Vause	Economist, Biodiversity Natural Environment Economics Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs	Both calls
	Mr. Richard Earley	International Biodiversity Policy Advisor Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs	First call
OECD Secretariat	Dr Katia Karousakis	Economist Climate Change, Biodiversity and Development Division	First call