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### Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Share report from AHTEG on indicator use in 5NRs</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Investigate ways to encourage collaboration and communication between Partners</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Revise and circulate the structure document for comments</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Complete comprehensive mapping exercise of BIP indicators against IPBES, SDGs, GBO etc.</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Send email to all Partners asking them to confirm if they would be willing to produce disaggregations of their indicators for IPBES regions</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Approach IPBES regional assessment co-chairs/authors to highlight possible input based on Partners’ responses</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Write up and circulate table of indicator disaggregations/new indicators on back wall to Partners for additional inputs</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Check any new indicators are not replicating existing ones in the mapping exercise</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Produce BIP internal and external communication plan</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Circulate BIP Partner profiles from BIP TPM</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Send doodle poll to all Partners regarding attendance to important events (e.g. SBSTTA, COP) to organise BIP meetings or informal gatherings</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Develop a BIP directory</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Carry out analytics/user needs survey for BIP website and Aichi Passport</td>
<td>BIP Sec &amp; Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Investigate existing examples of search facilities and options for inclusion within existing BIP website and stamping of the indicators, and share with BIP Sec for comment</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Develop detailed plans for website and Aichi Passport</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Tidy up factsheets on BIP website</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Keep BIP Partners updated with SDG developments</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Development of ideas and proposals around national level support for SDGs</td>
<td>BIP Sec &amp; Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Investigate opportunities for formal recognition of BIP’s role in the proposed Global Monitoring Groups</td>
<td>BIP Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Draft map of EBVs to BIP Indicators and circulate to BIP Partners</td>
<td>Mike Gill, GEO BON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Task Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Identify mechanisms of communication between BIP and GEO BON using Working Group 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Identify opportunities for BIP Partners and GEO BON to collaborate at the national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Clarify relationship to other related initiatives such as GEO BON and who does what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Maria Cecilia Londoño to work with BIP Sec to develop action points for supporting national level implementation of the CBD (NBSAPs and National Report indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Determine steps to validate BIP indicators for SEEA and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Explore making links to other bodies that have sustainability reporting with indicators to raise profile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>BIPTPM 2016/16 Unlocking global datasets (CBD SBSTTA 18 Information Document)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>BIPTPM 2016/17 Future plans for the BIP website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>BIPTPM2016/18 Links between the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (CBD SBSTTA 19 Information Document)</td>
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<tr>
<td>1.21</td>
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### Meeting presentations and outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annex</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Review of the BIP indicator suite and identification of gaps presentation (Anna Chenery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>The AHTEG on Indicators presentation (Kieran Noonan-Mooney)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>BIP Relevant CBD COP 12 and SBSTTA 19 requests presentation (Robert Höft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) – A quick update! presentation (Robert Munroe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>BIP Progress since December 2013 including the 4th Edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook presentation (Nadine Bowles-Newark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Regional GBO Assessments presentation (Fiona Danks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Current funding – ‘Mind the Gap’ project presentation (Sarah Ivory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Expanding the BIP Partnership: Proposed approach and BIP membership structure (AHTEG, SBSTTA 19) presentation (Nadine Bowles-Newark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Overview of IPBES, its work programme and opportunities for the BIP to engage with the IPBES process presentation (Anna Chenery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Disaggregating the global indicators for the IPBES regions – Protected areas indicators and Red List Index presentation (Diego Juffe-Bignoli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Capitalising on the potential within the current suite of indicators presentation (Sarah Ivory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Developing new indicators under the collaboration of the BIP presentation (Sarah Ivory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Supporting the use of the global indicators at the national level (Anna Chenery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>How GBIF is supporting national level reporting (an example of producing national disaggregations of global indicators presentation (Tim Hirsch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>NaturServe’s dashboard project presentation (Healy Hamilton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Bon in a Box presentation (Maria Cecilia Londoño)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>Communicating the BIP presentation (Katherine Despot Belmonte)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>The SDG Process, current status of global indicator framework and the national process presentation (Robert Munroe and Anna Chenery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Overview of GEO-BON and its progress presentation (Mike Gill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>The BIP, SDGs and SEEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>Conclusions and Action Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall Meeting Goal

To present the recent progress of the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP) and seek partner engagement on its role and strategic direction for the future.
Meeting Objectives
The main objectives of the meeting were to update partners on progress and get their feedback on the following:

1. What have the BIP and its partners achieved since the last TPM?
2. How do we get the most from the indicators in the BIP?
3. How do we build the membership base of BIP and further strengthen the partnership?
4. How can the BIP work to fill gaps in the indicator framework for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020?
5. How do we strengthen BIP engagement at the regional and national level?
6. How can the BIP support other processes such as IPBES and the SDGs, and what are the benefits?
7. What opportunities are there for development through the BIP?

Day 1: Monday 25th January

Introduction (Chair: Anna Cheney, BIP Sec)
This session began with a welcome and introduction by Matt Walpole (UNEP-WCMC), followed by Hilary Allison (BIP Secretariat), who gave an outline of the meeting agenda (Annex 1.2), and presented the meeting purpose and objectives. Robert Höft (Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Secretariat) then read the opening statement on behalf of Braulio F. de Souza Dias, Executive Secretary of the CBD (Annex 1.3). Following this, there was a round of introductions whereby participants detailed their organisation and relevant indicator(s) (Annex 1.1).

Session 1: Current CBD Context (Chair: Anne Teller, EC)

Review of the BIP indicator suite and identification of gaps – Anna Chenery, BIP Sec (Annex 1.4 BIPTPM2016/2)
Anna Chenery began by providing a review of the BIP indicator suite (Presentation: Annex 2.1). She presented the results of an indicator gap analysis, which showed that three Aichi Targets still have no indicators, and 29 ‘elements’ have no indicators, and a number of indicator options for future assessment of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

Discussion Points:
- GEO BON could potentially assist the BIP to fill data gaps
- Information on the use of indicators to track progress towards meeting Aichi Biodiversity Targets in the Fifth National Reports to the CBD is provided on AHTEG document UNEP/CBD/ID/AHTEG/2015/1/INF/3 (https://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=ID-AHTEG-2015-01)

The AHTEG on Indicators – Kieran Noonan-Mooney, CBD Sec (Annex 1.5 BIPTPM2016/3)
Kieran Noonan-Mooney provided an overview of the Ad hoc Technical Expert Group meeting on indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, which took place from 14th to 17th September 2015 in Geneva, Switzerland (Presentation: Annex 2.2). Kieran shared some of the outcomes from the AHTEG meeting such as the proposed list of global indicators, the progress towards the development and use of indicators (GBO-4), the use of indicators in national reports, and progress in capacity building at the national level. The importance of global indicators which can be disaggregated to the national level was also highlighted.
Discussion Points:
- The reviewed AHTEG report document will be submitted to SBSTTA 20 in April 2016.
- The process of reviewing the proposed list of global indicators is ongoing and this list will keep being updated as information becomes available; it will not be a closed list.
- The format of the table is likely to stay the same

**ACTION POINT**: BIP Sec to share report from AHTEG on indicator use in 5NRs

**BIP Relevant CBD COP 12 and SBSTTA 19 requests** – Robert Höft, CBD Sec (Annex 1.6 BIPTPM2016/4)

Robert Höft presented on CBD COP 12 and SBSTTA 19 requests relevant to the BIP, relating to thematic coverage, thematic disaggregation (e.g. gender), global indicator development and national indicator use, synergies with other international processes, funding for indicator maintenance (e.g. 8j Traditional Knowledge), and open access to data and methodologies (Presentation: Annex 2.3).

Discussion Points:
- The focus is often on what the BIP can contribute to other processes, but it should also consider what other processes can offer for the BIP.
- The BIP supports the CBD in developing indicators to monitor progress towards the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets. However, this work requires funding.
- There seems to be a disconnect between the development of indicators and data collection at the national level. There is also a disconnect between the needs at the national level, and the methods and processes for developing indicators. Thus, it is important to find the best funding model to address these issues.

**The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) – A quick update!** – Robert Munroe, UNEP-WCMC (Annex 1.9 BIPTPM2016/7)

Robert Munroe provided an update on the SDGs and targets, which came into effect on 1st January 2016 (Presentation: Annex 2.4). The links and overlaps between the different Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals and Targets were outlined.

**Key points:**
- There are many overlaps between Aichi Targets and SDGs

**Session 2: Update on progress and current funding situation (Global component) (Chair: Robert Höft, CBD Sec)**

**BIP Progress since December 2013 including the 4th Edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook** – Nadine Bowles-Newark, BIP Sec (Annex 1.7 BIPTPM2016/5 & Annex 1.8 BIPTPM2016/6)

Nadine Bowles-Newark began this session by giving a presentation on the BIP’s progress since December 2013 (Presentation: Annex 2.5). A number of indicator publications were highlighted, including the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-4), which was brought together by the BIP secretariat for the CBD. The BIP also made important contributions at the CBD COP 12 (agenda items 7, 12 and 17 on mainstreaming traditional knowledge and gender into indicator development), the AHTEG on Indicators (background document: Review of the global indicator suite), and SBSTTA 19 (agenda item 4 on Indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity). The BIP has also been following and making inputs into the SDGs process via UNEP.
**Key points:**
- BIP has been active since last TPM in December 2013, despite minimal funding – but does need to be more dynamic and accessible
- The idea of creating a BIP indicator platform or dashboard was suggested
- Internal communication between indicator providers needs to be enhanced

**ACTION POINT:** BIP sec to investigate ways to encourage/foster collaboration and communication between Partners

**Regional GBO Assessments – Fiona Danks, UNEP-WCMC**
Fiona Danks then presented the suite of regional assessments of the progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, which comprise a number of regional cuts of indicators included in GBO-4 (Presentation: Annex 2.6). Fiona presented some of the key findings from Africa and Asia-Pacific. There was at least one BIP indicator available for 17 of the 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets, except for Targets 2, 3 and 15.

**Key points:**
- Regional disaggregations of indicators have been produced for regional GBOs to provide a more detailed and useful analysis at a regional level
- IPBES uses a different classification of regions than GBO, which might pose issues for data disaggregation and use of data for IPBES purposes
- In regards to requests for information for the GBO reports, communication with BIP partner organisations needs to be enhanced as sometimes the best people to provide the information are not reached, and the time-frames for inputs tend to be short
- The reports cover huge areas, which are treated as one yet can be very diverse

**Current funding – ‘Mind the Gap’ project – Sarah Ivory, BIP Sec (Annex 1.10 BIPTPM2016/8)**
Sarah Ivory provided an overview of current funding for the BIP, and in particular the Mind the Gap project, which aims to address gaps in the global indicator suite (Presentation: Annex 2.7). Other relevant indicator work within UNEP-WCMC (e.g. NBSAPs portfolio, GEF “Connect” project) was outlined, and the presentation concluded with identified funding gaps for production and enhancement of the global indicator suite.

**Discussion points:**
- UNEP-WCMC ran a “training of trainers” programme to support indicator development around the world. About 2/3 of those trained are still engaged and interested, although some regions are more active than others, and some of those trained have more opportunity and availability to provide support
- A call will be made for proposals for indicator development to fill specific indicator gaps
- A number of funding gaps remain; perhaps a business plan could be useful to ensure continuous funding for the BIP
- There is a need to bridge the gap between global and national indicators

**Session 3: Expanding the membership of the BIP (Chair: Matt Walpole, UNEP-WCMC)**

**Proposed approach and BIP membership structure** – Hilary Allison, BIP Sec (Annex 1.5 BIPTPM2016/3, Annex 1.6 BIPTPM2016/4, and Annex 1.11 BIPTPM2016/9)
Hilary Allison introduced the session by giving a presentation on the proposed approach for expanding the BIP and a suggested BIP membership structure (Presentation: Annex 2.8). Hilary explained that the new revised structure aims to ensure the inclusivity of the BIP membership as it continues to work to provide the best available biodiversity information for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Hilary also shared some initial comments on the background document BIPTPM2016/9, received from the Steering Committee meeting held via teleconference on Friday 22nd January 2016. The roles of the Secretariat and Steering Committee were also described.

**Discussion points:**
- It is unclear if a structure is necessary; perhaps the three categories proposed should just be used to ensure new partners are doing work that contributes to the BIP (but not to ‘brand’ partners)
- A, B or C should be used for classifying indicators, not partners
- Benefits of being a partner need to be clearer
- Principles of supportiveness and respectfulness must be fundamental in membership expansion to alleviate tensions and stop indicators being ‘diluted’
- What is the BIP’s role in gatekeeping? Who decides if an indicator should be included?
- ‘Stamps’ on indicators could help to demonstrate their “quality” by highlighting their past uses (e.g. GBO 4/Aichi Passport/last updated 2010...)

**ACTION POINT:** BIP Sec to revise and circulate the structure document for comments

*Group Exercise: BIP structure and approach for expanding membership*

The objective of this exercise was to attempt to reach consensus on an approach for enhancing the partnership, and to gather input from the partners on the revitalisation of the BIP membership, including the proposed criteria.

**Comments from breakout groups:**
- The selection of the Steering Committee should ensure it remains fit for purpose as the BIP membership expands
- Agree with the classifications of Producers, Users and Supporters, however there was uncertainty over the purpose of categorising these further by A, B, C criteria
- It is unclear as to the level of mutually exclusivity within the A, B, C categories.
- Be careful that category C doesn’t expand to too many MEAs
- Make sure that additional partners add value so as not to ‘dilute’ BIP brand
- Quality control of the indicators is a major consideration
- Make the requirements for BIP membership more tangible (e.g. request members to submit information on making national data and methodologies available)
- Promote the access and fair use of data within countries. BIP members should deliver good practice for working in smaller countries so that access to data is transparent and fair.
- The Secretariat should do more to facilitate communications between the partners, and facilitate communication with potential partners
- Growth in the BIP membership should be reflected in the steering committee. Having members in the steering committee that represents all user groups (producers, users and supported) is important.
- Avoid all indicator producers being on the Steering Committee to avoid conflicts of interest
- Proposed 3 step process:
Gap analysis and data needs to bring partners in
- Discover who is producing data
- Quality control over data

Session 4: How can the BIP support IPBES (Chair: Hilary Allison, BIP Sec)

*Overview of IPBES, its work programme and opportunities for the BIP to engage with the IPBES process – Anna Chenery, BIP Sec (Annex 1.16 BPTPM2016/14)*

Anna Chenery provided an overview of IPBES and highlighted key opportunities for the BIP to engage with the IPBES process, particularly in order to promote synergies in regards to information and indicator use (Presentation: Annex 2.9). The BIP secretariat has been engaging in IPBES processes with the aim of supporting the consistent use of indicators across the platform. Some opportunities for the BIP include providing indicator disaggregations for regional assessments, and/or providing indicator capacity building workshops. Relevant entry points and action points were also outlined.

**Discussion points:**
- There has been some progress made with indicators, but there is a clear role to play in communicating the support that the BIP can provide at different levels
- There are a number of key entry points (e.g. second regional authors’ meeting)
- Some work has already been done to disaggregate indicators to IPBES regions
- A comprehensive mapping exercise between BIP, GBO, SDGs, and IPBES is needed
- There needs to be a more efficient way to share indicators across different MEAs. The BIP perhaps could play this role, which would be useful and timely
- BIP can approach lead authors and co-chairs of assessments and promote what can be done

**ACTION POINT:** BIP Sec to look into comprehensive mapping exercise of BIP Indicators against IPBES, SDGs, GBO

**ACTION POINT:** BIP Sec to send email to all Partners, asking them to confirm if they would be willing to produce disaggregations of their indicators for IPBES regions

**ACTION POINT:** BIP Sec to approach IPBES regional assessment co-chairs/authors to highlight possible input based on Partners’ responses

*Disaggregating the global indicators for the IPBES regions – Protected areas indicators and Red List Index – Diego Juffe-Bignoli, UNEP-WCMC*

Diego Juffe-Bignoli provided an example on how the BIP partners can support IPBES, for example by disaggregating global indicators to support the regional assessments (Presentation: Annex 2.10). Diego provided an overview of the paper published in the Scientific Data Journal by some BIP Partners (Brooks et al. 2016, [http://www.nature.com/articles/sdata20167](http://www.nature.com/articles/sdata20167)). All outputs are available at [http://datadryad.org/resource/doi:10.5061/dryad.6gb90.2](http://datadryad.org/resource/doi:10.5061/dryad.6gb90.2). One of the key outputs of this work is the “Data Descriptor”, which was designed to make data more discoverable, interpretable and reusable. The Data Descriptor can serve to facilitate comparability and consistency between the different regional/sub regional assessments by disaggregating three global biodiversity and conservation knowledge products (i.e. RLI of Threatened Species, Protected Planet, and Key Biodiversity Areas). Other similar regional disaggregations could be undertaken to complement this work using the shapefile available at the links above.
Open discussion: How can the BIP support IPBES?

- BIP indicator providers could make cuts of their information/data for specific regions or specific MEAs/Processes
- The BIP should take advantage of easy wins, such as data disaggregations to support regional assessments
- Regional breakdowns differ between IPBES and UNEP; shapefiles can be provided to facilitate the disaggregations. Shapefiles from Brooks et al. 2016 are available at: http://datadryad.org/resource/doi:10.5061/dryad.6gb90.2

Indicator speed dating session summary

To conclude the first day of the meeting, the BIP Secretariat hosted an informal drinks reception and indicator speed dating. There were 43 dates recorded with 21 matches ‘made in heaven’ and 21 potential matches. Some of the common themes included: increasing networks into new areas; increasing transparency of data; sharing data, integrating citizen science data, and ground truthing collaboration.

Day 2: Tuesday 26th January

Session 5: Making the most of the potential within the partnership (Chair: Mike Gill, GEO-BON)


Sarah Ivory highlighted current ways in which the existing potential within the Partnership could be drawn on in order to support the development and use of indicators and storylines for gaps in the CBD indicator framework, for other MEAs and processes, and for other important areas such as gender and biodiversity (Presentation: Annex 2.11). Opportunities include:

- Disaggregations of existing BIP indicators
- Alternative use of underlying data to produce indicators for additional Aichi Targets
- Use of additional data held by the Partner organisation

It was highlighted that some small-scale financial resources are available to support this under the ‘Mind the Gap’ project. The total amount available to partners is flexible depending on number of requests received, funds required, suggested indicator feasibility/robustness, gap addressed and indicator alignment.

Discussion points

- A table with all information, mapping all the indicators to different processes, targets, goals etc. would be really useful
- It is important to bear in mind that, after 2020 and with a new Strategic Plan, some of the areas that are currently gaps now may not be included and therefore may no longer be priority

Group exercise – what is possible using the current suite of indicators?

Next, partners were divided in groups and asked to use background documents BIPTPM2016/11 (Annex 1.13) and BIPTPM2016/12 (Annex 1.14) for reference, and to discuss opportunities relating to
Aichi Target/Element gaps and other MEAS, processes or subjects. Partners wrote their ideas on pink cards and placed them on the wall chart at the back of the meeting room. Group ideas have been summarised in Table 1 below (pink column).

**ACTION POINT:** BIP Sec to circulate group exercise table (Table 1) to Partners for additional input

**ACTION POINT:** BIP Sec to check any new indicators are not replicating existing ones
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aichi Target 1</th>
<th>Potential in Partnership (pink cards)</th>
<th>Ideas or proposals (green cards)</th>
<th>Existing indicators (yellow cards)</th>
<th>Institutions or experts (blue cards)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GBIF data on biodiversity occurrence over time, especially if disaggregated to identify the extent of citizen science reporting, could be used (GBIF) Align Eurobarometer with Biodiversity Barometer to increase coverage (EC, UEBT)</td>
<td>Cultural Impact Indicator (ZSL)</td>
<td>The environmental democracy index (defined as the first comprehensive index designed to measure procedural rights in an environmental context) – could be relevant for T1 or T2 (World Resources Institute)</td>
<td>Yale University: Environmental Policy Index includes an indicator of policy responses as one for the variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aichi Target 2</td>
<td>Countries that have done national accounting that takes into account biodiversity values Biodiversity Values Matrix (Regional – EU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aichi Target 3</td>
<td>Potentially environmental harmful agricultural subsidies (OECD) Potentially environmental harmful agricultural subsidies (OECD) Positive incentives for biodiversity (taxes, charges, fees, permits; OECD) Integration of Strategic Goal A with other Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential in Partnership (pink cards)</td>
<td>Ideas or proposals (green cards)</td>
<td>Existing indicators (yellow cards)</td>
<td>Institutions or experts (blue cards)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Need to scale down to local scale and enrich existing indicators, with case studies and groundtruthing at ecosystem/local scales – connect indicators of human pressures on ecosystems, ecosystem health and resulting biodiversity state (and human response) | Trends in population and extinction risk (TEAM)  
Plant diversity trend – 4790 species (TEAM) | UNODC, CITES, UNEP-WCMC, TRAFFIC: SDG Target 15.7 – ratio between detected illegal trafficking and legal trade in wildlife  
IUCN: Business and Biodiversity  
Stockholm Environment Institute: SCP group developing biodiversity indicators linked to trade and supply chains  
Regional Activity Centre on Sustainable Consumption and Production: Number of countries with Sustainable consumption and production action plan/strategy in the Mediterranean region – might know of others working on this |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aichi Target 4</th>
<th>Aichi Target 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Area of forest under SFM (certified)  
Use habitat cover data from Global Forest watch, ICRAF (land degradation), WCMC (habitat cover, cold water coral, seagrass), Reef base LPI disaggregations can be made for broad habitat types  
Red List of Ecosystems  
Forest cover index | Extinction risk trends – plant demography (TEAM)  
Population trends – Plant demography (TEAM)  
Use similar approach as WET index for seagrass meadows (UNEP-WCMC, ZSL, Fred Short seagrass.net, weakott et al. PNAS)  
WET index – methods can be applied to any ecosystem type given adequate data coverage | Night lights – pressure indicator (Healy Hamilton, Nature reserve & Dan Runfola, College of William and Mary)  
Biodiversity Habitat Index (Simon Ferrier, CSIRO) |

UNODC, CITES, UNEP-WCMC, TRAFFIC: SDG Target 15.7 – ratio between detected illegal trafficking and legal trade in wildlife  
IUCN: Business and Biodiversity  
Stockholm Environment Institute: SCP group developing biodiversity indicators linked to trade and supply chains  
Regional Activity Centre on Sustainable Consumption and Production: Number of countries with Sustainable consumption and production action plan/strategy in the Mediterranean region – might know of others working on this
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aichi Target 6</th>
<th>Potential in Partnership (pink cards)</th>
<th>Ideas or proposals (green cards)</th>
<th>Existing indicators (yellow cards)</th>
<th>Institutions or experts (blue cards)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wild Bird Indicator - a measure of extinction processes in bird communities disaggregated by habitat (Birdlife/RSPB) Rate of NPP removal in each ecosystem type Sea around Us could perhaps apply its ‘marine’ approach to aquaculture (Sea Around Us) HANPP and breakdown/disaggregation of the ecological footprint into its components (crop, forest and land footprint) could be used for terrestrial ecosystems (Ecological Footprint Network) Trends over time of EF/BC for each land type – might require further development of the Ecological Footprint methodology (Ecological Footprint Network)</td>
<td>Implement first order stock assessments using established data-poor assessment methods for all species/stocks in all countries of the world – cross validate with RAM-stock assessment legacy database and FAO assessment results (likely 2-3 years required; Sea Around Us)</td>
<td>Trends in by-catch and discard (FAO) Proportion of catches under catch documentation (FAO) Trends in IUU fishing (FAO)</td>
<td>Forest global database (Hanson et al.) Aquaculture Stewardship Council Marine Stewardship Council ISEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aichi Target 7</td>
<td>Nitrogen deposition – work in progress to disaggregate by plants – linked to critical loads and ecosystem services (INI, PBL, SEI, CEH) Nitrogen flows – potential link to supply chains (INI)</td>
<td>Number of deaths from air, water, soil pollution, SDG3.9 (WHO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential in Partnership (pink cards)</td>
<td>Ideas or proposals (green cards)</td>
<td>Existing indicators (yellow cards)</td>
<td>Institutions or experts (blue cards)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in pathways of introductions and spread of alien and invasive species (can be disaggregated for wetland species (Ramsar), plant species (GSPC), marine (IMO); Shyama Pagad IUCN SSC ISSG/University of Auckland) Update on trends in invasive species policy (Shyama Pagad IUCN SSC ISSG/University of Auckland) Impacts of invasive species in protected areas (UNEP-WCMC) Update an indicator on trends in legislation related to pathway management (IUCN ISSG)</td>
<td>Invasive alien species – pathways identified and prioritised – using existing global/regional databases on IA species (e.g. DAISIE, WRIMS), map (temporally and spatially) the pathways and identify adequate desired metric (IUCN ISSG &amp; UNEP-WCMC marine programme) ISSG is currently working on the development of a global dataset that can be analysed to produce updates on a) trends in identification of IAS and distribution. ISSG hopes to use this dataset as the backbone register of global invasive species and identify the pathways/vectors of introduction by this species leading to the development of an indicator relating to pathways (IUCN ISSG).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aichi Target 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate impact index for birds – could expand if information is available but would take time (RSPB)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Climate change impact on biodiversity – species’ temperature tolerance can measure extent of species adaptation (model-based approach in development; IUCN &amp; GBIF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential in Partnership (pink cards)</td>
<td>Ideas or proposals (green cards)</td>
<td>Existing indicators (yellow cards)</td>
<td>Institutions or experts (blue cards)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators on Equitable management (Disaggregated by gender; currently exploring; UNEP-WCMC/IIED/IUCN and others)</td>
<td>Trends in protected area condition – plant diversity, species time series (TEAM) Global study on connectivity of global PA network – defining and measuring connectivity (WCMC/IUCN) OECM indicator (in development; IUCN) Species Protection Index (Map of Life, Walter Jetz)</td>
<td>Protected area representativeness and connectivness indices (CSIRO, Simon Ferrier)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Bird Indicator - a measure of extinction processes in bird communities disaggregated by habitat (Birdlife/RSPB)</td>
<td>More plant assessments</td>
<td>Local biodiversity intactness index (T12 &amp; 14, Predicts - Andy Purvis) Species habitat index Map of Life (Yale University, Walter Jetz) Priority Species Indicator – measures the trends of priority species (i.e. those listed by countries as of conservation concern) through time. Can be based on species abundance trends and/or species occurrence trends – see UK Biodiversity Indicator In Your Pocket C4a &amp; C4b (RSPB/CEH)</td>
<td>Sapienza University BGCI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential in Partnership (pink cards)</td>
<td>Ideas or proposals (green cards)</td>
<td>Existing indicators (yellow cards)</td>
<td>Institutions or experts (blue cards)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aichi Target 13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of global plans of action (already exists for animals, FAO) Crop wild relative occurrence – aim is to develop information on status of wild relative of important crops to maintain genetic diversity (Global Crop Diversity Trust)</td>
<td>SSC Genetics Conservation Specialist Group are developing an indicator to assess the genetic diversity of ex-situ collections (IUCN SSC GCSG)</td>
<td>Kew: Crop Wild Relatives Project, collecting information and seeds of crop wild relatives BGCI: Seed Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aichi Target 14</strong></td>
<td>Link land-cover change and biodiversity change models from GEO BON with viral data and pandemic risk data from EcoHealth Alliance to produce modelled indicator outputs on the relationship between land cover change, mammal diversity and pandemic risk (understanding and predicting pandemic risk and its relation to land cover change in areas of high mammalian diversity)</td>
<td>Trends in economic value and ecosystem services – carbon stocks (TEAM)</td>
<td>Ramsar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status and trends in extent and condition of habitats providing carbon storage (TEAM)</td>
<td>Status and trends in extent and condition of habitats providing carbon storage (TEAM)</td>
<td>Global ecosystem restoration index (iDiv/GEO BON – Henrique Perreira) Development of EU-level indicators of restoration (EU) Forest global database (Hanson et al.)</td>
<td>SEI partner Stockholm Resilience Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aichi Target 16</td>
<td>Aichi Target 17</td>
<td>Aichi Target 18</td>
<td>Aichi Target 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential in Partnership (pink cards)</td>
<td>Ideas or proposals (green cards)</td>
<td>Existing indicators (yellow cards)</td>
<td>Institutions or experts (blue cards)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database on forest and land tenure for indigenous local communities (Rights and Resources Initiative) SDG indicator under SDG 5 on land tenure of men and women on agricultural land (collected by FAO, gender disaggregated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linguists e.g. SOAS: Endangered languages and traditional knowledge inter-generational transmission indicator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator of active indicators — coverage by indicators over time (ZSL) Sharing information and knowledge – using a similar approach as GBIF indicator; an indicator for WCMC@s curated marine data (seagrass, saltmarsh, cold-coral) (WCMC+ Partners)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Species status Info index, Map of Life (Yale University, Walter Jetz)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aichi Target 20</td>
<td>Potential in Partnership (pink cards)</td>
<td>Ideas or proposals (green cards)</td>
<td>Existing indicators (yellow cards)</td>
<td>Institutions or experts (blue cards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCCD</td>
<td>Among the variables used for ecological footprint calculation is an aggregate index of land productivity over time. Such value is currently available for crops only – could be used to monitor UNCCD land productivity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>Utilised species index – split by gender for species important for use by women/men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITES</td>
<td>CITES trade database – sustainability Mike’s programme – legality CITES compliance processes – legality Permit/certification – traceability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNODC KCWC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsar</td>
<td>Potential in Partnership (pink cards)</td>
<td>Ideas or proposals (green cards)</td>
<td>Existing indicators (yellow cards)</td>
<td>Institutions or experts (blue cards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Ramsar version of METT was adapted for wetland sites and adopted by parties at the Ramsar COP12 (Uruguay, June 2015). The Ramsar-METT is now being rolled out within the regions. Llewellyn Young is our (UNEP-WCMC) main contact for this work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brainstorm session on BIP communication – Anna Chenery, BIP Sec

Anna Chenery led a brainstorm exercise to conclude Session 5. Partners were asked to think about how they, as Partners, want the BIP secretariat to communicate with them. The overall conclusion from this exercise was that the BIP secretariat should use a range of means to communicate with partners. The following ideas were suggested:

- Provide an additional page/intranet for BIP partners within the BIP website
- Organise technical meetings or webinars (e.g. to share and discuss methodologies)
- Organise BIP meetings or informal gatherings at the margins of important events (SBSTTA, COP)
- Allow more time for discussions, beyond group work at BIP annual meetings
- Allow time for individual indicator updates at BIP meetings
- Have an interactive newsletter to keep partners updated
- Create a forum or portal for information sharing and for technical discussions
- Create a BIP ResearchGate community
- Organise meetings for specific targets and specific topics (e.g. CITES focussed session)
- Convene meetings for indicator providers
- Convene indicator development sessions (e.g. CITES indicators)
- Organise webinars
- Create a BIP contact list (focal points) or a Partner database that is easily accessible
- Have BIP Champions to represent the partnership in other processes (e.g. IPBES or SDGs)
- Provide updates about SDGs/IPBES via email or newsletters

**ACTION POINT:** BIP Sec to review ideas and prioritise, producing internal and external communication plan

**ACTION POINT:** BIP Sec to circulate Partner profiles from BIP TPM 2016 meeting

**ACTION POINT:** BIP Sec to send doodle poll to partners regarding attendance to important events (e.g. SBSTTA, COP) to organise BIP meetings or informal gatherings

**ACTION POINT:** BIP Sec to develop a BIP directory

Session 6: Developing indicators to fill gaps in the indicator framework for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (Chair: Hilary Allison, UNEP-WCMC)

*Developing new indicators under the collaboration of the BIP* – Sarah Ivory, BIP Sec (Annex 1.10 BIPTPM2016/8 & Annex 1.12 BIPTPM2013/10)

Sarah Ivory began this session with a presentation on developing new indicators under the Mind the Gap project in order to fill current indicator gaps (both at the Target level, and at Element level) (Presentation: Annex 2.12). The planned approach to identify, select and develop new indicators was outlined.
**Group exercise: What ongoing initiatives, work, indicators or people should we know about?**

In groups, partners were asked to discuss and provide suggestions on indicators that are ready for use or in development (yellow cards); ideas or proposals for how they could fill a gap (green cards); and suggest any leading institutions or experts in the subject area we should be in contact with (blue cards). Partners wrote their respective ideas on yellow, green and blue cards and placed them on the wall chart at the back of the meeting room. Ideas have been summarised in **Table 1** above (green, yellow and blue columns).

**Session 7: How can the global indicators support national level implementation of the CBD**

(Chair: Pamela Abbott, UNEP-WCMC)

**Supporting the use of the global indicators at the national level** – Anna Chenery, BIP Sec

(Annex 1.17 BIPTPM2016/15 & Annex 1.18 BIPTPM2013/16)

Anna Chenery began this session by providing an overview of how BIP indicators have supported and can further support countries in developing/using indicators to address their own national priorities (Presentation: Annex 2.13). Relevant publications produced by the BIP (e.g. unlocking global datasets publication), as well as key challenges and observations were also outlined. Anna highlighted that SBSTTA 19 Recommendation XIX/4 (which invites the BIP to develop further technical guidance on indicators for national level use) demonstrates a real appetite for the consideration/use of global indicators at the national level.

**Discussion points:**

- BIP can facilitate links between parties and data providers
- Targets, indicators and reporting are all tightly linked
- Potential for incorporating national data or for supporting national use depends on the indicator
- The BIP may need to help countries access and understand data to improve coverage/’patchiness’
- Applying global indicators at the national level must be done with caution due to issues of scalability; maybe sharing best practices is more important

**How GBIF is supporting national level reporting (an example of producing national disaggregations of global indicators)** – Tim Hirsch, GBIF

Tim Hirsch presented on the Global Biodiversity Information Facility’s global indicator “Number of GBIF Records Over Time” (Aichi Target 19), and provided examples of how GBIF data and tools support national level reporting, such as the GBIF country pages, national data trends, and country reports (Presentation: Annex 2.14).

**Naturserve’s dashboard project** – Healy Hamilton, NatureServe

Healy Hamilton presented remotely on The Biodiversity Indicators Dashboard, which is an online tool that provides analysis, visualisation, and communication of time series datasets on biodiversity status and trends (Presentation: Annex 2.15). Healy provided an overview of the different features available, the different indicators (pressure, response, state, and benefit) currently enabled, as well as the future directions and ‘in development’ pages for the dashboard.
Bon in a Box – Maria Cecilia Londoño, Humboldt Institute Colombia

Maria Cecilia Londoño provided an introduction to GEO-BON’s “BON in a Box”, which is a digital, customisable, and smart toolkit for biodiversity observations (Presentation: Annex 2.16). The purpose of the toolkit is to serve as a technology transfer mechanism that allows countries to access the most advanced and effective monitoring protocols, tools and software in order to enhance/harmonize their national biodiversity observation systems. Maria Cecilia provided details of the first pilot in Latin America, which was led by the Alexander von Humboldt Institute in Colombia. Lastly, possible opportunities/collaborations between the BIP and GEOBON were also highlighted.

Group exercise

Anna Chenery led a group exercise to conclude Session 7. Participants were divided into four groups, two of them were asked to discuss how indicator partners can better support national use of their indicators. The other two groups were asked to discuss i) whether indicator partners can incorporate national data and, ii) how this can be achieved. The following are some of the answers shared by groups:

GROUP 1: How can the BIP support countries in producing the global indicators at the national level?

- This will vary depending on the indicators and the countries
- Provide standardised methodologies and terminologies
- Share data (but data access needs to be discussed further)
- Make an interactive map or BIP dashboard linked to Aichi Targets
- BIP needs to facilitate stronger links between data users and data providers
- Develop a BIP indicator champion contact list
- Provide examples, best practices, cases studies of global indicator use at the national level
- Promote and communicate the BIP to different audiences (both BIP partners and BIP secretariat)
- Must be sensitive to issues around national data, as countries do not like being told to use global data
- Better promote BIP tools, guidance, and resources, e.g. videos to ‘sell’ indicators
- Include links to data sources as part of the CBD’s 6NR template
- Provide clearer contacts on the BIP website for different indicators, and examples of their use at the national level

GROUP 2 & 3: Can the global indicators integrate/utilise national level data being produced?

- Yes, but it depends on the data, methods, models and the country in question. Metadata is vital, as well as an open policy
- The BIP should work together with countries to provide data for specific targets
- It could be useful to develop case studies
- It is easier to aggregate data than to disaggregate data
- The BIP needs to find ways to encourage countries to share their data. However, countries are not always aware of the data they do have available or able to share it or release it.
- We need a ‘BIP in a box’ to integrate national level data and global indicators
- The BIP could help countries in interpreting data
Session 8: Maintaining a global partnership (Chair: Anna Chenery, BIP Sec)

Communicating the BIP – Katherine Despot Belmonte, BIP secretariat (Annex 1.19 BIP TPM2016/17)

Katherine Despot Belmonte outlined some initial plans for improving the BIP website (Presentation: Annex 2.17). The plans include replacing the existing search facility for an interactive search facility; incorporating results for global indicator use at the national level from the ‘Unlocking Global Datasets’ project; updating indicator fact-sheets; and adding indicator ‘Stamps’ to see current indicator status and uses.

Discussion points:

- BIP Sec to do a user analysis/needs survey in the first step. Any change on the website should be based on consultation and careful analytics.
- BIP Sec should also investigate whether an Aichi Passport is needed; analyse use, and cost/benefit.
- Who visits the website (e.g. academics, NGOs, government)? It is important to think about the audience/users.
- The website should provide clearer signposting on how to get underlying data if available.
- Clearer and more consistent indicator factsheets with contact details and methodologies would be useful.

ACTION POINT: BIP Sec to carry out analytics/user needs survey for BIP website and Aichi passport.

ACTION POINT: BIP Sec to investigate existing examples of search facilities and options for inclusion within existing BIP website and stamping of the indicators, and share with BIP Sec for comment.

ACTION POINT: BIP Sec to develop detailed plans for website and Aichi Passport.

ACTION POINT: BIP Sec to tidy up fact sheets on website.

Group exercise

Participants were then divided into groups and provided suggestions on how to better communicate the BIP. Feedback from this exercise is summarised below:

a. What should be included in an interactive indicator search facility?
   - Need to be clear on audience (user needs survey or analysis?)
   - Some indicator providers like the indicator search facility as it is.
   - A dashboard (with lots of filters) would be useful.
   - Such a dashboard could be linked to the Aichi Passport app.
   - Important to visualise links to other MEAs, IPBES, SDGs.
   - Lots of filters, including things noted in AHTEG report (availability, last update etc.). Also include background documents, partner details and contacts, summaries, different potential disaggregations, metadata, methodologies (global and national/regional), case studies.

b. How can we revamp the Aichi Passport?
   - Make stamps interactive to provide lists of indicators based on these facets.
   - Include all indicators in the new passport.
   - Analyse cost-effectiveness; is it worth it? How much is it being used? By whom?
• Stamps or tags on indicators – when you click on them, they should bring up all other indicators with the same stamp
• Clearer signposting on how to access the data and methodologies

c. **How can we better communicate the BIP?**

• Technical meetings (e.g. Hackathon)
• Targeted meeting groups (e.g. CITES focussed session)
• Webinars
• Contact database with indicator profiles (e.g. contact person/focal point, indicator name, and data sources)
• Social media or BIP forum
• BIP champions to represent the BIP in other fora (e.g. GBO5)
• BIP partners to provide storylines for assessments like GBO
• BIP Sec to provide regular updates on IPBES and SDGs.
• Potentially lose the news feed from the website – maybe replace with twitter feed?
• Standardise factsheets
• Make methodologies more transparent
• Do include indicator ‘stamps’ to clearly see the links to Aichi Targets, SDGs, IPBES, and other MEAs.
• BIP fellows/interns
• Develop a BIP dashboard: include background documents; indicator profiles & summaries; partner profiles & contact details; different indicator cuts (national, thematic, other MEAs); metadata; indicator methods (global, and regional, national if possible); interactive map linked to filters; case studies of indicator impacts

**Day 3: Wednesday 27th January**

**Session 9: The BIP and the SDGs (Chair: Robert Höft, CBD Secretariat)**

*The SDG Process, current status of global indicator framework and the national process – Robert Munroe, UNEP-WCMC and Anna Chenery, BIP Sec (Annex 1.9 BIPTPM2016/7 & Annex 1.20 BIPTPM2016/18)*

Anna Chenery began this session by providing background information on the Inter-agency Expert Group on the SDG indicators (IAEG-SDG), and an overview of the work that the BIP secretariat has done so far to include BIP indicators in the global indicator framework for the SDGs (Presentation: Annex 2.18). The BIP secretariat has mapped BIP indicators to the SDGs, made suggestions for potential indicators for the SDGs via UNEP, and attended the first and second meetings of the IAEG-SDGs. As a result of these efforts, eleven BIP indicators are under consideration. The 3rd meeting of the IAEG-SDGs will take place on 30th March- 1st April in Mexico City. This will be the first time that the IAEG-SDGs will meet under its revised ToRs and in accordance with its new programme of work for the implementation of the global indicator framework (to be agreed in March). The meeting will discuss the establishment of procedures for the methodological review of indicators, including approval mechanisms of needed revisions or replacements, and the development of global reporting mechanisms.

Then, Robert Munroe provided more information on the process of translating the global goals and targets to the national level and the suggested global follow-up and review process that is to be discussed in March.
Discussion points:

- The Aichi Targets run until 2020 and the SDGs 2030. However, the themes addressed in the Aichi Targets are unlikely to change post-2020, and the need to keep monitoring progress towards biodiversity conservation remains.
- BIP could support governments in understanding what is out there (both data and indicators) and how to use it in the context of tracking progress on SDG implementation.
- The BIP’s broad indicator set can be used by national governments to support their multiple reporting obligations, beyond just SDGs 14 and 15.
- Need to ‘reinterpret’ the BIP indicators for a Sustainable Development community (align ourselves with SEEA framework?)
- The revised IAEG-SDGs ToR will be decided in March 2016.
- More information on ideas for the follow-up and review process for the 2030 Agenda are available: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/9599SG%20report%20on%20follow%20up%20and%20review%20-%20FINAL%20FOR%20POSTING.pdf

**ACTION POINT:** BIP Sec to keep BIP Partners updated with any SDG related developments

**ACTION POINT:** BIP Sec to consider development of ideas and project proposals around national level support

**ACTION POINT:** BIP Sec to investigate opportunities for formal recognition of BIP’s role in the proposed Global Monitoring Groups

*Group exercise – How can the BIP support the SDGs on the national level?*

Participants broke into four groups to answer the following questions:

**a. What do you think the opportunities are?**
- Provide capacity building on data use and indicators at the national level
- Associate BIP indicators to all SDGs. Incorporate a dual visualisation tool in the BIP website to link the relationship between indicators and SDGs
- Many BIP indicators (not just ‘official’ SDG indicators) are clearly relevant to thematic reviews
- The water quality index indicator could be useful for SDG 6 (clean water)
- Promotion of indicators: partners should promote their indicators and the BIP through different channels

**b. How can the BIP Sec support you in making best use of the information you produce?**
- Seeking a mandate for BIP to service the SDGs monitoring group
- Financing datasets
- Profile the use of indicators in the SDGs process in SBSTTA 20
- Convince governments of the need for a broader indicator set to meet multiple reporting obligations

**c. The proposed thematic reviews include ‘Ensuring food security on a safe planet’ and ‘Making cities sustainable’. How could your indicators be used to support these?**
- Ensuring food security on a safe planet:
• Genetic diversity crops/livestock
• Status of crop wild relatives
• Change in wetland extent over time
• Marine Trophic Index
• Loss of reactive nitrogen
• Sustainable fisheries / MSC certified
• Agriculture under sustainable management
• PA overlay with biodiversity (particularly marine protected areas)
• RLU (exploited species)
• Implementation of the Nagoya protocol
• Traditional Knowledge indicator
• BIP Target 1 indicators

• Making cities sustainable:
  • Ecological footprint
  • Air quality – reactive nitrogen
  • Biodiversity index
  • Urban biodiversity index
  • Urban ecosystem services

Session 10: The relationship between GEO BON and BIP (Chair: Matt Walpole, UNEP-WCMC)

Overview of GEO BON and its progress – Mike Gill, GEO BON (Annex 1.21 BIPTPM2016/19)
Mike Gill provided an overview on the Group on Earth Observations – Biodiversity Observation Network (GEO BON), which is a coordinated global network for improving biodiversity observations (Presentation: Annex 2.19). GEO BON’s goal is to have a greater amount of higher quality biodiversity observations around the world that are interoperable. Mike outlined GEO BON’s approach, progress and tools, as well as a number of connecting points between GEO BON and the BIP.

Discussion points:
• GEO BON collects metadata from different datasets, partners, and networks; and make this data available. There are plans to create a helpdesk to assist people to find data
• GEO BON perhaps could facilitate dialogue between data providers and policy-makers
• Need complementarity between BIP and GEO BON, not rivalry
• GEO BON should communicate indicators through the BIP
• Opportunities to collaborate around national/regional projects
• Some clarity needed around EBVs and usefulness for BIP indicators/policy questions
• WG9 is a key opportunity for communication and collaboration
• BIP needs a means of identifying data gaps, streamlining between partners and then putting in requests to GEO BON

ACTION POINT: Mike Gill to draft mapping EBVs to BIP indicators and share with BIP Partners
ACTION POINT: GEO BON and BIP Sec to identify mechanisms of communication between BIP and GEO BON using Working Group 9
ACTION POINT: GEO BON, BIP Sec and BIP Partners to identify national opportunities for collaboration
ACTION POINT: BIP Sec and GEO BON to clarify relationship and determine who does what
ACTION POINT: Maria Cecilia to work with BIP Sec to develop action points for supporting national level implementation of the CBD (NBSAPs and National Report indicators)
**Group Exercise:**
Partners discussed and provided feedback on the following questions:

**a. How can GEO BON and the BIP best work together?**
- The BIP Sec could communicate data needs to GEO BON on behalf of BIP partners
- Develop synergies and mutual partnerships; for example BIP partners could join GEO BON WG9 and GEO BON indicator developers could be part of the BIP
- Map indicators with EBVs. GEO BON should provide examples of how EBVs are implemented and their usefulness for BIP indicators; and/or showcase the usefulness of EBVs for specific policy questions
- BIP partners need to know how their indicators could be improved by GEO BON data
- What are the services provided by GEO BON? Who is the main user? Is GEO BON a legal entity that can be contracted?
- GEO BON and BIP should complement each other – identify gaps and agree on how to fill them
- GEO BON to play an R&D role in indicator development, and focus on data/technology
- Collaborate in national/regional projects

**b. How do we ensure clear lines of communication between GEO BON and BIP?**
- Clarity of mandates is critical, and needs tackling
- GEO BON could communicate its indicators through BIP to avoid confusion
- GEO BON should be included in BIP meetings to learn how they can contribute in terms of data needs and gaps
- Communicate WG9 activities to BIP partners
- WG9 is the channel and link between GEO BON and BIP

**c. How can GEO BON best serve the BIP?**
- Providing data and filling data gaps – BIP could contract GEO BON?
- National level initiatives for data gathering and methodology development would benefit a lot of the indicators BIP Partners work on
- Joint fundraising between BIP & GEO BON
- Need collaboration of mandates: GEO BON should support but not develop indicators?

**d. What data gaps could GEO BON focus on?**
- A technical session between BIP and GEO BON is needed to identify data available and gaps
- Thematic data gaps (e.g. marine: mammals, corals and seabed)
- Aggregating observation into useful data (e.g. EBVs)

**Session 11: Bringing it all together and the way forward (Chair: Hilary Allison, BIP Sec)**
**The BIP, SDGs and SEEA – Alessandra Alfieri, United Nations Statistics Division**

Anna Chenery introduced Alessandra Alfieri, who presented remotely via GoToMeeting on the System of Environmental Economic Accounting (SEEA) (Presentation: Annex 2.20). Alessandra provided detailed information on the integration of Statistical Systems for the production of indicators. The links between the SDGs, the BIP, and SEEA were also outlined.

**Group Exercise:**
Then participants broke out into three groups for the last group exercise to discuss and provide feedback on the following questions:
How do we ensure the sustainability of the BIP and its indicators?

- Developing a clear role and brand for the BIP
- Making clear links with the SDGs
- BIP Sec to be the champion for national level uptake of indicators (i.e. capacity building, indicator integration, creating storylines, information system between BIP and SEEA)
- Raising funds for national level analysis

What is the role of the BIP moving forward?

- Clarify relationships with other organisations (e.g. GEO BON)
- BIP to be the interface between all MEAs and SDGs

**ACTION POINT:** BIP Sec to determine steps to validate BIP indicators for SEEA

**ACTION POINT:** BIP Sec to explore making links to other bodies that have sustainability reporting with indicators to raise profile

**Bringing it all together**

Anna Chenery, Nadine Bowles-Newark and Sarah Ivory summarised the discussions and action points taken from each of the sessions over the three days of the meeting (see Presentation: Annex 2.21).

Hilary Allison concluded the meeting by thanking the partners for their valuable input during the meeting, and thanking the meeting organisers for a successful event.