

Workshop on 'Concrete actions for co-operation between European national CHMs'

Informal workshop organised by
the Belgian CHM National Focal Point

19-20 June 2003

Brussels, Belgium



How to build on the previous exchanges of experiences
at European level on the implementation of article 18.3
of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)?

Report edited by A. Franklin, H. de Koeijer & J. L. Van Goethem

Contents

1. Background	2
2. Objectives	2
3. Organisation of work.....	3
4. Review by UNEP-WCMC on the use of the CHM.....	3
5. Discussions and recommendations.....	4
Who is the target audience?.....	5
What are the information needs?	5
How to 'sell' the CHM?	6
What should be the best organisational structure for the CHM?.....	7
How to manage data optimally on a day-to-day basis?	7
What is the mission statement of the CHM?	8
Who should provide funds for CHM services?	8
What should the CHM focal points do first?.....	8
Other points of discussion during the workshop	9
6. Conclusions	9
7. Annexes	11
Annex 1. Programme of the workshop	11
Annex 2. Recommendations by Working Group 2, Bonn Workshop 2001	12
Annex 3. List of participants	13
Annex 4. Standard keywords for CBD themes and issues	15
Annex 5. Resources available at some European CHM focal points	16

1. Background

The clearing-house mechanism (CHM) was set up to facilitate and promote co-operation in relation to the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity: conservation, sustainable use and fair and equitable sharing of benefits. It also plays an important role in developing public awareness on those three objectives.

The CHM supports the work of the Convention by encouraging this co-operation in six key areas: tools for decision-making, training and capacity-building, research, funding, technology transfer and repatriation of information. Its development is guided by the three goals of the CHM Strategic Plan:

- The promotion and facilitation of scientific and technical co-operation (*co-operation*);
- The development of a global mechanism for exchanging and integrating information on biodiversity (*information exchange*);
- The development of the CHM Focal Points and their partners (*network development*).

Thus, the CHM should not be considered only as a web site but rather as a tool for helping communication between Parties to the Convention and between stakeholders within each Party. Internet is now the most powerful technical mean to communicate, but this should not limit the development and use of other means that are valuable for better communication.

As far as web sites are concerned, one of the aims of the CHM is to avoid the duplication of efforts by looking for existing information on other web sites and providing links to them. The different CHM nodes create their own pages to give added value to the information already available on the Internet, for example by integrating data from different regions in a country in order to present them in a coherent structure at the national level.

In Europe (EU and non-EU countries), national CHM focal points (NFPs) have been designated in most of the countries that are Party to the Convention, 77% of the countries have a CHM web site, and network development in different thematic areas has been initiated at the national level.

Co-operation between European CHM focal points is enhanced through regional meetings and workshops (e.g. Bonn 1997, Florence 1998, Bonn 2001). Bilateral contacts also occur on a regular basis. However, this co-operation could be made more clearly visible and more operational on a daily basis.

2. Objectives

The workshop was seen as a follow-up to the Bonn workshop on 'Building the CHM Partnership: Facilitating Scientific and Technical Cooperation', 28-29 September 2001, Bonn, Germany. It involved a small group of participants, mainly from European CHMs that are already operational, and addressed very concrete or technical matters rather than general issues. Partners from other biodiversity-related initiatives in Belgium

(Biodiversity Platform, Belgian GBIF node) and in Europe (EPBRS, ECNC, GBIF) had also been invited in order to contribute to the enhancement of co-operation between CHM and other initiatives.

The workshop aimed to assess the progress made since the Bonn workshop and to find out whether there were common difficulties in the implementation of the CHM objectives and the Bonn recommendations. It particularly addressed the need for synergies between biodiversity-related initiatives within and between the countries. The workshop also had for objective to develop concrete and feasible proposals for future co-operation in the near future between European CHM Focal Points.

3. Organisation of work

The workshop started with the presentation of the review done by UNEP-WCMC on the use of the CHM by Parties world-wide. This overview provided a good basis for discussions on the topics addressed in the four sessions that took place subsequently:

1. Follow-up on the recommendations by Working Group 2 of the Bonn meeting in 2001 (see annex 2). What has been achieved since then?
2. National CHM web sites. How relevant is the information given on the national web sites? Are we fulfilling needs? Web statistics as a tool to analyse trends. Other tools to analyse trends and needs. Co-operation with other networks (Biosafety CH, GBIF and national nodes, Biodiversity Platform, ENBI and others).
3. Co-operation between national CHMs. How can national CHMs work more proactively? How to improve the sharing of expertise and technology? How to optimise CHM structure and content in order to enable efficient searches simultaneously across multiple CHMs? Or how can CHMs collectively deliver useful information in one query on specific issues, based on the experience of others?
4. Short round table discussion. How can we improve the implementation of CHM objectives? Can we contribute to the transfer of technology?

4. Review by UNEP-WCMC on the use of the CHM

The draft final report of the review carried out by the World Conservation and Monitoring Centre (WCMC) in 2002-2003 was distributed to participants during the meeting. Dr Aram Gevorgyan presented the main outcomes of the survey. The review established that 147 Parties have designated CHM focal points, out of a total of 187 Parties to the Convention. Only 60 Parties have developed CHM web sites.

The study also highlighted that almost 40% of the 44 responding countries identified the co-operation via CHM focal points as 'low' for all the options provided. Ten countries assessed the co-operation as 'medium' and 'high' for case studies, 16 gave the same ranking for joint capacity building activities. Only two countries ranked co-operation through case studies as high. In relation to the co-operation of CHMs with other biodiversity-related conventions, the survey revealed that co-operation with RAMSAR

and CITES on scientific and technical levels as well as information exchange was reasonably well established. However co-operation with WHC and CMS was poor or non-existing according to two thirds of the respondents.

The section of the review on CHM web sites showed that the most common information hosted directly on national web sites are national strategies and/or action plans for biodiversity (24 countries out 44 respondents) and national reports for the Convention. About half of the responding Parties host their first and second national reports on their web sites in an UN language. The last part of the WCMC report proposes an action plan aiming to provide an integrated framework within which the CHM network can be maintained and co-ordinated over the coming years. The action plan addresses three levels of the CHM network:

- Global level, including actions to be undertaken by the CBD Secretariat and the Informal Advisory Committee;
- Regional level, incorporating measures addressed to the Parties within each of the five regions officially identified by the Convention;
- National level, dealing with 189 National CHM nodes categorised into five target groups. As the review revealed rather different levels of CHM development in the participants to the survey, the Parties have been classified into five categories, in order to provide a list of activities that are in concordance with the varying needs of the national CHMs.

Comments from participants of the workshop on the draft report are welcome before 1 July 2003. The final report will be available in August 2003, and will be forwarded for consideration to the Informal Advisory Committee of the CHM, who will meet in November 2003 (just before SBSTTA-9).

5. Discussions and recommendations

The workshop revealed that even after several years of CHM implementation in Europe, there are several issues, common to all countries, with scope for improvement. As there generally is a shortage of time and a lack of financial and human resources to fully implement the CHM objectives, there is also an urgent need to prioritise the actions to be undertaken.

Discussions of the workshop were centred around a list of a few fundamental questions that arose during the first day:

1. Who is the target audience? Who are the stakeholders?
2. What are the information needs? What deliverables do we try to provide? How do you find out what other people need?
3. How to better 'sell' the CHM? How to make the stakeholders understand that the CHM can be a showcase for their activities?
4. What should be the best organisational structure for the CHM?
5. How to manage data optimally on a day-to-day basis?
6. What is the mission statement of the CHM? Is the mission statement different for different national CHMs?

7. Who should provide funds for CHM services?
8. What should the CHM focal points do first? And can all CHMs do the same things first?

Who is the target audience?

The target audience can be very broad and will depend on national activities on biodiversity. The main categories identified by the participants to the workshop are listed below.

- Scientific community
- Politicians
- Environmental administrations
- Science administrations
- Other administrations
- Non CBD biodiversity-related initiatives
- Non governmental organisations
- Activists (other than NGOs)
- Students
- Educators and teachers
- Practitioners and field managers
- Private sector
- News and media
- Public

What are the information needs?

This question should be addressed as function of:

- The audience targeted (cf. above)
- The level of co-operation: national level, co-operation with other countries, supra-national level

Needs are difficult to assess for Europe as a whole, as they vary from country to country. However, the exercise should be attempted using national needs analyses as a basis, as it will provide guidelines for the implementation of CHM objectives.

Recommendation: Each participating CHM focal point to the workshop will provide a 'needs table' for his/her country (see table 1, next page), elaborated in two steps: firstly, the focal points fill in the table with what he/she thinks are the most urgent information needs, and secondly, this filled table is submitted to the targeted stakeholders for refinement and suggestions. In this way, gaps can be identified between the information provided and the information expected by stakeholders. A 'needs table' will be drafted for each of the three levels of co-operation identified above. Results will be compared and a synthesis at European level will be carried out.

As an example, the following needs were identified for the scientific community: sources of funding, overview of what is going on at CBD level, who is who, research priorities of implementation activities, potential partners outside one's discipline, access to data for research, possibilities for dissemination of results, potential users of research.

The fulfilment of some of these information needs may fall under the competence of partners of the CHM focal points (e.g. GBIF nodes).

Table 1. Proposed structure for the ‘needs table’

Targeted audience	Needs	Role of CHM? If not, whose role?	Who could pay?	Priorities
Scientific community				
Politicians				
Environmental administrations				
Science administrations				
Other administrations				
Non CBD biodiversity-related initiatives				
Non governmental organisations				
Activists (other than NGOs)				
Students				
Educators and teachers				
Practitioners and field managers				
Private sector				
News and media				
Public				

How to ‘sell’ the CHM?

The CHM receives varying degrees of political interest depending on the country. ‘Selling’ the CHM implies delivering the right information (cf. needs analysis) to the right people (cf. targeted audience). Attention should also be given to the type of support used to disseminate information, as it may vary with the audience (e.g. avoid sending e-mails to politicians, overloaded with electronic information). If the CHM is integrated into the national political framework for biodiversity, for example as an integral part of NBSAPs, its political recognition will be facilitated.

Several ideas emerged during the discussions. A list of recommendations was drafted by the end of the meeting. This list does not apply to awareness activities for the general public, but rather to actors for biodiversity at the national level.

Recommendations:

- Try to align ourselves with NBSAP development and the people in charge of their implementation, whether for new strategies or those that need to be updated (e.g. development of on-line databases on policy). The UK CHM is working along these lines, with its support to the implementation of the UK Biodiversity Action Plans;
- Advocate a coordinating mechanism for all biodiversity-related initiatives in the country (e.g. a ‘secretariat’ or other). The German steering group is an example of such coordination. It integrates representatives of all biodiversity-related initiatives in Germany (e.g. CBD, Diversitas, GBIF, Biosafety Clearing House) and keeps all members mutually informed of each others’ activities;

- Provide an overview on ‘who is doing what’ and show the complexity of the situation (e.g. list and addresses of actors and what are they doing, including non CBD biodiversity-related projects);
- Make sure that all the actors have a profile/visibility in the CHM (provide a showcase for their activities);
- Lead the development of products that no one else provides and make them visible on the CHM (cf. lists of projects on co-operation activities). An example has been provided with the involvement of the French CHM in the coordination of a book involving more than 130 people on the conservation of biodiversity in French overseas territories;
- Analyse whether the resistance that the CHM is getting is because the people are reluctant to the CHM concept, or because people do not believe that the web can be used (web site aspects of information sharing and networking);
- Develop a positive term to describe the CHM that the audience would like and that can be easily understood (e.g. ‘biodiversity gateway’ or other);
- Try to become a service to people practically involved in CBD negotiations (e.g. SBSTTA). In this regard, France has created a special web site, in coordination with the CHM, to involve scientific and technical experts in CBD negotiations via the SBSTTA (www.biodiversite-sbstta.org);
- Use appropriate medias, such as publication of papers in specialised newsletters (e.g. article on the French CHM in the newsletter of the Man & Biosphere Programme in France).

What should be the best organisational structure for the CHM?

All CHMs are not organised in the same way. Some countries have steering committees for the CHM (e.g. France, Germany, Switzerland), while in others, CHM focal points carry the responsibility for CHM development (e.g. Belgium, the Netherlands, Poland, UK).

Recommendations:

- Try to create a steering committee around CBD implementation in the country and use its suggestions for guidance to CHM work;
- Create a committee of active CBD-related initiatives, facilitated by the CHM (it may be the same as the steering committee for CBD implementation);
- Work further on the proposal for an ideal structure for CHM organisation proposed in the Action Plan of the WCMC review (p. 98, draft final report).

How to manage data optimally on a day-to-day basis?

Data management is very national-specific, as it depends on the needs of the country. Some common technical ideas could however be applied to improve the overall CHM service.

Recommendations:

- Use terms of the CBD: articles, thematic work programmes and cross-cutting issues can be used as keywords to present information to an international audience (cf. draft proposal by Lawrence Way, annex 4);

- A different structure might be needed for a national audience as compared to an international audience, or, the biodiversity keywords/terms might need to fit in an existing national structure;
- Establish or develop a meta database to manage information on the CHM.

What is the mission statement of the CHM?

Most CHM nodes have developed a short text explaining the role of the CHM at national level. This might differ from country to country, depending on national priorities.

Recommendations:

- Look at the mission statement and vision for the CHM given in the CHM Strategic Plan for 1999-2004 (<http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meetings/cop/cop-05/information/cop-05-inf-03-en.pdf>, page 14)
- Re-interpret the ideas of the CHM nationally (write down a vision of what the people could do with the CHM).
- Try to come up with a clear, simple, mission statement that all can understand and that can be used at the European level in general.

Who should provide funds for CHM services?

The table on financial and human resources for the CHM prepared for the workshop (annex 5) revealed that there is a shortage of funding and personnel, even for the most active CHMs in Europe. No real answer to the question of funding was provided during the workshop, as it is likely to differ in each country. However, if the CHM is integrated in NBSAPs, funding sources should be able to be identified better.

What should the CHM focal points do first?

In order for the recommendations to be effectively implemented, activities for the coming months have been prioritised.

Recommendations:

- Execute the two-step 'needs analysis' by the CHM focal points (*to be done by all participating countries to the workshop*);
- Synthesise the results of the needs analysis at European level (*coordination by the Belgian CHM*);
- Work - together - on redrafting the mission statement for the CHM. Can we come up with a common mission statement that could be used by the different European CHMs? (*coordination by the NL and UK CHMs*);
- Start testing the use of CBD keywords/terms on the national CHM web sites, in order to enable or facilitate searches between the sites (*coordination by the UK and Belgian CHMs and WCMC*).

Other points of discussion during the workshop

Web statistics

Part of the session on CHM web sites was devoted to the discussion of the usefulness of web statistics to know more about the use of the web sites. The participants to the workshop gave background information on their use of web statistics and on the hits or page requests to their web site. A clear distinction could be made in the information provided by the web statistics from countries that had direct access to the provider of the statistics (e.g. UK and Belgium) and the countries that just received standard information from their server providers (e.g. Poland and the Netherlands). The latter mainly used the statistics to add information on visitors for their yearly reports.

Web statistics were found not always reliable by some participants, and therefore of limited interest to assess needs from CHM web site users.

Technology transfer

Due to the lack of time, only a very short discussion took place on technology transfer. Germany informed that the government had contracted an institute to carry out a study on what does transfer of technology mean to people (both at national level and international level). A questionnaire has been developed and will be submitted among others to the participants of the Trondheim workshop on technology transfer and biodiversity (Norway, 23-27 June 2003).

6. Conclusions

Working group 2 of the Bonn meeting in 2001 focused on elements of methodological approaches to facilitate scientific and technical co-operation, and this meeting strove to develop further the recommendations proposed at the time.

The 2003 workshop revealed that CHM implementation in Europe is progressing towards its objectives, even if some countries still lack human and financial resources, as well as political visibility.

As in 2001, the question of the 'role' or 'niche' of the CHM remained an important issue to the focal points. Facilitating the exchange of information, the first pillar of the CHM Strategic Plan, is a priority objective and is undertaken by all countries. Co-operation and networking, the two other pillars, are getting increased attention and are becoming more widely implemented, even though they are still the first to suffer from the lack of time and personnel.

'How to sell the CHM' was another question already formulated in 2001. The exchange of information, either through the Internet, by e-mail, CD Rom or in printed form, or, the exchange of experiences through more frequent meetings were seen as ways to support network building and the creation of a "common understanding of what the CHM is about and its real benefits and added value" (p.6, Bonn report). This workshop definitely helped to refine this idea. Several ideas emerged, and, although they seem fairly common sense, they had generally not been put to the forefront of CHM development. The participants agreed that the concept of a 'clearing house mechanism' is extremely difficult to convey to biodiversity stakeholders. Therefore, a more

appropriate expression might be used to describe CHM activities to a wide audience, while the expression 'CHM' would mostly be used within the CBD sphere. Proposed expressions included the notion of 'a gateway to biodiversity information'.

Giving a better sense of ownership of the CHM concept to national biodiversity stakeholders was also a recurrent idea in the discussions. This would not only help to 'sell' the CHM but would also facilitate co-operation at national level. Ownership can be promoted by the establishment of a structure in charge of the CHM at national level (whether established as a 'secretariat' or 'steering committee' remains the country's choice), or by developing the CHM as a showcase for the activities of all stakeholders.

The exchange of experiences on co-operation at national level proved very useful. Several ideas presented by one country will be taken up by other countries. The project to establish a common work programme (and a common communication strategy) between the main biodiversity projects at the federal level in Belgium is one of these (cf. 'Biodiversity.be' and the corresponding website www.biodiversity.be).

Joint initiatives between focal points will be developed further during the coming months, with the compilation of a 'needs analysis' at European level, the elaboration of a common 'mission statement' and the use of CBD terms as keywords for national CHM web site.

7. Annexes

Annex 1. Programme of the workshop

Day one (19 June 2003)

- 10:00-11:00 Arrival of the participants (coffee / tea) at the Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences.
- 11:00-11:15 Welcome / Introduction to the workshop.
General information by Jackie Van Goethem.
- 11:15-11:20 Adoption of the agenda.
- 11:20-13:00 Presentation of review done by UNEP-WCMC on the use of the CHM, followed by discussion.
- 13:00-14:30 Lunch in the restaurant of the Institute.
- 14:30-16:00 **Follow-up on the recommendations by Working Group 2 of the Bonn Meeting in 2001.** Chair: Horst Freiberg (see *Bonn Meeting Report* or the recommendations of Working Group 2 in annex).
- 16:00-16:20 Coffee / tea break.
- 16:20-18:15 **National CHM web sites.** Chair: Lawrence Way
How relevant is the information given on the national web sites? Are we fulfilling needs? Web statistics as a tool to analyse trends. Other tools to analyse trends and needs. Co-operation with other networks (Biosafety CH, GBIF and national nodes, Biodiversity platform, ENBI and others).
- 18:15-... Drink followed by buffet dinner in the restaurant of the Institute. Optional: visit of the 'Grand Place' of Brussels.

Day two (20 June 2003)

- 9:00-10:50 **Co-operation between national CHMs.** Chair: Severin ten Houte de Lange.
How can national CHMs work more proactively? How to improve the sharing of expertise and technology? How to optimise CHM structure and content in order to enable efficient searches simultaneously across multiple CHMs? Or how can CHMs collectively deliver useful information in one query on specific issues based on the experience of others?
- 10:50-11:15 Coffee / tea break.
- 11:15-13:00 **Co-operation between national CHMs.** Continued.
- 13:00-14:00 Lunch.
- 14:00-15:30 **Round table discussion.**
How can we improve implementation of CHM objectives? Can we contribute to transfer of technology?
- 15:30-15:45 Wrap-up of the Workshop.

Annex 2. Recommendations by Working Group 2, Bonn Workshop 2001

Chairperson: *Dr. Jackie Van Goethem (Belgium)*

Rapporteurs: *Severin ten Houte de Lange (the Netherlands), Lawrence Way (United Kingdom).*

Participants: *Han de Koeijer (Belgium), Ivaylo Zafirov (Bulgaria), Katharina Krieger (Colombia), Ana Strbenac (Croatia), Ulla Pinborg (Denmark), Hans Erik Svart (Denmark), Lauri Klein (Estonia), Olivier Gargominy (France), Horst Freiberg (Germany), Stephanie Splett-Rudolph (Germany), Hans Werner Koepfel (Germany), Corrado Iannucci (Italy), Daina Dzintare (Latvia), Sissel Rübberth (Norway), Julijana Lebez Lozej (Slovenia), Asa Präntare (Sweden), Jon Mengiardi (Switzerland), Severin M. ten Houte de Lange (the Netherlands), Lawrence Way (United Kingdom), Graham Drucker (ECNC), Beatriz Torres (CMS).*

Focus of discussions in WG 2: Elements for methodological and practical approaches to facilitate scientific and technical cooperation.

Discussions started with the question: 'What does exist?' and looked then for positive examples and difficulties.

Elements to be recognised:

1. *Information provision*
2. *Facilitate networking / communication*
 - Scientific National
 - Funding agencies International
3. *Organise meetings*
 - Regular meetings between Pan-European CHM focal points
 - Meetings between institutions for partnership building
 - Organisation of e-conferences
4. *Capacity building*
 - Bilateral / multilateral partnership building
5. *Awareness raising*

Target groups:

 - politicians
 - scientists / professionals
 - general public
 - NGO's
 - children (special pages on CHM)
6. *Funding for*
 - meetings / travel
 - capacity building
 - projects.

Questions:

- How to use the CHM to address cross-cutting issues?
- What is the added value of the CHM?
- How to better sell the CHM?

Difficulties and handicaps identified:

- Term 'biodiversity' is not easily understood
- The name CHM is difficult and confusing
- The loss of biodiversity is not felt by society, is less concrete than climate change.

Technical:

- information in different formats
- stakeholders do not want to share information
- updating is difficult.

Suggestions made:

- Terms biodiversity and CHM:
 - use good and meaningful national translations
 - put the convention text into understandable language
- Try to learn from sites which have become popular
- Put more attractive info (with pictures) in the CHM for the general public (meaningful sentences, stories)
- Put meaningful key words on the pages
- Launch awareness campaigns: let each stakeholder address its own target group / customers
- Share experience and re-use the technology already available in single CHM sites
- Identify in each country the users / target groups for cooperation and identify their specific needs / priorities
- Use CHM as a tool to streamline / synergise the implementation of different related conventions (Ramsar, Bonn, Bern, ...)
- Distribute hard copy material about CHM, with meaningful text
- Put some questions on your CHM site: ask users to tell you what they did not find, etc.
- Address cross cutting issues (like economy, traditional knowledge, poverty) specifically on your CHM site (this attracts other disciplines; ministries)
- Start a new partnership phase for the CHM, related to Article 18.3.

Annex 3. List of participants

CHM National Focal Points

Name	Forename	Address	Postal code	City	Country	Email
Franklin	Anne	Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences Rue Vautier 29	B-1000	Brussels	Belgium	anne.franklin@naturalsciences.be
Freiberg	Horst	Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN) Konstantinstrasse 110	D-53179	Bonn	Germany	horst.freiberg@BfN.de
Gargominy	Olivier	Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle/ISB 61, rue Buffon	F-75005	Paris	France	gargo@mnhn.fr
ten Houte de Lange	Severin	National Reference Centre for Agriculture, Nature and Fisheries (EC-LNV), P.O. Box 482 41, Horapark, Bennekomseweg	NL-6710 BL	Ede	The Netherlands	s.m.ten.houte@eclnv.agro.nl
de Koeijer	Han	Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences Vautierstraat 29	B-1000	Brussels	Belgium	han.dekoeijer@naturalsciences.be
Mengiardi	Jon	Gruner AG Gellertstrasse 55, Postfach	CH-4020	Basel	Switzerland	jon.mengiardi@gruner.ch
Pisarski	Zbyszko	Institute of Environmental Protection 5/11 Krucza Street	PL-00548	Warsaw	Poland	zbyszko.pisarski@ios.edu.pl
Van Goethem	Jackie	Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences Vautierstraat 29	B-1000	Brussels	Belgium	jackie.vangoethem@naturalsciences.be
Way	Lawrence	Joint Nature Conservation Committee Monkstone House, City Road	UK-PE1 1JY	Peterborough	United Kingdom	lawrence.way@jncc.gov.uk

Partners from biodiversity-related initiatives

Name	Forename	Street	Postal code	City	Country	Email
Breyer	Didier	Service of Biosafety and Biotechnology Scientific Institute of Public Health Rue Juliette Wytsman 14	B-1050	Brussels	Belgium	dbreyer@sbb.ihe.be
Gevorgyan	Aram	UNEP-WCMC 219 Huntingdon Road	UK-CB3 0DL	Cambridge	United Kingdom	aram.gevorgyan@unep-wcmc.org
Mergen	Patricia	Be-Bif Université Libre de Bruxelles, Campus de la Plaine CP 257 Bâtiment NO, Bureau 4 O4 210 Boulevard du Triomphe, entrée ULB 2	B-1050	Brussels	Belgium	pmergen@ben.vub.ac.be
Segers	Hendrik	Belgian Biodiversity Platform Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences Vautierstraat 29	B-1000	Brussels	Belgium	hendrik.segers@naturalsciences.be
Sharman	Martin	European Commission Research DG DI-4 Biodiversity and Ecosystems Office: LX46 2/74	B-1049	Brussels	Belgium	martin.sharman@cec.eu.int
van der Werf	Aline	Science Policy Office Rue de la Science 8	B-1000	Brussels	Belgium	vdwe@belspo.be

Annex 4. Standard keywords for CBD themes and issues

Proposal by Lawrence Way (UK)

Code	Standard Type	Standard Name
A01	<i>Article</i>	5 - Cooperation
A02	<i>Article</i>	6 - General Measures
A03	<i>Article</i>	7 - Identification and Monitoring
A04	<i>Article</i>	8 - In-situ Conservation
A05	<i>Article</i>	8h - Alien Species
A06	<i>Article</i>	8j - Indigenous People Issues
A07	<i>Article</i>	9 - Ex-situ Conservation
A08	<i>Article</i>	10 - Sustainable Use
A09	<i>Article</i>	11 - Incentive Measures
A10	<i>Article</i>	12 - Research and Training
A11	<i>Article</i>	13 - Public Education and Awareness
A12	<i>Article</i>	14 - Impact Assessment
A13	<i>Article</i>	15 - Access to Genetic Resources
A14	<i>Article</i>	16 - Access to Technology
A15	<i>Article</i>	17 - Exchange of Information
A16	<i>Article</i>	18 - Technical and Scientific Cooperation
A17	<i>Article</i>	19 - Biotechnology
A18	<i>Article</i>	20 - Financial Resources
A19	<i>Article</i>	21 - Financial Mechanism
A20	<i>Article</i>	22 - Other International Conventions
A21	<i>Article</i>	23 - Conference of the Parties
A22	<i>Article</i>	24 - Secretariat
A23	<i>Article</i>	25 - SBSTTA
A24	<i>Article</i>	26 - Reports
P01	<i>Protocol</i>	Biosafety
T01	<i>Thematic Work Programme</i>	Agricultural Biodiversity
T02	<i>Thematic Work Programme</i>	Dry and Sub-humid lands Biodiversity
T03	<i>Thematic Work Programme</i>	Forest Biodiversity
T04	<i>Thematic Work Programme</i>	Inland Waters Biodiversity
T05	<i>Thematic Work Programme</i>	Marine and Coastal Biodiversity
T06	<i>Thematic Work Programme</i>	Mountain Biodiversity
C01	<i>Cross-cutting Issue</i>	Access and Benefit-sharing
C02	<i>Cross-cutting Issue</i>	Alien Species
C03	<i>Cross-cutting Issue</i>	Traditional Knowledge, Innovations and Practices
C04	<i>Cross-cutting Issue</i>	Biodiversity and Tourism
C05	<i>Cross-cutting Issue</i>	Climate Change and Biodiversity
C06	<i>Cross-cutting Issue</i>	Economics, Trade and Incentives
C07	<i>Cross-cutting Issue</i>	Ecosystem Approach
C08	<i>Cross-cutting Issue</i>	Global Strategy for Plant Conservation
C09	<i>Cross-cutting Issue</i>	Global Taxonomy Initiative
C10	<i>Cross-cutting Issue</i>	Impact Assessment, Liability and Redress
C11	<i>Cross-cutting Issue</i>	Indicators
C12	<i>Cross-cutting Issue</i>	Protected Areas
C13	<i>Cross-cutting Issue</i>	Public Education and Awareness
C14	<i>Cross-cutting Issue</i>	Sustainable Use of Biodiversity

Annex 5. Resources available at some European CHM focal points

Question/country	Belgium	France	Germany	Netherlands	Poland	Switzerland	UK
1) How many people are involved with the CHM at the NFP?	3	2	1	1	1	3	3
2) What is the average proportion of time devoted to the CHM per person involved?	80%+20%+10% (37%)	80%+20% (50%)	50%	25%	2-3 weeks/ year	30%+20%+10% (20%)	30%+5%+1% (12%)
3) What is the proportion of the NFP's total budget available for CHM implementation in 2003?	43%*	?	?	0%	0%	80%	0.2% of JNCC total budget
4) How many of the last COPs (6) and last 3 SBSTTAs (6, 7, 8) did the NFP attend (at least one member of the NFP)?	All	All	All	COP 6 [†]	None	None [†]	None [†]

* The budget is used for the partnership initiative with developing countries

[†] CHM NFP generally represented by another person