UNEP

CBD

CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/AHTEG-TTSTC/4
23 July 2007

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AD HOC TECHNICAL EXPERT GROUP ON
TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND SCIENTIFIC
AND TECHNOLOGICAL COOPERATION
Geneva, 10 – 12 September 2007
Item 5 of the provisional agenda*

DEVELOPMENT OF AN INDICATOR FOR TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AS PART OF THE FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSING PROGRESS TOWARDS THE 2010 TARGET

Note by the Executive Secretary

I INTRODUCTION

1. In decision VII/30, the Conference of the Parties adopted a provisional framework for assessing progress towards the 2010 biodiversity target, and also identified a number of indicators for development by SBSTTA or working groups, including an indicator for technology transfer. In Annex IV of decision VIII/15, the Conference of the Parties invited Parties and other Governments to submit information on an indicator for technology transfer, and indicated that the expert group on technology transfer and scientific and technological cooperation may wish to consider this matter.

2. This indication by the Conference of the Parties came further to a similar recommendation by SBSTTA at its tenth meeting. The issue was further considered by the expert group on technology transfer and scientific and technological cooperation established by the Executive Secretary pursuant to decision VII/29, at its meeting in November 2005. The existing work under the CBD was brought to the attention of the meeting, and the outcome of the discussion were summarized in the progress report on implementation with regard to technology transfer and scientific and technological cooperation that was submitted to the Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting (UNEP/CBD/COP/8/19). For ease of reference by the Ad hoc Technical Expert Group, the relevant information is reproduced in this note.

II PREVIOUS WORK

3. SBSTTA, at its tenth meeting, in the annex to recommendation X/5, invited Parties and other Governments to submit information on an indicator for technology transfer, and indicated that the expert group on technology transfer and scientific and technological cooperation may wish to consider the matter. The Executive Secretary subsequently informed the expert group about this invitation and

/…

included this matter in the agenda for the meeting of the expert group in November 2005. He also drew attention of the group to relevant work already undertaken by other experts groups under the Convention, and made the relevant documentation available to the Group, notably:

- The report of the third meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on the Review of Implementation of the Programme of Work on Forest Biological Diversity (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/11/INF/3), which identifies indicators for technology transfer in the context of forest biodiversity (the relevant section of the report is reproduced in Annex I);

- The note of the Executive Secretary entitled "Indicators for assessing progress towards 2010 target: Possible indicators for development", prepared for consideration by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for Assessing Progress towards, and Communicating, the 2010 Target at the Global Level (UNEP/CBD/TEGIND/1/3), which examines, in paragraph 70 of the document, two options for the development of an indicator on technology transfer: (a) the expansion of the biodiversity marker of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), with a view to identify national official development assistance (ODA) programmes with a large technology component; and (b) the use of national information on access and benefit-sharing arrangements that are implemented by relevant actors that utilize genetic resources for building an indicator which would aggregate the value of technology transferred pursuant to those benefit-sharing arrangements that include provisions on the transfer of pertinent technologies (the relevant section is reproduced in Annex II).

4. During its meeting of 27 November 2005, the Expert Group held an initial brainstorming discussion under this item. As regards forest-related indicators for technology transfer, the representative of the secretariat of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) noted that UNFF country reports are prepared on a voluntary basis and often lack detail on technology transfer. They would hence not provide a comprehensive basis for the development of an indicator.

5. It was noted by a number of participants that option (b) discussed in document UNEP/CBD/TEGIND/1/3 might merit further consideration. In addition, several participants also pointed to a number of existing tools and methodologies, such a balanced-scorecard approaches or toolbox analyses, which might provide useful entry points for the development of indicators.

6. It was however the general view expressed that agreement on a limited number of indicators for technology transfer would be premature in light of the further work envisaged on enabling environment and the connection between technology transfer and technological cooperation (see paragraph **Error! Reference source not found.** above). It was in particular noted that, as technology transfer includes much more than just a transfer of resources, it would be constraining to develop indicators of technology transfer that would focus on this particular aspect.

III SUGGESTED ACTIVITY OF THE AD HOC TECHNICAL EXPERT GROUP

7. In light of its work on previous agenda items, the Expert Group may wish to consider whether to embark in the exploration of options for the development of an indicator on technology transfer for assessing progress towards the 2010 biodiversity target. In case of an affirmative decision, the Expert Group may wish to continue its examination of the options presented and/or engage in identifying other options for the development of an indicator.

Annex I

EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE AD HOC TECHNICAL EXPERT GROUP ON THE REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK ON FOREST BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

(UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/11/INF/3)

Appendix 1

ASSOCIATED GLOBAL INDICATORS

Status 1/	**Indicator**	**Data available now?**	**Methodology available now?**	**Possible source of data**	**Relevant indicators in reference to Criteria and Indicator processes for sustainable forest management**
GOAL 11. PARTIES HAVE IMPROVED FINANCIAL, HUMAN, SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL CAPACITY TO IMPLEMENT THE CONVENTION					
Target 11.1: New and additional financial resources are transferred to developing country Parties, to allow for the effective implementation of the expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity under the Convention, in accordance with Article 20					
PFD	Amount of new and additional funds, including through ODA, transferred to developing countries and destined to implement activities that are in harmony with the expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity	Some	yes	Donor countries, GEF and other multilateral funding agencies, recipient countries	
PFD	Level of foreign direct investment in developing countries and countries with economies in transition for sustainable forest management	Some	yes	Private sector, World Bank, regional development banks, recipient countries	
PFD	Number and financial value of projects implemented in developing countries and countries with economies in transition for	Some	yes	Recipient countries	

1/ ITU = Indicator for immediate testing and use; PFD = Possible indicator for further development

Status 1/	**Indicator**	**Data available now?**	**Methodology available now?**	**Possible source of data**	**Relevant indicators in reference to Criteria and Indicator processes for sustainable forest management**
	sustainable forest management				
Target 11.2: Environmentally sound technology is transferred to developing country Parties, to allow for the effective implementation of the expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity under the Convention, in accordance with its Article 20, paragraph 4, and Article 16					
PFD	Number of countries with international programmes for the transfer of environmentally sound technologies to developing country Parties in accordance with Article 16 of the Convention	Some	yes	UNFF country reports	
PFD	Number of projects promoting the national dissemination of environmentally sound technologies	Some	yes	National reports?	

Annex II

EXCERPT FROM 'INDICATORS FOR ASSESSING PROGRESS TOWARDS THE 2010 TARGET: POSSIBLE INDICATORS FOR DEVELOPMENT'

(UNEP/CBD/AHTEG-2010-Ind/1/3)

Possible indicator 19: Indicator for technology transfer

67. Article 16 of the Convention, on access to and transfer of technology, recognizes that both access to and transfer of technology among Contracting Parties are essential elements for the attainment of the objectives of the Convention. It requires Contracting Parties to provide and/or facilitate access to and transfer of technologies that are relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity or make use of genetic resources and do not cause significant damage to the environment. Each Contracting Party is to take legislative, administrative or policy measures with the aim that Contracting Parties, in particular those that are developing countries, which provide genetic resources are provided access to and transfer of technology which makes use of those resources.

68. Article 19 of the Convention requires Contracting Parties to establish measures to provide for the effective participation in biotechnological research activities of Parties, especially developing countries, which provide genetic resources for such research. Contracting Parties are also to take practicable measures to promote and advance priority access by such Parties, on a fair and equitable basis, to the results and benefits arising from biotechnologies based upon the genetic resources provided.

69. Designing an indicator for implementation of these commitments is a complex and challenging task. Sifting through national export statistics (both for goods and services) in order to identify the transfer of pertinent technology would be tedious work requiring large input in terms of time and manpower. Such an endeavour may also encounter conceptual problems in light of varying goods and services classifications on which national export statistics are based; moreover, these export classifications may often not be disaggregated enough to enable the identification of technologies for conservation and sustainable use. In this connection, it is also noteworthy that technologies for conservation and sustainable use include multiple-use technologies, whose beneficial effects on biodiversity will crucially depend on the specific recipient. This feature will also make the simple use of national export statistics very difficult. Finally, with regard to technologies that make use of genetic resources, which are often privately owned, trade secret provisions may impede getting comprehensive information on such private sector technology transfer.

70. In light of these considerations, the development of two possible indicators could be envisaged.

(a) One option that could be taken into consideration, especially with regard to technologies for conservation and sustainable use, is to expand the Development Co-operation Directorate of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD DAC) biodiversity marker 1/ with a view to identify national ODA programmes with a large technology component. The indicator could consist of the aggregate value of the technology transferred. As this marker only covers bilateral ODA, it could be supplemented with information from relevant multilateral funding institution such as GEF. It is, however, uncertain whether pertinent information at such disaggregated level will be available at these multilateral institutions. Furthermore, it was recently decided by the DAC Working Party on Statistics to incorporate the Rio markers in regular CRS reporting for a trial period of three years, with the understanding that coverage and quality of the data received will be reviewed in 2007. Hence, for

1/ *See* UNEP/CBD/AHTEG-2010-Ind/1/2 and UNEP/CBD/AHTEG-2010-Ind/1/INF/8.

procedural reasons, the amendment of the biodiversity marker as suggested here might only be feasible after the extended trial period and the review to be undertaken in 2007.

(b) Option (a) would not include the transfer of technologies carried out by the private sector, which is of particular relevance for technology that makes use of genetic resources. A possible option in this regard would be to use national information on access and benefit-sharing arrangements that are implemented by relevant actors that utilize genetic resources. An indicator could be built by aggregating the value of technology transferred pursuant to those benefit-sharing arrangements that include provisions on the transfer of pertinent technologies. While this indicator would not include all transferred technologies that make use of genetic resources, it would cover those technologies that are transferred pursuant to a benefit-sharing arrangement, which may be deemed to be of particular relevance in light of Articles 19/1 and 19/2 of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
