

Meeting Report of the DELC MEA Knowledge Management (KM) Meeting

22-24 September 2009, Chexbres, Switzerland

Day I

1. Setting the Stage

The meeting was opened by **Mr. Bradnee Chambers**, (UNEP/DELC) who welcomed participants and requested a round of introductions. He then welcomed the participants and provided some background information to the convening of the meeting.

Mr. Chambers then outlined the importance of Knowledge Management within the context of Environmental Law. (*Attachment 1; attachments can be downloaded from www.cbd.int/kmmea*). He emphasized the importance of Art. 31, of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which states that an interpretation of a treaty must take into account other relevant treaties and subsequent practices. The growing number of MEAs with often overlapping responsibilities has led to concerns that their decision making bodies may inadvertently reach contradictory decisions. A knowledge management strategy that would enhance cooperation among the different MEAs and their governing bodies and secretariats may alleviate this situation.

He noted that international commerce, agriculture and labour law regimes are administered by a unique secretariat or organization. This administrative structure facilitates greatly policy making that is coherent, integrated and holistic. Even more so will the fragmented landscape of environmental law profit from the development of information tools such as FAOlex, ILOlex and the WTO analytical index which creates the requisite knowledge base for more effective decision making.

Mr. Chambers then provided possible elements for an MEA KM strategy and suggested the development of pilot projects among MEAs which build on existing initiatives such as ECOLEX and InforMea. He also proposed initiatives related to facilitating interoperability of information and data hosted by MEAs and providing enhanced capacity to Secretariats to better manage data. Finally, he referred to other aspects of KM including MEA implementation and compliance and joint functional elements such as research, education, resource efficiency, conflict avoidance, cross fertilization and learning.

He concluded by emphasizing DELC's commitment to supporting this process through the newly established MEAs KM team in Geneva.

Mr. Marcos Silva, Co-Chair (CITES), presented an introduction outlining broader issues related to KM (*Attachment 2*). He referred to the challenges that a KM strategy presents to the United Nations, particularly with regard to efforts to reach a common definition of exactly what constitutes KM. He also discussed the relevance and importance of conclusions in the JIU and OIOS reports. His presentation also emphasized that issues related to KM are rooted within the new ICT Strategy approved by the United Nations General Assembly in December 2008. He continued by summarizing related efforts undertaken by the MEAs and the results of past meetings, including:

- The informal meeting on formats, protocols and standards for improved exchange of biodiversity information in Montreal, Canada (19 - 20 February 2002), which recognized *the urgent need for interoperability to foster scientific and technical co-operation and information dissemination and exchange, within the constraints of the infrastructure currently available*;
- the meeting of the technical working group on an information exchange mechanism for the EMG in Nairobi, Kenya (12-13 March 2006), which recommended the approval of pilot-project(s) proposed by the proposed Information, Communication and Technology Advisory Committee (ICTAC) under the Environment Management Group (EMG) to demonstrate the feasibility and utility of adherence to common formats, protocols and standards;
- a brainstorming workshop on KM for MEAs and KM for biodiversity related conventions including harmonization of national reporting in Cambridge, UK (13-16 June 2006), which decided on the implementation of a project proposal (InforMEA) to establish a practical and feasible approach to empowering Parties and secretariats by using the principles and IT tools of KM; and
- the DELIC workshop on KM among MEAs in Cambridge, UK (7-9 March 2008), which received guidance from MEA secretariats in terms of reviewing the status of the DELIC Knowledge Management project and identified future work on KM among the biodiversity-related agreements (including discussion on national reporting harmonization).

He emphasized that MEAs expressed strongly the belief that KM projects related to information management will be sustainable only if technical capacity is enhanced at the Secretariat level. He also stressed that that projects using convention data will be successful only if the custodians of the data are able to participate equitably in the development of the project.

With regard to questions by participants on the relationship between information management and knowledge management, Mr. Silva emphasized that the objective of the meeting was not to create an information management strategy. Rather, the meeting should aim to make recommendations related to the development of an enabling environment for capturing, managing and sharing the MEA's knowledge assets. Arguably, however, the first step in developing such an environment is dependent on a well functioning data and information sharing system.

He concluded by praising the efforts by the DELIC team and discussed how the present environment differs from past efforts, especially in light of the establishment of a KM office in Geneva. This office may facilitate the development of collaborative KM projects and make available some funding to support such activities.

A brief discussion followed on the need to identify the target group or audience that will profit from enhanced interoperability and harmonization of data and information and how this may offer the foundation for the development of a long-term KM strategy for the MEAs. The importance to include IPBES (Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services) into the discussions was also raised by some participants.

Ms. Ines Verleye (TEMETEA) stated that some parties are of the view that the objectives of each individual convention are unique and should remain so. Furthermore, decision making and governance in the MEAs are the responsibility of their respective Conference of the Parties (COPs). She agreed, however, that interoperability of information hosted by the secretariats would be of benefit to Parties. Participants representing the MEAs emphasized that a business model for

interoperability must be based on demand and that a KM strategy must assist MEAs in their work. Lastly the need for cultural change with regard to data ownership was emphasized in the context of KM and Knowledge Sharing.

2. Presentations by MEAs

Stockholm Convention:

Mr. Osmany Pereira gave an appealing power point presentation on developments in the Stockholm Convention. The Secretariat has been mandated to serve as a clearing-house mechanism for information on Persistent Organic Pollutants which includes the establishment of infrastructure and procedures to facilitate identification, integration and exchange of information and the creation of a global knowledge base on POPs (Tools & Facility). This tool, which will be built using the DotNetNuke Content Management platform, will have an Interactive Web site to support the development of the “POPs information exchange network/community”, contain a Multi-purpose Contacts Database, a Document Management System and a Correspondence Tracking and Messaging System, and will also host Private sub-webs for user groups to manage their internal information before sharing it with the rest of the community. This will form the basis of interoperability among the chemicals cluster to a given point, with commonly accepted standards and guidelines (*Attachment 3*).

Rotterdam Convention:

Mr. Federico Izzo introduced the PIC document Management Systems known as M-files and demonstrated how it has been integrated to their document lifecycle processes by showing how an email could be extracted from the mail system and saved in M-files. He indicated that M-files had an extensive Metadata system and the taxonomy captured the larger majority of documents in use including the assignments of access permissions as well as the workflow routing for a said document., He then demonstrated the PIC Database that contains information on official contacts, chemicals, meetings, notifications from parties, etc, and provided an example of how this database also feeds the PIC Website with the Periodic Circulars. His was a demonstration on how systems in one organization can be integrated to share data for multiple uses over multiple applications (*Attachment 4*).

Ramsar Convention:

Mr. Nick Davidson informed that the Secretariat has no IT resources to readily respond to KM initiatives as there is no direct mandate on KM although certain mandates imply the use of KM. The secretariat has a contacts database and a reporting facility which are not web-enabled. He suggested that UNEP considers developing a system whereby Secretariats without technical capacity can call for assistance or tap into a database of experts. He emphasized that participating secretariats need to achieve a similar level of technical capacity for KM tools to be successful. He mentioned Ramsar’s collaboration with the CBD on information sharing and harmonization of reporting.

Convention on Migratory Species (CMS):

Mr. Florian Keil from the African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA) represented also CMS at the meeting. He informed that AEWA in particular and CMS in general have no dedicated IT teams/support, and no overt KM programme. He emphasized that the capacity to analyze information generated by the newly established online reporting tools was of key importance to AEWA. He reported that UNEP-WCMC had developed an Information Management System for CMS and along with several other tools such as the Critical Sites Network Tool for the Wings of the Wetlands Project. Furthermore, an open-source-based extranet had been developed for AEWA for communities of practice. He concluded with references to issues such as data security and the need for enhanced capacity at the secretariats' level on how to use suggested KM tools.

Convention on international Trade in Endangered Species (CITES):

Mr. Marcos Silva introduced "Electronic Permitting" as a tool that has been developed for trade facilitation by CITES. The concept of Trade facilitation is directed towards reducing the complexity and cost of the trade transaction process, and ensuring that all activities occur in an efficient, transparent and predictable manner. This process generally aims at: harmonization of applicable laws and regulations, simplification of administrative and commercial formalities, procedures and documents, standardization and integration of information and related requirements, the use of technologies to exchange information efficiently, and, transparency in making information available. Some challenges related to the implementation of the project include a) the wide variety of different systems based on different protocols and standards used by parties, and b) the legal issues surrounding use and acceptance of electronic signatures. However, there are many processes and projects working towards harmonization led by international organizations such as UN/Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business (UN/CEFACT) and the World Customs Organization (WCO). The CITES Secretariat has developed an e-permitting toolkit to assist Parties with the development of such systems. This e-permitting toolkit will be submitted to the next CITES COP for review and possible adoption (*Attachment 5*).

International Treaty on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA):

Mr. Selim Louafi went on to provide an overview of KM activities of the ITPGRFA. The Treaty's cornerstone is its Multilateral System of Access and Benefit Sharing. This system created a global gene-pool of distributed worldwide gene-banks to exchange their material (accession) according to conditions (a standard contract) agreed multilaterally. It is the only fully operational, international Access and Benefit-sharing System for plant genetic resources. The process of ordering or processing a germplasm request is done through participating in an agreement known as the Standard Material Transfer Agreements (SMTAs). In this manner, information can be exchanged between the content providers, the treaty database, and users, on a web-based interface over the Internet (*Attachment 6*).

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD):

Mr. Olivier de Munck focused in his presentation on responses and more insight to the questionnaire that had been sent to the MEAs before the meeting. CBD identified and described some frequently shared information between the MEAs and also described some interoperability initiatives that it has been carrying out. In conclusion CBD suggested a careful consideration of web 2.0 providers & services as possible facilitator of interoperability amongst convention, to prepare the respective specifications and guidelines for service customization and to ensure client-side implementation. (*Attachment 7*)

World Heritage Center (WHC- UNESCO):

Mr. Alonzo Addison provided his presentation upon his arrival to the group. He emphasized the WHC's good experience with interoperability. He demonstrated the underlying system and its interoperability with partners, as exemplified by the Heritage Site Finder feature, which is integrated with Google Earth. He went on to describe the center's approach to web services and how their information has been organized and hosted. He highlighted the need for common standards at a higher level that will allow the Secretariats the flexibility to continue developing their own independent systems in a way that could be integrated to the larger common system.

3. Presentation by tools that present MEA derived data**ECOLEX**

Ms. Francoise Burhenne and **Ms. Barbara Moauro** gave their presentation on ECOLEX and explained that its relevance to MEAs hinges on its database which includes treaties, national and international court decisions, national legislation, and literature, and its capacity to contribute information on national legislation taken or used in implementation; major court cases related to the conventions themselves or implementing legislation; other conventions and agreements in related fields; and relevant law and policy literature. ECOLEX's experience with interoperability includes its recent collaboration with CIESIN on the treaties and decisions database. This collaboration could be explored and expanded to reach out to MEAs when common ground is established and resources are provided to achieve this goal (*Attachment 8*).

UNEP -World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)

Mr. Peter Herkenrath presented on the project -UNEP (DELIC & UNEP-WCMC), in collaboration with the Secretariats of Biodiversity-related Conventions & Agreements (CBD, CITES, CMS, Ramsar, AWEA, IOSEA), which was developed to strengthen the implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions through the strategic use of information. He described the objectives of the project as well as the underlying information architecture to facilitate data exchange. The project comprised development of a portal to key agreement documents (www.inforMEA.org), online reporting tools for CMS, AWEA and CITES, and suggestions for harmonization of national reporting between biodiversity-related agreements (*Attachment 9*).

TEMATEA (UNEP-IUCN)

Ms Ines Verleye gave an overview of the TEMATEA project and what it intends to achieve. She emphasized that the system presents adopted texts and structures related mandates and obligations categorized in a thematic way to provide national experts with a clear overview of national obligation throughout clusters of MEAs. She highlighted that the bulk of the updating work is related to the review and extraction of the action related parts of the decision texts for the relevant category. Ms. Verleye provided a demonstration of the various sections of the portal and the kind of information it contains. Marine and Coastal Biodiversity along with other modules are about to be added to the site (*Attachment 10*).

UNEP-DELIC Analytical Index on International Environmental Law:

Ms. Eva Duer then presented the DELC analytical legal index, a tools which is about to be developed with a view to providing a structure that can link up information provided through difference information and knowledge tools through an analytical index or glossary of legal terms. For the sake of demonstration she referred to the structure of the WTO analytical index at the example of the Most Favored Nation Principle and sketched out how the precautionary principle or approach could be presented in a way that bundles together reference to the same throughout convention texts, ministerial declarations, international case law as well as national legislation (*Attachment 11*).

4. Brainstorming and Discussions

During the ensuing discussion it was clarified that the proposed analytical index will build upon existing tools such as ECOLEX.

With regard to the development of a controlled vocabulary/thesaurus, the participants agreed that it would be too costly and time consuming to develop such a vocabulary at the present time. However, the participants agreed that the programme areas and cross-cutting issues of the conventions could be used as a type of controlled vocabulary for categorizing relevant information.

The issue of the need to inform Parties participating at a COP of obligations under other conventions was raised, which set in motion a lively discussion on how to make such information available in a timely manner. The meeting agreed that it would be extremely valuable to develop a tool to allow secretariats and DELC to compile relevant decisions and resolutions which may be of relevance for Parties when they are drafting new resolutions and decisions.

Several participants were concerned over the lack of technical capacity in their secretariats. Some conventions also expressed concerns that they lacked the requisite resources to adjust effectively existing business processes when developing such information tools.

While it would be possible to develop a centralized depository of convention data including decisions and resolutions, the participants expressed a preference for a distributed model of information. That is, data would conform to certain standards, possibly through the development XML schemas, and pushed through the use of dynamic feeds (or pulled through harvesting mechanisms). This would require agreement on web services and XML schemas. The XML schemas would structure the categories of data accordingly thereby offering opportunities for the development of interoperable systems.

Mr. Chambers summarized that there was an expressed need for an agreement on data formats/standards and guidelines, for the support for the application of these standards as well as for dynamic feeds. He emphasized that the DELC Geneva team can offer technical support. Wrapping up the day the agenda for the following day was revised, groups were formed around slightly revised topics and presentations oriented towards potential solutions.

DAY II

1. Developments in UNEP and UNON

The second day began with a presentation by **Mr. Gowri Shankar** of the newly developed UNON ICTS strategy which seeks to enable a KM environment using an enterprise content management platform recommended by UN Headquarters called Documentum¹. Documentum includes management solutions for resource planning, monitoring and reporting. Mr. Shankar presented tools and services associated with this comprehensive package, as well as the approximate costs (*Attachment 12a & 12b*).

The next presentation by **Mr. Mohammed Atani** (UNEP/DCPI) focused on a KM and KS strategy for UNEP. In developing this strategy all existing KM initiatives within UNEP will be brought together under the umbrella of a UNEP wide strategy. This process will include an appropriate KM infrastructure, evaluation mechanisms. He indicated that the process should be participatory and should be informed of MEA needs and developments, preferably through the DELC KM office in Geneva. Work will involve the development of a community of practice of experts working on KM in UNEP, and be supported by an external consultant.

Mr. Mamadou Kane (UNEP/DELC) followed with a presentation on MENTOR, an e-learning platform developed by DEWA which is currently being populated with content provided by UNEP and its administered conventions.

2. Current and possible future projects on interoperability

Mr. Osmany Pereira (POPs) gave an introduction to the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm synergies process, touching upon the complexities associated with this multi-stakeholder process. He also described the issues related to the development of a joint Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) as mandated by the Stockholm COP.

Mr. Richard Woods (POPs) gave an excellent non-technical presentation on the elements that comprise an interoperable system within the context of the CHM project and the synergies process. The process entails inventory taking, specification of the target common platform, identification of the common elements, their transformation and the establishment of interfaces, their management and development (*Attachment 13*).

Mr. Olivier de Munck presented a service tool based on Web 2.0 technologies developed by Google that could be used for data exchange among conventions. He recommended the following criteria for selecting service providers: reliability, range of services, security, use of open standards, flexibility and customization, documentation and cost effectiveness. He described the steps needed to be taken by each convention in order to exchange data through such services while maintaining master data in protected MEA databases (*Attachment 14*).

3. Open discussions

The floor was opened by the Co-Chairs for comments on the presentations. Participants discussed the different models available to assist with interoperability of heterogeneous databases and information systems, and reviewed the advantages and disadvantages of different tools and providers of content management systems, including Documentum and open source systems. It was

¹ <http://www.documentum.com/>

agreed that Documentum was a powerful tool but that it may be of too great complexity and cost for the Secretariats. However, if Documentum was offered by UNEP with the requisite support, participants agreed that its use should be examined accordingly.

Some participants agreed that there exists a need to better harmonize UNEP KM initiatives with those of the conventions. There was also agreement that there exists a pressing need for technical guidelines and specifications to assist the conventions to implement such projects in a more coherent and mutually beneficial manner.

The discussions also touched upon the legal implications of storing United Nations data with a public provider such as Google. It was concluded that there was a need for legal advice on the issue of intellectual property, UN data and data security.

4. Work in Groups

For the afternoon sessions participants formed three groups in the following composition:

- **Group I: Interoperability standards, projects and guidelines**

(Alonzo Addison, Gerardo Fragoso, Olivier de Munck, Kelly Kabiru, Gowri Shankar, Marcos Silva, Richard Woods)

- **Group II: Steering committee and structure for follow on process**

(Mohammed Attani, Nick Davidson, Eva Duer, Federico Izzo, Mamadou Kane, Florian Keil, Selim Louafi)

- **Group III: Tools Group**

(Bradnee Chambers, Francoise Burhenne, Barbara Moauro, Peter Herkenrath, Tabitha Ndegwa)

The Working Groups reported on the outcomes of their discussion during the last session of the day. Mr. Florian Keil reported of the discussions from Group II and presented the group's suggestions to develop an MEA KM Steering Committee which would be meeting annually and consist of MEA and UNEP representation and observers from initiatives such as Ecolex, Tematea, InforMEA and other interested bodies. The steering committee will designate members to participate in an MEA KM technical working group to oversee the specifications and implementation of the project on behalf of the committee. Mr. Keil also emphasized the need to consider issues related to national reporting under the KM umbrella.

Mr. Marcos Silva reported on conclusions reached by Group I who looked at Interoperability standards, projects and guidelines. He discussed the recommendations to develop a proof of concept project on interoperability which are to be drafted by DELC in collaboration with the proposed Steering Committee. The proof of concept note will attempt to describe how capacity can be enhanced at the secretariat level and how this capacity can contribute to an enabling technical environment where knowledge tools needed by Parties can be developed in a timely and cost-

effective manner. Impacts on existing business processes will be identified by MEAs to inform long-term projects and initiatives on interoperability. Furthermore an independent review of InforMEA was suggested as well as the development of a long-term KM MEA strategy based on the proof of concept note.

Mr. Bradnee Chambers reported on the findings of Group III which concluded that the represented tools - ECOLEX, TEMATEA and inforMEA - are complementary and serve different stakeholders and target groups. TEMATEA targets national governments, ECOLEX and its cooperation with CIESIN targets the legal environment community at large, and inforMEA serves MEAs and their stakeholders and will provide the lesson learned and potential base for future interoperability efforts. However, there was agreement that the tools will profit from more cooperation and coordination between themselves and with MEAs. Given that ECOLEX and the DELC analytical index project target by and large the same audience, linkages between these initiatives have to be considered carefully and close collaboration in the conception and development of the analytical index between DELC and ECOLEX will be important.

It was also agreed that an MEA KM portal that may be developed under an interoperability project should also link up to all of the represented tools, describing their purpose and content before leading to their respective web sites.

It was agreed that outcome documents of Group I and II would be further discussed the following morning. However, participants continued to informally discuss group outcomes and recommendations well into the evening.

Day III

1. Way forward

The last half day was devoted to discussion on recommendations arising from the meeting. Draft texts were discussed on the screen and further refined and elaborated. The outcome documents are annexed to this document (Annex I and Annex II)

2. Closure

Co-chairs Mr. Bradnee Chambers and Mr. Marcos Silva concluded the meeting, thanking the participants for their considerable contributions, enthusiasm and open and frank discussions. Mr. Chambers re-emphasized DELC's commitment to carry this process forward.

Annex I

Work plan drafted by participants of Group II on issues related to interoperability of MEA data and information and discussed and agreed to in the plenary on 24 September 2009:

Elements of a work plan on interoperability amongst MEAs:

- Development of a concept note, drafted by DELC in collaboration with interested representatives from MEAs. This concept note will identify targeted audiences and undergo review by the proposed steering committee on KM. A long-term KM strategy will make use of the lessons learned from implementation of the concept note.

DELC will follow up on the recommendations of the meeting to initiate collaboration through the proposed steering committee and to build on previous work related to online reporting and analytical tools.

The governance structure for shared leadership and ownership of the project as identified in Annex II will be reflected in the concept note and will:

- Describe the process of fostering collaboration;
- Identify means to ensure long-term sustainability of the project;
- List categories of information to be made interoperable.

Actions by DELC in support of the project include:

- an independent evaluation of InforMEA in line with the TORs to be developed by the Steering Committee.
- provision of a dedicated person/technical team to support MEA Secretariats lacking ICT capacity to participate effectively in the proof of concept phase

The meeting also recommended that:

- During the proof of concept project, any potential impacts on existing business processes should be documented and shared among Secretariats. This exercise will assist to better understand the potential impacts of a long-term KM project on such business processes and offer Secretariats the knowledge to respond accordingly;
- The designated technical working group will undertake the drafting of technical specifications for the system, based on agreed upon common formats, protocols and standards.
- The designated technical working group, as established by the Steering Committee and with support from DELC, will facilitate the process and negotiations of agreement on formats and metadata including a basic controlled vocabulary based on the programme areas of each MEA;
- For MEA secretariats lacking capacity, DELC will facilitate the identification of server space for hosting databases in collaboration with technical working group The technical working group will identify the appropriate specifications for the portal including user testing;
- DELC will subsequently develop the user interface for the portal;

- Following initial results gained from the proof of concept project, DELC in collaboration with the Steering Committee will draft a long-term KM MEA strategy based on lessons learned, including the articulation of a vision and integration of all components discussed.

Annex II

Recommendations by the participants at the DELC Meeting on KM and MEAs on the steering process for KM initiatives amongst and across MEAs

The recommendations below are based on those flowing from the break out working group that met on 23 September on the Steering process for the MEA KM initiative, and which considered the following question:

Which process will be most suitable to follow through and carry forward the projects and concepts flowing out of the KM meeting?

After discussion the team agreed that in addition to the support from the DELC KM team in Geneva, a steering process driven by the MEAs will be needed to ensure MEA ownership and effective implementation of project.

Further to follow up discussion it was considered that the MEA KM Steering Committee will consist of one designated representative of each participating MEA as well as representatives from other bodies that will participate as observers. The steering committee can discuss any topics of relevance to MEA KM process. The steering committee will provide recommendations in the context of KM to the respective MEA secretariats.

A technical working group on MEA KM will be designated by this body that will guide the implementation of these recommendations as well as the initiatives flowing from them.

TORs:

The MEA KM technical working group will

- Formulate and further refine the strategic goals as well as short and medium term projects and initiatives flowing from this MEA KM meeting
- provide guidance to the implementation of these goals, projects and initiatives
- Steer in the mapping of existing business processes and existing and needed resources to implement initiatives
- Monitor the progress of project implementation and review this regularly
- Consult with, be informed about and feed appropriate information and needs into processes and initiatives that have relevance and are of interest to this process, such as the UNEP KM ²project

The steering process facilitated through the technical working group will be assisted by the DELC MEA KM team

² UNEP POW 2010-11, Stand alone project on KM in UNEP

Composition:

The group considered size, expertise, level as well as origin of the KM MEA technical working group.

The meeting recommends for the technical working group:

- That the membership not exceeds more than 8-10 representatives
- That these are in charge of implementing KM and KS processes within their respective conventions/ well connected to their counterparts within the clusters
- That the participation will be designated per and by cluster in the following manner:
 - POPs/PIC/Basel Cluster - 1
 - Montreal Protocol ?
 - UNFCCC 1 (to be invited)
 - UNCCD ? (to be invited)
 - Biodiversity Cluster (Liaison group): 2
 - 1 UNEP (CBD, CMS and its Agreements, CITES)
 - 1 Others (Ramsar, ITPGRFA WHC)
 - UNEP (DELIC, representative of the UNEP KM project) 2

Modus Operandi:

The technical working group will meet inter-sessionally between the annual KM MEA meetings on a regular basis and in-between communicate through dynamic communication (group).

Wherever considered necessary in the context of a given project the technical working group may decide to establish respective project sub-groups with the appropriate expertise.

The technical working group will review draft documents, will ensure effective communication between and within MEA and MEA clusters and provide recommendations to the MEA KM steering committee.

Annex III
Agenda and Participant List

UNEP Workshop on Knowledge Management and MEAs
22-24 September

AGENDA

DAY 1: Stocktaking of Interoperability needs

Morning session: Opening and presentations by Conventions

Co-Chairs: Bradnee Chambers, Marcos Silva

- 09.00 Introductory remarks, presentation of meeting purpose and agenda
- 09.30 Brief presentations of max 10 minutes by participating conventions
Presentations' content: overview of responses to questionnaire (standards, resources, harmonization efforts, reporting issues, KM initiatives, recent and new developments, challenges, plans/next steps)

Stockholm, Rotterdam, Ramsar,

- 10.30 - *Coffee Break* -

AEWA/CMS, CITES, CBD, ITPGR, WHC

- 12.00 Synthesis and open discussion

- 13.00 - *Lunch Break* -

- 14.15 Presentation of tools processing MEA derived data

Presentations (of max 10 minutes by participants with 15 minutes for Q and A to each presenter) of the below projects/initiatives in the context of potential harmonization efforts made by the secretariats. How can the respective project profit and contribute to greater data harmonization among conventions, how do recent developments within UN, Conventions, and UNEP impact on it, future plans, etc

ECOLEX (including cooperation with CIESIN).

UNEP-WCMC- INFORMEA

TEMATEA

Analytical Index

- 15.40 - *Coffee Break* -

16.00 Discussion and Brainstorming

Analytical summary of the discussions, and identifications of problems, brainstorming on potential solutions and the future evolution of tools

17.30 Wrap up and introduction of next day

19.00 Welcome Cocktail

Day 2: Discussion in breakout groups and small project identification

09.00 Relevant KM Perspectives: - UNON ICT Strategy (UNON)
- UNEP KM project (DCPI)

- Experiences from Chemicals/Waste synergies process on KM
- CBD – Potential way forward on interoperability

10.20 - *Coffee Break* -

10.45 Break out sessions into groups

What are the impediments and possible solutions to achieve data harmonization/interoperability, shared data standards among conventions and the tools that process related data with the new mandates given by Headquarters, UNEP, ICT Task force report, etc

- Interoperability standards and guidelines (Marco, Olivier, Osmany, Alonzo, Gerardo, Gowri, Mohammed, Kelly)
- Steering committee and structure for follow on process (Nick, Mamadou, Eva, Federico, Florian, Selim,)
- Tools Group (Bradnee, Francoise, Barbara, Eva, Peter, Ines, Tabitha)

12.45 - *Lunch Break* -

14.00 Presentations of existing MEA interoperability and data harmonization projects to inform the further group discussions

CBD: Olivier de Munck on Web 2.0 services and how they may be useful for exchange of MEA information
Chemicals Clearing House
CITES e-permit project

15.00 Break out sessions into groups

15.35 - *Coffee Break* -

16.00 Presentation of group findings

17.00 Day's summary and wrap up

Day 3: Concrete Way Ahead

09.30 Plenary discussions of group findings and meeting recommendations based on the outcomes of working groups I and II

- Interoperability standards, projects and guidelines
- Steering structure and follow-up process

12.00 Wrap und and Closing

13.00 Lunch and departure

PARTICIPANTS LIST
UNEP Workshop on Knowledge Management and MEAs
22-24 September, Chexbres, Switzerland

MEA SECRETARIATS			
1	<p><u>AEWA</u> Mr Florian Kiel Information Officer UNEP/AEWA Secretariat Bonn, Germany Email: fkeil@unep.de</p>	2	<p><u>RAMSAR</u> Mr. Nicholas Davidson Deputy Secretary General Ramsar (Convention on Wetlands) davidson@ramsar.org</p>
3	<p><u>CBD</u> Mr. Olivier de Munck Programme Officer Clearing-House Mechanism Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD) E-mail: olivier.demunck@cbd.int</p>	4	<p><u>ROTTERDAM</u> Mr. Federico Izzo Head of Common IT Services Secretariat of the Rotterdam Convention fizzo@pic.int</p>
5	<p><u>CITES</u> Mr. Marcos Silva Senior Capacity Building Officer Secretariat to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) E-mail: marcos.silva@cites.org</p>	6	<p><u>STOCKOLM</u> Mr. Osmany Pereira Chief, Joint Services Section Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants Email: opereira@pops.int</p>
7	<p><u>ITPGRFA (FAO)</u> Mr. Selim Louafi Senior Treaty Officer International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGR), FAO E-mail: Selim.Louafi@fao.org</p>	8	<p><u>STOCKOLM</u> Mr. Richard Wood Programme Officer Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants Email: rwood@pops.int</p>
BODIES AND INITIATIVES			
9	<p><u>ECOLEX</u> Ms. Francoise Burhenne Senior Counsel IUCN- Environmental Law Centre E-mail: Francoise.Burhenne@iucn.org</p>	10	<p><u>TEMATEA</u> Ms. Ines Verleye TEMATEA Secretariat email: inesverleye@gmail.com</p>
11	<p><u>UNEP-WCMC</u> Mr. Peter Herkenrath Senior Programme Officer UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre Email: Peter.Herkenrath@unep-wcmc.org</p>	12	<p><u>UNEP-WCMC</u> Mr. Gerardo Fragoso Head of Species Programme UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre Email: Gerardo.Fragoso@unep-wcmc.org</p>
AGENCIES			
13	<p><u>FAO</u> Ms. Barbara Moauro FAOLEX Database Manager Food and Agricultural Organization E-mail: barbara.moauro@fao.org</p>	14	<p><u>UNESCO (WHC)</u> Mr. Alonzo Addison Special Advisor to the Director UNESCO World Heritage Centre (CLT/WHC)</p>

			Email: a.addison@unesco.org / Addison@cal.berkeley.edu
UNEP-DELC			
15	Mr. Bradnee Chambers Senior Legal Officer & Chief Policy & Interlinkages Unit UNEP Division of Environmental Law and Conventions Email: Bradnee.Chambers@unep.org	16	Ms. Eva Durchschlag-Duer Programme Officer Knowledge Management Unit UNEP Division of Environmental Law and Conventions Email: Eva.Durchschlag-Duer@unep.org
17	Mr. Mamadou Kane Programme Officer Policy & Interlinkages Unit UNEP Division of Environmental Law and Conventions Mamadou.Kane@unep.org	18	Mr. Kelly Kabiru Associate Programme Officer Knowledge Management Unit UNEP Division of Environmental Law and Conventions Kelly.Kabiru@unep.org
19	Ms. Tabitha Ndegwa Associate Programme Officer Knowledge Management Unit UNEP Division of Environmental Law and Conventions Tabitha.Ndegwa@unep.org		
OTHER UNEP DIVISIONS			
20	Mr. Mohamed Atani Technical Officer UNEP-Division of Communications and Public Information (DCPI) Mohamed.Atani@unep.org	21	Mr. Gowri Shankar Chief, Knowledge Management and Application Development Section, UNON Email: gowri.shankar@unon.org