



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL  
ENVIRONMENT  
Directorate D - Natural Capital  
**ENV.D.1 – Land use and management**  
**ENV.D.2 – Biodiversity**  
**ENV.D.3 – Nature protection**

## **MINUTES**

### **30<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Coordination Group for Biodiversity and Nature (CGBN)**

**8 and 9 June 2021**

Virtual Webex meeting

Documents: See [CIRCABC internet site](#) (*click on Library*)  
Nature of the meeting: Open for CGBN stakeholder members, no web streaming  
Co-chaired by: Heads of Unit ENV.D.2 and ENV.D.3

#### **1. Welcome, agenda**

The chair opened the meeting.

The [agenda](#) was adopted and approved with minor modifications explained by the Chair.

The [summary record of the 29<sup>th</sup> CGBN meeting](#) was approved without changes.

The chair invited the Portuguese Presidency to report from the last Nature Directors' Meetings (NDM), and invited the incoming Slovenian Presidency to inform about plans for the second half of 2021.

#### **Update on the works of the Portuguese Presidency and the NDM**

The last NDM under the PT Presidency took place on 25 March and focused on key topics related to the EU Biodiversity Strategy such as the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and nature conservation (need to reinforce eco-schemes to support biodiversity, reinforce organic farming to achieve the 25% organic farming target by 2030, reduce pesticide use taking into account the precautionary principle), discussion of possible EU restoration targets and the need to reinforce the synergies with other policies (e.g. soil). The next NDM is planned for 29 June (focus on best practices and lessons learnt one year after the adoption of the EU Biodiversity Strategy and the national implementation, possibly governance).

#### **Planning for the upcoming Slovenian Presidency**

The NDM under the Slovenian Presidency is planned for 18-19 November 2021 (in person meeting). The agenda was still flexible at the time of the CGBN, with the intention to discuss topics that will be important in the coming months. Given that things are changing rapidly due to the pandemic, flexibility is the best approach, but the plan is to have an excursion to a cave, include (wild) pollinators on the agenda (SI priority) and invite stakeholders.

One stakeholder raised concerns about the CBD COP15 process in which NGOs and African countries, for example, are lacking sufficient resources to continue lengthy discussion in a virtual setting. There were voices favouring the postponement of the COP again to enable ownership and effective participation. The representative of the Slovenian Presidency agreed there was some shared frustration and that he was aware of limitations of virtual meetings. The EU+MS will work to make the COP a fully inclusive process. It would be good to have at least 1-2 physical meetings of the OEWS. It is important to keep the momentum, start negotiating targets, so that later this year, when we can have a physical meeting, to start actual discussions and negotiations. The Chair agreed that resources were not a minor problem, but in light of the scale of the biodiversity problem they need to be found.

## **2. EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030, update on implementation progress**

The Commission explained that a detailed information note was presented to the CGBN on 25-26 November 2020, followed by an update on progress on the main implementation topics (non-exhaustive) uploaded to Circa on 7 June 2021 (see [presentation](#)). From the next CGBN on, we hope to be able to use a new online implementation tracking tool. The final content of the tool will be agreed in the coming months, most likely including: Action number + title, Commission service responsible (no name), Deadline for implementation, Short description of the action (i.e. what does its implementation involve in practice), simple “traffic light” information on the status of implementation (Planned / Ongoing / Completed). The tool will be updated regularly. It will serve as a basis to prepare the annual Commission progress report to EP and Council.

The Commission provided an update on the EU Biodiversity Strategy (BDS): from over 100 actions to be delivered by 2030, 11 are completed, important progress made on several more, 42 scheduled for delivery in 2021.

The Commission recalled that the reactions of other EU institutions to the BDS were presented in November, except for that of the European Parliament (EP) which was having a debate on the Strategy at the same time as the CGBN meeting. A short summary of the draft EP resolution was presented by the Commission. It was recalled that the Commission announced the launch of the biodiversity monitoring Dashboard and the Actions Tracker and his readiness to the report on implementation progress to EP and Council as a standing agenda point.

## **3. Evaluation of the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020**

The Commission informed the CGBN that, following the Open Public Consultation, the support study report and the Commission’s own report on the evaluation of the 2020 Biodiversity Strategy are being finalised. The intention is to have them published together in the autumn. The Commission further explained that it received over 111,000 responses to the consultation, the majority from a campaign organised by a coalition of NGOs. Out of the remaining responses, 90% came from Poland, 55% from the forestry sector – which creates a certain bias in the respondents group. The draft Commission evaluation report, based on a support study for the evaluation prepared by a Trinomics-led consortium, was submitted to the Regulatory Scrutiny Board in May and scheduled for the Board’s discussion on 16 June 2021. Next steps after the Board’s opinion include the revision of the text (including the Board’s comments), launch of an Interservice consultation, and publication in autumn 2021. See [presentation of the main findings](#).

*The following points were made in the discussion:*

- One stakeholder recalled that they were deeply involved in the evaluation of implementation, and glad to see that the Commission’s work on restoration is taking into account the conclusions from the evaluation. They listed the remaining main challenges and expressed strong support for learning lessons from the evaluation and applying them in practice.
- Another stakeholder liked the process to revitalise the policy cycle around the BDS – it was good to evaluate the major drawbacks that prevent us from achieving the 2020 BDS (need for a broader funding perspective, better integration of other policy sectors, more restoration). Broader policy cycle could be interesting for other policy sectors.

## **4. New governance and monitoring framework for biodiversity**

A [draft note](#) on the new governance framework and monitoring mechanism was made available to the CGBN members via Circabc on 27/05/2021. The Commission presented the main elements of the proposed new governance framework (see [presentation](#)), and invited comments and written feedback until 18 June COB. Afterwards, the note will be finalised and presented to the next CGBN and NDM for endorsement. As part of the new governance framework, the Commission is planning to launch an online tracking tool (Actions Tracker) for monitoring progress in implementation of the over 100 actions under the Biodiversity

Strategy, and a Dashboard illustrating progress towards quantified targets at EU and MS level. It presented a short mock-up of these two tools (see [presentation](#)).

*The following points were made in the discussion:*

- One stakeholder asked whether the Commission considered to postpone the launch of the new governance framework in light of a possible delay of the CBD COP 15 to next year. The Commission explained that whereas there was a link between the EU and Global Biodiversity Framework, there is no intention to wait for the adoption of the latter to start the implementation progress tracking of the former. Once the GBF is adopted, the Commission will seek ways to adapt its governance framework. The teams working on both EU and Global monitoring tools will ensure compatibility and support tracking on the global scale.
- A CGBN member asked about plans to integrate the results from past, current and future EU and nationally funded research projects into the dashboard. The Commission explained that this will depend on what the projects delivered. It will be important to match project results with the actual action in the BDS – if they deliver concrete results in this respect, the deliverables should be reported via implementation monitoring tools. The Commission further clarified that the Dashboard is about the main existing indicators used for monitoring progress. The Knowledge Centre for Biodiversity will host a specific section for RTD. Should the project deliver better indicators or information, they will be matched with the Dashboard.
- A Member State commented it was good to see the practical example of the monitoring tools and asked which indicators will be kept, and which actors will be involved in providing information. For Member States, it would be important to stick to what they already have to report rather than create new reporting obligations. It was also suggested to have a discussion with Directors about it. Finally, the Member State asked to clarify the role of the Working Groups and the mandates for them – how long the groups will be working, for which deliverable, roles and responsibilities of CGBN and NDM should be made more concrete, and the process for preparing decisions should be well clarified.
- Another member of the CGBN was positive about the governance document and suggested to add regular monitoring, reporting and review of progress, clarification of the responsibility for actions, concrete information on involvement of other actors (citizens, NGOs, etc.). The importance of a continued involvement of stakeholders was underlined, and new expert groups on pollinators and soil welcomed. The stakeholder also stressed the importance of the setting clear mandates and deliverables for all expert groups that should report back to the Framework. All expert groups will need to be organised in line with COM rules, in full transparency and clarity on who can participate.
- One Member States noted that they could not see a major difference between the new governance system and the existing one. They asked about the relationship between the different expert groups.
- One stakeholder expressed concerns that the monitoring framework will be too much of an “action tracker” rather than a “biodiversity tracker” and that more emphasis should be put on measuring the actual state of biodiversity, and called for a need to ensure balance between completing actions and achieving the biodiversity targets at MS level.
- The Commission took note of all comments and clarified:
  - Old vs new governance – main differences. It stressed that indeed we were not reinventing the wheel but building on the existing experience and recent developments (e.g. on forests). We have looked into the structure of the CIF and kept all that worked well, including input from CGBN. There was much work on trying to match the long list of actions we have to implement with the right expert groups / bodies responsible for the implementation monitoring. As regards the integration of biodiversity into other policy areas, or mainstreaming – we tried many things to strengthen interaction (joint meetings, information points etc.), and results varied. We can have better online tools, shared spaces etc., but welcome CGBN’s suggestions

for working methods, tools to improve this aspect. In this vein, it is important to stress the importance of the new political context for biodiversity governance – governance is not only about the structure, names of Expert Groups etc., but also the political will. There has been a big change in the priority given to biodiversity, biodiversity is no longer a marginal topic – this political shift will also ensure stronger ownership by other COM services.

- Expert Groups. As for the mandates of the expert groups, it will look into the existing ones and see if / where they need to be adapted. If new expert groups are to be created, new mandates will have to be developed for them. All these groups will become sub-groups of the new biodiversity governance platform. The expert group on agriculture will discontinue while the MAES Working Group will be upscaled to become an expert group on knowledge. There will also certainly be a need for an expert group on ecosystem restoration, following the development of the Nature Restoration Law. It is important to avoid duplication of works of any other expert groups, including those involved in Horizon.
  - Indicators and Dashboard. On indicators – for now, the Dashboard will include only the existing ones, the development of new ones is not foreseen at this time but we cannot exclude that, in the future, we might need some additional information to track progress towards the targets. The Action Tracker will focus on delivering actions. The Dashboard, on the other hand, should tell us how much species / habitats have recovered, what is happening with pollinator populations, birds, link to Art 17 FCS provisions. The Pollinator monitoring scheme will also contribute to that. All this will tell us how much we are making progress in the actual improvement of the condition of ecosystems. Biodiversity partnership under Horizon will help reinforce biodiversity monitoring (using new techniques like AI, space monitoring). We still need to build a mechanism for ratcheting up. It is important to stress that the biodiversity monitoring framework is not isolated from other environmental monitoring frameworks – they should all work together, and we will ensure that they are streamlined, consistent and better integrate all the knowledge we have, while avoiding unnecessary reporting burden. In any case, there will be a discussion with MS on the selection of indicators.
  - Accessibility. The Action Tracker and Dashboard will be publically available online. A more detailed internal version will be used internally by Com services.
  - Updates. The Actions Tracker will need to be regularly updated by relevant COM services. The Dashboard will be updated automatically once new information / data become available to allow for a dynamic, constant track of progress. The COM will also rely on public contributions to provide additional info, correct etc.; this will help the overall quality of reporting on the BDS.
- A stakeholder asked for more clarification on the links between the Actions Tracker and the Dashboard, namely how will they relate to each other. If the state of nature is demonstrated by the Dashboard, the latter should also be able to demonstrate a need for corrective action, to ratchet up. How do we get from the analysis of the Dashboard to adjusting actions to be taken? Will the Dashboard report on EU level progress, or will it look at MS to understand where action is needed? And on indicators – how would GBF work on indicators be related to this? How will the two fit together?
  - The Commission replied that some indicators may be relevant for the global level, others for MS – once the GBF is adopted, we will need to assess whether to revise our system to make it fully compatible. The analysis of a link between action and result would be a task for any implementation reports that go along with the Dashboard, not the Dashboard itself. These aspects will be looked at more closely in the 2024 mid-term evaluation of the BDS, but CGBN meetings twice a year will also monitor the situation and decide on possible corrective action. The targets depicted in the Dashboard are set at EU level. The Dashboard shows the situation in each MS, but the target is common. The Commission asked CGBN members to send any feedback by Tue 22 June (2 weeks), in order to be able to feed it to the NDM discussions.

## **5. Update on the EU Pollinators Initiative**

The Commission gave an update on update on the progress report on the implementation of the EU Pollinators Initiative adopted on 27 May (see [presentation](#)).

## **6. Financing for biodiversity**

The Commission gave an update on the state of play on biodiversity funding under the RRF and the MFF (see [presentation](#)), focusing on the biodiversity target in the MFF and the ongoing work on developing a revised biodiversity tracking methodology. The Commission shortly presented the policy context and followed with more details on the expected biodiversity funding opportunities under the CAP, the state of play on expected cohesion funding for biodiversity (state of play on programming, highlight funding opportunities Member States should be aware of etc.)

## **7. Binding EU restoration targets**

The Commission presented state of play and next steps of work on the binding EU nature restoration targets (see [presentation](#)). It explained the rationale behind a two-stage approach, starting with setting targets where baselines are available, and a process to enable setting further targets, in a second step, where more data is needed (e.g. on forests not covered by Annex I, free flowing rivers, specific marine habitats, further targets on soil etc.). The MAES process will lay foundations for developing a methodology for assessing ecosystem condition. The proposal will also set out enabling measures covering a range of aspects needed in legislation as well as the content of national restoration plans. The Impact Assessment accompanying the proposal will consider four policy options.

*The following points were made in the discussion:*

- One stakeholder asked whether the Commission could be more specific on the types of nature (not being Annex I habitats) that will be covered by step 1. The Commission clarified that, for stage 1, restoration will efforts will focus on Annex I habitats, and could – depending on the impact assessment also cover other marine habitats, pollinators, soil and urban areas.
- Another stakeholder welcomed progress on this initiative and its focus on restoration to high quality nature, but expressed concerns as regards the level of ambition (still not commensurable to what science is telling us, restoring only 4% is not sufficient – need to look at where and how much we can restore and recreate), lack of clarity on how some of these requirements will be additional to those under the Habitats Directive (especially for degraded forests), whether the two-step approach would not delay the targets that could be adopted already now in step 1 (e.g. on river continuity – we should propose in step 1 whatever we can), and the exact form of a target linked to the farmland bird index. The Commission explained that views tend to vary when it comes to the level of ambition, with some saying it's too low and others it's too high. It agreed on the need for additionality, i.e. that there is already a legal obligation to restore but it has not been specified how much by when. Adding this clarification will be an important added value compared to the existing legislation, as will be the new provisions on what needs to be done outside the existing legislation. On free flowing rivers, the Commission is carefully checking how much could be legislated in step 1, but available evidence makes it hard to present a legally binding target already in phase 1. On farmland birds, the idea is to restore farmland area to enhance the status of farmland birds so as to restore the index to x% by 2030.
- Another stakeholder regretted there was no stakeholder consultation on specific ecosystem targets (except one workshop) and stressed the importance of involvement of land owners. The stakeholder asked how the Commission plans to reflect climate change and shifts it implies to ecosystems, hydrology etc. The Commission agreed that the perspective of land owners is important and will ensure that it is properly reflected in the Impact Assessment. As regards climate change, in some ecosystems degradation will be inevitable, whilst in others restoration will be possible taking climate change into account.

- Another stakeholder welcomed the pollinator target and discussions on non-deterioration. The stakeholder stressed that non-deterioration used to be a soft policy target in previous strategies, and has never been met. Art 17 of the Habitats Directive is clear in this respect. The “do-no-significant-harm” principle is a voluntary approach that has not delivered on the aspiration of non-deterioration. Time has come to add a legally binding non-deterioration target. This will ensure actions in e.g. the agricultural field. If we just restore and don’t address non-deterioration, we will not achieve the outcome we need to reach.
- One Member State remarked that it will be important to acknowledge work already done in MS. MS have different baselines and conditions and need flexibility to define national objectives and goals that correspond to those conditions. MS efforts to reach the targets in the BDS can go hand in hand with restoration efforts. This is equally important as setting specific targets on restoration. The Commission acknowledged this position and clarified that the idea was not to set everything in stone from the outset but to account for MS specificity through national restoration plans.
- Another Member State asked to clarify what is the reference for the surface we are considering. The Commission explained that the considered area = total area of ecosystems in a MS. The target for restoration of degraded area = total area of a degraded ecosystem in that MS. Recreation = area that MS assess as needed to be restored. It would be for MS to assess a total degraded area in their territory + needs for recreation. This is based on information submitted by MS concerning reaching of FCS under Art 17 BHD, knowing that MS reported a lot of area in unknown condition (area is likely to be underestimated). MS would need to estimate the real needs.
- The Commission explained that next steps will depend on the opinion of the Regulatory Scrutiny Board in July and involve preparing the legal act, and possibly further workshops to discuss further details and issues. The aim is to adopt the Commission proposal by end of the year.

## **8. Biodiversity and agriculture**

A representative from IEEP presented the results of evaluation support study they carried out for the Commission (DG AGRI) in 2019 (results published in March 2020) aiming to assess the impacts of the 2014-2020 CAP on habitats, landscapes and biodiversity (in particular to determine the extent to which the CAP contributed to Target of the 2020 Biodiversity Strategy – see [presentation](#)). The Commission encouraged MS to look at the study, available on-line, to maximise co-benefits of CAP measures with the biodiversity agenda. This policy analysis is important to consider for CAP Strategic Plans. To make these plans deliver for biodiversity, we need a permanent dialogue between agricultural and environmental ministries. DG AGRI is presently finalising a short analysis to allow MS to compare to the current situation and define their needs according to the intervention logic in both pillars of the CAP which now in the new CAP will both have to be strategically and comprehensively considered to ensure a more holistic, strategic approach.

*The following points were made in the discussion:*

- One stakeholder reported that, in January 2021, they were asked by DG AGRI to comment on a factsheet listing potential agriculture practices that eco-schemes could support in the framework of the post 2020 CAP. The stakeholder asked about further developments on that factsheet. The Commission replied that in January 2021, a non-exhaustive list of eco-schemes was published, showing what type of eco-scheme intervention could be used in future CAP (e.g. eco-schemes related to protection of grassland, extensive grazing, protection of peatland). The aim of this exercise is to help MS to give concrete ideas, hope this will contribute to more relevant MS proposals on eco-schemes.
- Two other stakeholders commented on the need to see Commission recommendations properly reflected in each CAP Strategic Plan, the need to increase awareness of farmers on how to change the existing practices (importance of farm advisory services and knowledge sharing), a possibility of stakeholder involvement in commenting on CAP Strategic Plans and of sufficiently influencing the CAP to deliver on biodiversity by 2030.



## 9. Biodiversity and Forests

The Commission gave an update on the state of progress in the preparation of the future EU Forest Strategy and an update on progress on deliverables at the sub-working group Forest and Nature.

The Forest Strategy was announced both in the European Green Deal and in the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030. The expected adoption date is 20 July. The Strategy will build on the Biodiversity Strategy and cover the multifunctional role of forests. The Commission also presented the state of play on a number of guidance documents under preparation, including guidelines on the definition, mapping, monitoring and strict protection of primary and old-growth forests (recent feedback from forest expert group), guidelines on closer-to-nature forest management (next Working Group meetings will discuss the results of the analysis launched on 20 April), and guidelines on tree planting (they will follow the adoption of the Forest Strategy). It invited CGBN members to read the recently published study by JRC.

*The following points were made in the discussion:*

- One stakeholder regretted that the Forest Strategy was coming up so late, as the old strategy run out in 2020 and stakeholders have been calling for a new one for several years. They hoped the 20 July would be kept and the calls from the Council and the EP concerning the content of the new strategy will be properly reflected in the text.
- The Commission remarked that the biodiversity governance framework may need to reflect links to the upcoming Forest Strategy. It recalled that, according to the BDS, all old-growth forests should be strictly protected. The definition of strict protection will be discussed and defined in the NADEG. There is also homework for MS to do in terms of coordination – sometimes, there is lack of communication; MS need to ensure good sharing of documents between representatives in different working groups.

## 10. EU ecosystem assessment – summary for policy makers

A representative of the Commission's project on the Monitoring and Assessment of Ecosystems and their Services (MAES) presented the recently adopted Summary for Policy-Makers of the first EU-wide ecosystem assessment released on 20 May 2021 and invited CGBN to join the EuropaBON network and contribute to its work (see [presentation](#)). The ecosystem assessment was carried out by the Joint Research Centre, the European Environment Agency, DG Environment, and the European Topic Centres on Biological Diversity and on Urban, Land and Soil Systems. The report will be translated into all EU languages and published, as needed, to allow for a wide dissemination. Link to the summary: <https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC123783>.

*The following points were made in the discussion:*

- One Member State remarked that it was a landmark result from a long process. Methods for ecosystem monitoring and assessment are the most important result from this process. Those indicators that tell the condition should be more widely promoted in other sectors. They show that some ecosystems need more work and data.
- Another stakeholder referred to the need to present the recent developments on natural capital accounting at NDM, including the KIP INCA contribution. A report from that work will be released in a few weeks. This is also relevant to wider policy areas, including Taxonomy and LULUCF, so it would be good to better understand the connections. This is important also in the context of the upcoming proposal from ESTAT to amend the Regulation on environmental accounts. China is considering their ways of mapping ecosystem condition – a similar system as the one we tried before, based on indicators of pressure and state.

## 11. Ongoing relevant policy developments.

The Commission made a presentation (see [presentation](#)) on the 1st Delegated Act published under the **Taxonomy Regulation** and on the work continuing with the Taxonomy Platform to prepare the 2nd

Delegated Act. The 1<sup>st</sup> Delegated Act on climate change mitigation and adaptation was adopted in April. Work is ongoing on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Delegated Act to cover the remaining 4 environmental objectives. The public feedback period will run from end July – mid-Sept. Oct/Nov.

Work is also ongoing on Ecolabel criteria for financial products and green bonds (coming up later this year). A proposal to revise the non-financial reporting directive will set up requirements on big companies, including good language on natural capital accounting. The Commission is also working on the new sustainable finance strategy, to come out before the summer.

*The following points were made in the discussion:*

- One stakeholder commented on a decision of NGOs to postpone their input to the Taxonomy Platform, as they believed the Delegated Act was not based on scientific evidence. This concerned in particular some issues about forestry and bioenergy criteria that have been agreed disregarding the BDS goal to minimise the use of whole trees for energy production.
- The COM welcomed the decision of NGOs to return to the platform in time to provide feedback during the 4 months scrutiny period that has just started running. The Commission is always striving to share documents ahead of time, but there was a lot of pressure to deliver the 1st Delegated Act on time which sometimes made consultation difficult. The Commission took it as a lesson learnt for the preparation of the second one.

The Commission presented recent development on **Research and Innovation** for biodiversity (see [presentation](#)). The Biodiversity Partnership SRIA is ready, so the Partnership itself will start this summer. The Partnership is preparing their first call on Biodiversity Conservation to be launched in October. Also, in light of Horizon Europe going to be adopted very soon, the Commission presented some figures on Biodiversity research investments and briefly mentioned the long-term biodiversity research agenda.

## **12. AOB. Conclusions and next steps.**

No requests for points to be treated under any other business had been received ahead of the meeting.

The Commission referred to the European Parliament's vote on a resolution on the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030, adopted yesterday, providing a strong message on the level of ambition and support from the Parliament.

The Commission recalled that it has shared on Circabc the [resolution](#) on soil protection adopted by the European Parliament on 28 April by large majority. Soil health and soil biodiversity are crucial to halt and reverse biodiversity loss in the EU and this is why a number of commitments have been made in the EU Biodiversity Strategy on soil. In particular, the Commission will present, after the summer break, a new overarching Soil Strategy that will address the major challenges and contribute to the achievement of SDG 15.3 on land degradation neutrality by 2030. The Parliament's resolution strongly supports EU action on soil, recognizing the importance of protecting soil and promoting healthy soils in the Union for the objectives of the European Green Deal: climate neutrality, biodiversity restoration, the zero-pollution ambition for a toxic-free environment, healthy and sustainable food systems and a resilient environment. The EP resolution calls on the Commission to take a series of actions, both legally-binding and not, to address soil pollution and other types of soil degradation, covering several related aspects, such as research, knowledge and innovation, monitoring and digital aspects, financing, governance, policy coherence, communication, international aspects, and links to the other environmental policies (water and air pollution, waste and circularity, health, biodiversity, climate, agriculture).

Referring to **upcoming events**, the Commission recalled the [calendar](#) posted on Circabc that is regularly updated. Some additional points were made on:

- CBD COP15 state of play and next steps:



- Discussions are on-going on the timing and process for the forthcoming Conference of the Parties to the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD COP15) to take place in Kunming, China. Travel to China will not be possible in October and, in view of a decision at its meeting of 16 June, the CBD COP-Bureau is consulted on two options: 1) postponement or 2) a COP in two phases; first to formally open the CoP in Kunming in October 2021 – attended only by representatives of the Parties based in China (most likely Ambassadors to China), followed by a second part of the COP in 2022 to finalise the negotiations. A further discussion with EU MS is scheduled for 10 June.
- The virtual meetings of the CBD Subsidiary Body for Scientific, Technological and Technical Advice (SBSTTA24) and the CBD Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI3) will end 13 June. Outcomes include many brackets and a significant part of the draft COP-Decisions remain to be negotiated. The outcomes do, however, allow for the next step, which is the preparation of Draft One of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, announced for 5 July. The virtual start of the third meeting of the Open Ended Working Group (OEWG3) will be from 23 August to 3 September.
- The next NDM is planned for 29 June morning (under PT Presidency).
- The next CGBN meeting – date to be confirmed, most likely in October / November 2021.

## Attendance List – CGBN

<b>MEMBER STATE EXPERTS</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Austria	Federal Ministry for Sustainability and Tourism
Belgium	Research Institute for Nature and Forest Public Service of Wallonia, Department of Natural and Agricultural Research
Bulgaria	Ministry of Environment and Water
Croatia	Ministry for Environment and Energy
Cyprus	Ministry of Environment
Czech Republic	Agency for Nature Conservation Ministry of the Environment of the Czech Republic
Denmark	Ministry of the Environment
Estonia	Ministry of the Environment
Finland	Ministry of the Environment
France	National Museum of Natural History Ministère de la transition écologique et solidaire
Germany	Ministry of the Environment
Hungary	Ministry of Agriculture
Ireland	Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht
Italy	Ministry for ecological transition
Latvia	Ministry of the Environment Nature Conservation Agency
Lithuania	Ministry of the Environment
Luxembourg	Ministry of the Environment
Malta	Ministry of the Environment, Sustainable Development and Climate Change
Netherlands	Ministry of the Environment
Poland	General Directorate for Environmental Protection
Portugal	Institute for Nature Conservation and Forests
Romania	Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests
Slovakia	Ministry of the Environment
Slovenia	Ministry for the Environment and Spatial Planning
Spain	Ministry for Ecological Transition and demographic challenge
Sweden	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
<b>Not presented:</b>	
Greece	Ministry of the Environment
<b>STAKEHOLDERS</b>	
BirdLife	BirdLife Europe
CEPF	Confederation of European Forest Owners
ClientEarth	ClientEarth
COPA-COGECA	European farmers – European Agri-cooperative
EAA	European Anglers Alliance
EEB	European Environmental Bureau
EHF	European Habitats Forum
ELO	European Landowners Organization
EUSTAFOR	European State Forest Association
FACE	European Federation for Hunting and Conservation

FOE	Friends of the Earth
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
UEPG	Union Européenne des Producteurs de Granulats
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature
<b>Not presented</b>	
Business Europe; EBRD-European Bank for Reconstruction and Development; EPBRS – European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy	
<b>EU INSTITUTIONS &amp; Contractors</b>	
DG Environment	A.2, D.1, D.2, D.3, F.1
Contractor (D.3)	Wageningen University & Research· Department of Forest and Nature Conservation Policy
Other DGs	AGRI DDG2.D4, JRC D3, JRC D5, RTD B3, CLIMA A3
EEA	European Environment Agency
ETC/BD	European Topic Centre on Biological Diversity