



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
LIMITED

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/WG.2/L.1
3 May 2012

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC,
TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE
Sixteenth meeting
Montreal, 30 April - 5 May 2012
Agenda item 15*

DRAFT REPORT OF WORKING GROUP II

ITEM 5. ISLAND BIODIVERSITY: IN-DEPTH REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK

1. Working Group II took up agenda item 5 at its 1st meeting, on 30 April 2012, under the chairmanship of Ms. Larissa Maria Lima Costa (Brazil). In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the in-depth review of the implementation of the programme of work on island biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/4) and information documents on a compilation and synthesis of information submitted by Parties, other governments and organizations for the in-depth review on island biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/3) and on the integration of climate change impacts and response activities within the programme of work on island biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/4).

2. At the invitation of the Co-Chair, Mr. Ronny Jumeau, Ambassador to the United States of America and Permanent Representative of the Seychelles to the United Nations, as well as Seychelles Ambassador for Climate Change Issues and Small Island Developing States, made a statement. He said that precious and unique island biodiversity was disappearing at an alarming rate, with the extinction rates on islands being 187 times higher for birds, and 177 times higher for mammals, than on continents. That rate of loss was increasingly affecting options for sustainable development, including poverty eradication, and was whittling away at resilience to climate change. However, while island countries were asking for more and stronger cooperation and support, they were also, despite their limited resources, leading by example.

3. He informed the Working Group that Seychelles had deposited its ratification of the Nagoya Protocol at the United Nations Depository in New York, making Seychelles the first island state, and only the fourth country in the world, to do so. The Seychelles had also opted to borrow at international market rates to build several new islands for development rather than encroach on its national parks and nature reserves. Another example was Palau, a country of some 20,000 people, which had in 2011 allocated US\$ 1.4 million from the "Green Fee" (an added departure tax) to the Palau Protected Area Network as part of its commitment to the Micronesia Challenge.

• UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/1.

4. Island biodiversity was important to all countries with islands, irrespective of their level of development, and he welcomed the European Union's voluntary scheme for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services in the Territories of the European Union Outermost Regions and Overseas Countries and Territories (BEST) as a promising signal of both greater recognition of, and investment in, protecting the biodiversity of its island territories. He said that the forthcoming eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties was arguably the last opportunity to address the specific issue of island biodiversity and he urged the meeting to do justice to those far flung but unique champions of biodiversity and help them in the judicious use of their natural environments for the benefit of their populations and biodiversity, and as the common natural heritage of humanity.

5. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, France, India, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Madagascar, Mexico, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, South Africa, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Yemen.

6. A statement was also made by the representative of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats.

7. Statements were also made by representatives of Island Conservation and RARE Conservation.

8. On the proposal of the Co-Chair, the Working Group established a contact group, to be co-chaired by Ms. Nenenteiti Teariki-Ruatu (Kiribati) and Mr. Floyd Homer (Trinidad and Tobago) to suggest revisions to the draft recommendations.

9. The Working Group discussed the revised version of the draft recommendation contained in document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/4 at its 4th meeting, on 2 May 2012.

10. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, China, European Union, India, Philippines, and South Africa.

11. The representative of Argentina proposed the replacement of the term "Governments" with the term "States" in the chapeau of operative paragraphs 1, 4 and 6 of the draft recommendations. In view of the lack of consensus for that proposal, she requested that her proposal be reflected in the report of the meeting.

12. The Working Group agreed to forward the revised draft recommendation, as orally amended, to the plenary as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/L.2. The text is contained in annex ... to the present report.

ITEM 6. MARINE AND COASTAL BIODIVERSITY

Item 6.1 Ecologically or biologically significant marine areas

13. Working Group II took up agenda item 6.1 at its 1st meeting, on 30 April 2012, under the chairmanship of Ms. Gabriele Obermayr (Austria). In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note on marine and coastal biodiversity: ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (ESBAs) (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/5) and the draft summary report on ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/5/Add.1, and Cor.1). It also had before it the report of the joint OSPAR/NEAFC EBSA regional workshop (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/5), a review of the report of the joint OSPAR/NEAFC EBSA regional workshop in the Northeast Atlantic (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/5/Add.1), the report of the Western South Pacific EBSA regional workshop (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/6), the report of the Wider Caribbean and Western Mid-Atlantic EBSA regional workshop (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/7), the synthesis report on the work carried out regarding identification of ESBAs in the Mediterranean (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/8), the EBSA

Training manual and modules, including the user manual for the use of the EBSA repository and information-sharing mechanism (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/9) and a note identifying specific elements for integrating the traditional, scientific, technical and technological knowledge of Indigenous and local communities, and social and cultural criteria for identification of ecologically or biologically significant areas (EBSAs) as well as the establishment and management of marine protected areas (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/10).

14. At the invitation of the Co-Chair, Mr. Nic Bax of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO, Australia), Ms. Ana Paula Prates of the Brazilian Ministry of the Environment, Mr. David Johnson of the OSPAR Commission (Administrator of the Oslo and Paris Conventions for the protection of the marine environment of the North-East Atlantic) and Célia le Ravallec of the UNEP Mediterranean Action Plan, took the floor in turn to present the results of four regional ESBA workshops. The workshops covered the Western South Pacific, the Wider Caribbean and Western Mid-Atlantic, the North-East Atlantic and the Mediterranean regions, respectively. Mr. Nic Bax opened the presentation with an introduction to EBSAs and their importance and drew it to a close with a number of pertinent conclusions, more fully described in documents UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/5-8.

15. Statements were made by representatives of Denmark, Iceland, Japan, Mexico, and Republic of Korea.

16. Working Group II resumed its consideration of agenda item 6.1 at its 2nd session, on 1 May 2012.

17. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, France, Germany, Ghana, India, Liberia, Madagascar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Russian Federation, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Thailand, and Venezuela.

18. Statements were also made by representatives of the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea of the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs (UN/DOALOS) and the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

19. Further statements were made by the representatives of the International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF), the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB), the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the World Ocean Council, and WWF International.

20. The representative of Argentina, with respect to document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/5, requested that all parts of the document that mentioned the Falkland Islands, and in particular pages 108, 123 and 130, contain the following footnote: “*A dispute exists between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas), South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands (Islas Georgias del Sur e Islas Sandwich del Sur) and the surrounding maritime areas*”. She also requested that the text of the footnote in Spanish be: “*Existe una disputa entre el Gobierno de la República Argentina y el Gobierno del Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del Norte en relación a la soberanía de las Islas Malvinas (Falkland Islands), Islas Georgias del Sur (South Georgia) e Islas Sandwich del Sur (South Sandwich Islands) y áreas marítimas circundantes*”, and that the text of the footnote in French be: “*Il existe un différend entre les gouvernements de l'Argentine et du Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande du Nord concernant la souveraineté des “Îles Malouines (Falkland Islands/Islas Malvinas)”, de la “Géorgie du Sud (South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands/Islas Georgias del Sur e Islas Sandwich del Sur)” et des zones marines environnantes*”.

21. Following the statements the Co-Chair established an open-ended contact group to be co-chaired by Mr. Alexander Shestakov (Russian Federation) and Mr. Paulino Franco de Carvalho Neto (Brazil) to suggest revisions to the draft recommendations.

22. At its 6th meeting, on 4 May 2012, the Working Group considered a revised version of the draft recommendation contained in document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/5, prepared by the co-chairs of the open-ended contact group. The note by the Executive Secretary contained in documents UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/5/Add.1 and Corr.1 was annexed to the draft recommendation.

23. Statements were made by representatives of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, the European Union, France, Germany, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, South Africa and Spain.

24. [To be completed].

Item 6.2. Addressing adverse impacts of human activities on marine and coastal biodiversity;

Item 6.3. Marine spatial planning, marine protected areas and voluntary guidelines for the consideration of biodiversity in environmental assessments in marine and coastal areas

25. Agenda items 6.2 and 6.3 were taken up by the Working Group at its 2nd meeting, on 1 May 2012 under the chairmanship of Ms. Gabriele Obermayr (Austria). In considering item 6.2, the Subsidiary Body had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on addressing adverse impacts of human activities on marine and coastal biodiversity, (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/6). It also had before it the report on the progress made in the implementation of the specific work plan on coral bleaching (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/11), a scientific synthesis on the impacts of underwater noise on marine and coastal biodiversity and habitats (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/12), the report of the joint expert meeting on addressing biodiversity concerns in sustainable fisheries (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/13), the report of the expert meeting to develop a series of joint expert review processes to monitor and assess the impacts of ocean acidification on marine and coastal biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/14) and the synthesis document on the impacts of marine debris on marine and coastal biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/15). The Working Group also had before it, when considering item 6.3, a note by the Executive Secretary on marine spatial planning and voluntary guidelines for the consideration of biodiversity in environmental impact assessments and strategic environmental assessments in marine and coastal areas (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/7) and the draft voluntary guidelines for the consideration of biodiversity in environmental impact assessments and strategic environmental assessments in marine and coastal areas (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/7/Add.1) as well as information documents containing background on the development of voluntary guidelines for the consideration of biodiversity in environmental impact assessments (EIAs) and strategic environmental assessments (SEAs) in marine and coastal areas (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/16), proposals for the Sustainable Ocean Initiative (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/17) and a synthesis of the experience and use of marine spatial planning (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/18).

26. Statements were made by representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, France, India, Japan, Mexico, Norway, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Spain, Thailand and Timor-Leste.

27. Working Group II resumed its consideration of agenda items 6.2 and 6.3 at its 3rd meeting, on 1 May 2012.

28. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia, Jordan, Peru, and the United States of America.

29. Statements were also made by representatives of the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea of the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs (UN/DOALOS), the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the United Nations Environment Programme.

30. Further statements were made by representatives of the Federation of German Scientists, Greenpeace, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF), and the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB).

31. Following the discussion the Co-Chair said that she would prepare a revised version of the draft recommendations contained in documents UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/6 and UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/7 for the consideration by the Working Group at a subsequent meeting.

32. *[To be completed]*.

ITEM 8. GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR PLANT CONSERVATION: PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING DECISION X/17

33. Agenda item 8 was taken up by Working Group II at its 3rd meeting on 1 May 2012, under the chairmanship of Ms. Lima Costa. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation: Progress in implementing decision X/17 (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/11) and an information document on the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation: World Flora Online by 2020 (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/38).

34. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Denmark, France, Guatemala, India, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

35. A statement was also made by the representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

36. Further statements were made by representatives of Botanic Gardens Conservation International, the Global Partnership for Plant Conservation, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and TRAFFIC International, speaking also on behalf of WWF International.

37. Following the exchange of views, the Co-Chair said that she would prepare a revised version of the draft recommendation contained in document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/11, reflecting the views expressed by participants and written submissions to the Secretariat for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

38. The Working Group discussed the revised version of the draft recommendation at its 5th meeting, on 3 May 2012.

39. Statements were made by representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Mexico, Peru, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

40. The representative of the United States America asked the proponents of the phrase “and those countries that are centres of origin of biodiversity” to reconsider that wording as that phrase was vague. He said that all countries were centres of origin of biodiversity and he offered to work with the proponents of the text to refine that language before the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to ensure that it reflected the real intent of the proponents.

41. The Working Group agreed to forward the revised draft recommendation, as orally amended, to the plenary as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/L.[xxx]. The text is contained in annex ... to the present report.

**ITEM 9. GLOBAL TAXONOMY INITIATIVE: REVISED DRAFT
COMPREHENSIVE CAPACITY-BUILDING STRATEGY**

42. Agenda item 9 was taken up by the Subsidiary Body at its 3rd meeting, on 1 May 2012 under the chairmanship of Ms. Larissa Maria Lima Costa (Brazil). In considering the item, the Subsidiary Body had before it the revised draft capacity-building strategy for the Global Taxonomy Initiative (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/12) and, as information documents, a progress report on capacity-building activities for the Global Taxonomy Initiative and invasive alien species (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/31) and a note on the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing and the Global Taxonomy Initiative (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/37).

43. In introducing the item the representative of the Secretariat reminded the Working Group that at its 15th meeting Subsidiary Body had agreed on a recommendation to the Conference of the Parties on the draft capacity-building strategy for the Global Taxonomy Initiative and had also requested the Executive Secretary to revise the draft capacity-building strategy. The draft strategy had been reviewed once again by Parties, observers, and Indigenous and local communities, and their comments and suggestions had been incorporated in the revised strategy.

44. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Canada, China, Denmark, Finland, Jordan, Malaysia, Mexico, and South Africa.

45. Working Group II resumed its consideration of agenda item 8 at its 4th meeting, on 2 May 2012.

46. Statements were made by representatives of Brazil, Burundi, Colombia, France, Ghana, Japan, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey and Uruguay.

47. A statement was also made by the representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

48. Following the exchange of views, the Co-Chair said that she would prepare a revised version of the draft recommendation contained in document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/12, reflecting the views expressed by participants and written submissions to the Secretariat for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

49. The Working Group discussed the revised version of the draft recommendation at its 5th meeting, on 3 May 2012.

50. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, China, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Sweden, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

51. The Working Group agreed to forward the revised draft recommendation, as orally amended, to the plenary as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/L.[xxx]. The text is contained in annex ... to the present report.

ITEM 10. NEW AND EMERGING ISSUES

52. Agenda item 10 was taken up by the Subsidiary Body at its 4th session, on 2 May 2012 under the chairmanship of Ms. Gabriele Obermayr (Austria). In considering the item, the Subsidiary Body had

before it a note by the Executive Secretary on new and emerging issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/13) and an information document on new and emerging issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/35).

53. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Ghana, Guatemala, Iceland, India, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mexico, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

54. Statements were also made by representatives of the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea of the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs (UN/DOALOS), the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

55. Further statements were made by representatives of the Alliance for Biodiversity in Latin America, ETC Group, and Friends of the Earth United States, speaking also on behalf of the International Center for Technology Assessment and the Center for Food Safety

56. Following the exchange of views, the Co-Chair said that she would prepare a revised version of the draft recommendation contained in document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/13, reflecting the views expressed by participants and written submissions to the Secretariat for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

57. The Working Group discussed the revised version of the draft recommendation contained in document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/13 at its 5th meeting, on 3 May 2012.

58. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Colombia, European Union, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Japan, Liberia, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Uruguay.

59. Statements were also made by representatives of the Alliance for Biodiversity in Latin America, ETC Group, the Federation of Germany Scientists, and the International Center for Technology Assessment, also on behalf of the Center for Food Safety and supported by Friends of the Earth United States.

60. Following the statements, the Co-Chair established an open-ended drafting group, chaired by Mr. Hesiquio Benitez Dias (Mexico), to discuss the draft recommendation.

61. At its 6th meeting, on 4 May 2012, the Working Group heard a progress report from the chair of the drafting group and resumed its consideration of the draft recommendation.

62. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, the European Union, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, India, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, South Africa, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

63. As a result of the discussion, it was decided to create a group of the Friends of the Chair, to be chaired by ... (United Kingdom), to consider outstanding issues.

64. [*To be completed*].