



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
LIMITED

UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/L.1
28 May 2010

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

Third meeting
Nairobi, 24-28 May 2010
Agenda item 10

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

Draft report of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention

Rapporteur: Ms Somaly Chan (Cambodia)

ITEM 1: OPENING OF THE MEETING

1. The third meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention was held at the headquarters of the United Nations Environment Programme from 24 to 28 May 2010.
2. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following Parties and other Governments: *[to be completed]*
3. Observers from the following United Nations bodies, specialized agencies, convention secretariats and other bodies also attended: *[to be completed]*
4. The following organizations were also represented by observers: *[to be completed]*
5. The meeting was opened at 10 a.m. on Monday, 24 May 2010, by Mr. Jochen Flasbarth, representative of the President of the Conference and Chair of the meeting. Mr. Flasbarth thanked the delegates for attending and conveyed the best wishes of the Environment Minister of Germany, President of the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention. He pointed out that, at that meeting, it had been decided that a working group would be set up to prepare a number of items for consideration and adoption, including the drawing up of a revised and updated strategic plan and biodiversity target. It had also been agreed to undertake an in-depth review of the progress that had been made towards achieving goals one and four. He pointed out that there were issues of great importance on the agenda of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties that would affect the future of biodiversity policy. He said that one very important question was how to enable the world to be more successful in implementing the Convention and its three objectives; another was to ensure that the world would not again fail in meeting targets. Referring to the celebration that had been held for the International Day of Biodiversity, which had featured the participation of schoolchildren, he said that it

/...

was a timely reminder of the importance of explaining the biodiversity agenda to children, who represent the future.

6. Ms. Angela Cropper, Deputy Executive Director, UNEP, welcomed the Working Group to UNEP headquarters and to Nairobi. She commented on the ambitious nature of the agenda and pointed out that, as the participants were experts on all aspects of biodiversity, it was not within her remit to raise any questions on policy relating to biodiversity, but rather to its implementation. She said that it was widely recognized that the rate of implementation was too slow. While the challenges remained the same as they were in 1992, there was now a clearer understanding of the contribution of biodiversity to human well being. Direct drivers of change had worsened. She raised the question of the development of tools for the assessment of biodiversity and whether the business sector could be motivated to become more involved. She said that part of the UNEP response to environmental degradation was to better frame, publicize and catalyze a transition to a low carbon economy. She pointed to the urgent need to bridge data gaps and to make links between scientific discoveries and policy options and wondered whether an accelerated programme for synergies between biodiversity bodies would accelerate the implementation of the Convention on Biodiversity. Other questions raised were whether some of the climate impacts on biodiversity could be addressed through REDD, REDD plus and blue carbon issues. If the protocol were to be agreed, then could it be used to accelerate implementation? Was there sufficient filtering down to country level? She stressed the importance of developing measurable and achievable targets and called for the establishment of indicators to show the extent to which targets were being reached. She called for the setting of a balance between idealism and realism in policy, while bearing in mind that the bar must not be set too low. She said that ways should be explored to improve national biodiversity action plans and strategies and called for enabling mechanisms that were genuinely effective. She wondered whether the institutional arrangements put in place helped Parties to coordinate sectoral approaches. While pointing out that the accumulated work carried out under the Convention at global level signified that progress had indeed been made, she added that much remained to be done. She urged participants to set a course towards mainstreaming biodiversity, which would shine a new light on the understanding that biodiversity represented life.

7. At the opening session of the meeting, Mr. Ahmed Djoghla, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity drew attention to the special significance of the current meeting and he expressed his gratitude to the UNEP Executive Director for providing financial resources for the current meeting, being held for the first time in Africa, at UNEP headquarters.

8. In the wake of the global celebrations of the International Day for Biological Diversity on 22 May 2010, he paid tribute to the UNEP Deputy Executive Director, Ms. Angela Cropper, for hosting the main celebration of the unique event and to Kenyan partners, including the National Environment Management Authority, the National Museums of Kenya, Friends of Karura Forest and the Huruma Community. He also thanked key partners, including the German embassy, the German Technical Cooperation Agency (GTZ) and the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. He congratulated the 67 Parties and other other stakeholders that had notified the secretariat of celebrations to mark the event and he drew attention, in particular, to *The Green Wave* initiative operating under the slogan "One school, one tree, one gift to nature". He said that the 2010 International Year of Biodiversity would culminate in New York on 22 September 2010 in the high-level meeting on biodiversity during the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly. The executive summary of the third edition Global Biodiversity Outlook report would be presented to the high-level meeting. The report had been translated into all United Nations languages, and he commended the Governments of Brazil, Japan, Kenya and Germany for translating the report into their national languages to ensure its more effective dissemination. The message of the report was clear: the current species extinction rate was 1,000 times greater than the natural extinction rate and the world had failed to meet the 2010 biodiversity target.

9. Mr. Djoghlafl drew attention to the draft Strategic Plan for the period 2011–2020, which represented the result of two years of intensive consultation with 50 submissions made by 42 Parties and 8 international organizations; he commended the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice for its guidance and achievements. He invited Parties that had not yet done so to submit their views on shaping the targets and vision of the Strategic Plan. He commended the Government of Germany and Mr. Jochen Flasbarth, in particular, for their initiative in holding a meeting of a high-level working group comprising 50 eminent personalities in Bonn, Germany, in March 2009, to provide guidance to the Convention for the post-2010 period. He thanked the Government of Japan for elaborating a national multi-stakeholder strategic plan, including a section on means of implementation, which had provided inspiration for the secretariat in the development of the Strategic Plan 2011–2020. He expressed his gratitude to Ms. Monique Barbut, Chief Executive Officer and Chairperson of the Global Environment Facility, for her support to biodiversity, including an increase in funding of 28 per cent to the Facility's biodiversity focal area under the fifth replenishment.

10. He stressed that business as usual was not an option for mankind or for the Convention secretariat and its partners. He expressed the certainty that a new global alliance would be established at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to be held in Nagoya, Japan, in October 2010, including a Nagoya protocol on access and benefit sharing. In closing, he urged participants to be the architects of a sustainable future for generations to come.

ITEM 2: ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

2.1. Officers

11. In keeping with established practice, the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties served as the Bureau of the Working Group. Accordingly, the meeting was chaired by the representative of the President of the Conference of the Parties. It was agreed that Ms. Somaly Chan would act as Rapporteur.

2.2. Adoption of the agenda

12. The provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/1) was adopted as follows:

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters.
3. Progress towards the 2010 biodiversity target:
 - 3.1. Implementation of the Strategic Plan;
 - 3.2. In-depth review of goals 1 and 4 of the Strategic Plan and further consideration of needs for capacity-building.
4. Science-policy interface on biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being: consideration of the outcome of the intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meetings on an intergovernmental science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services.
5. Post-2010 Strategic Plan and multi-year programme of work of the Convention:
 - 5.1. Revising and updating of the Strategic Plan beyond 2010;
 - 5.2. Multi-year programme of work of the Convention and national reporting;

/...

6. Implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization:
 - 6.1. List of initiatives to implement the strategy and indicators;
 - 6.2. Innovative financial mechanisms;
 - 6.3. Review of the guidance to financial mechanism.
7. Further consideration of the proposed biodiversity technology initiative.
8. Operations of the Convention:
 - 8.1. Periodicity of meetings of the Conference of the Parties;
 - 8.2. Retirement of decisions;
9. Other matters.
10. Adoption of the report.
11. Closure of the meeting.

2.3. Organization of work

13. The Working Group decided to work in plenary, with the establishment of informal groups as necessary to facilitate its work.

ITEM 3. PROGRESS TOWARDS THE 2010 BIODIVERSITY TARGET

3.1. Implementation of the Strategic Plan, and

3.2. In-depth review of goals 1 and 4 of the Strategic Plan and further consideration of needs for capacity-building

14. The Working Group took up agenda item 3 at the [to be completed] session of the meeting, [to be completed]. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the fourth national reports as well as other relevant sources of information (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/2), an executive summary of the third edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/2/Add.1), notes by the Executive Secretary on integration of biodiversity into poverty reduction and development (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/2/Add.2) a note on the engagement with the private sector (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/2/Add.3) and a preliminary analysis of information in the fourth national reports (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/INF/1), a note on the implementation of activities related to mainstreaming biodiversity, development and poverty reduction (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/INF/2), an information document on National Biodiversity Targets for 2010 and Beyond 2010 (UNEP/CBC/WG-RI/3/INF/7).

15. Introducing the item, the Chairman invited the Working Group to consider items 3.1 and 3.2 simultaneously and to consider the draft recommendations set out in the documents before it.

16. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina; Australia; Brazil; Canada, including a short video message from a Canadian child; China; Comoros; Cook Islands, on behalf of the Asia and Pacific region; India; Islamic Republic of Iran; Japan; Jordan; Malawi, on behalf of the African region; Mexico; New Zealand; Niger; Norway; Philippines; Serbia, on behalf of the Central and Eastern

European region; Spain on behalf of the European Union; Switzerland; Turkmenistan; United Republic of Tanzania; Yemen.

17. The representative of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity and a speaker on behalf of EcoNexus, ETC group and ECOROPA also made statements.

18. A statement was also made by the representative of the United Nations University Institute of Advanced Studies.

19. At the suggestion of the Chair, the Working Group decided to establish an open-ended group of friends of the Chair to discuss revisions to the draft recommendation contained in document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/2/Add.1. At the suggestion of the Chair, the Working Group agreed that the secretariat in collaboration with the Chair would produce revised draft recommendations based on the draft recommendations set out in documents UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/2 and Add.2 to reflect statements made.

20. At the 5th session of the meeting, on the morning of 27 May 2010, the Working Group took up consideration of the draft recommendation on business engagement, submitted by the Chair.

21. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina; Brazil; Canada; Cuba; Grenada; Indonesia; Japan; Malawi; Mexico; New Zealand; Norway; Philippines; South Africa; Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its member States; and Switzerland.

22. A statement was also made by the representative of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity.

23. At the suggestion of the Chair, the Working Group decided to establish an open-ended group of friends of the Chair to be chaired by the Philippines to consider revisions to the text of the draft recommendation.

24. Following an update at the same session, by the chair of the open-ended group, the Working Group agreed to take up the draft recommendation, as orally amended, at a subsequent meeting as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/L.3.

25. At the 7th session of the meeting, on 27 May 2010, the Working Group took up a draft recommendation on the integration of biodiversity into poverty eradication and development, submitted by the Chair.

26. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, China, Grenada, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Spain (on behalf of the European Union and its member States), and Uganda.

27. A statement was made by the representative of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity.

28. The Working Group agreed to take up the draft recommendation, as orally amended, at a subsequent meeting as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/L.8.

29. Also at the 7th session of the meeting, on 27 May 2010, the Working Group took up a draft recommendation on implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan, submitted by the Chair.

30. Statements were made by the representatives of China, Cuba, Ethiopia, Grenada, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Malawi, Senegal, Spain (on behalf of the European Union and its member States) and Uganda.

31. The Working Group agreed to take up the draft recommendation, as orally amended, at a subsequent meeting as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/L.6.

. ITEM 4: SCIENCE-POLICY INTERFACE ON BIODIVERSITY, ECOSYSTEM SERVICES AND HUMAN WELL BEING: CONSIDERATION OF THE OUTCOME OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND MULTI-STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS ON AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL SCIENCE-POLICY INTERFACE ON BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES

32. The Working Group took up agenda item 4 at the 4th session of the meeting, on 26 May 2010. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on science-policy interface on biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well being and consideration of the outcome of the intergovernmental meetings (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/4) and the report of the second ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/INF/6).

33. Introducing the item, the Chair said that by paragraph 8 of decision IX/15, the Conference of the Parties had noted the need for improved scientific information, as related to inter alia the interests of the Convention on Biological Diversity and other biodiversity-related conventions with a view to strengthening the role of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the scientific advisory bodies of other biodiversity-related conventions, and welcomed the agreement of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme to convene an ad hoc open-ended intergovernmental multi-stakeholder meeting to consider establishing an efficient international science-policy interface on biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being. By paragraph 9 of that decision, the Conference of the Parties had requested the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention, at its third meeting, to consider the outcome of the intergovernmental meeting and its implications for the implementation and organization of work of the Convention, including its Strategic Plan, and to make recommendations for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its tenth meeting. Accordingly, the Executive Secretary had prepared the documents before the Working Group.

34. At the suggestion of the Chair, the Working Group agreed that it was premature to discuss the issue prior to the third ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services to be held in the Republic of Korea in June 2010. The Working Group agreed to adopt the draft recommendation set out in the document before it with an additional fourth paragraph as follows: “recommends that the Conference of the Parties at its tenth meeting considers the outcome of the third ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services and implications for the implementation and organization of work of the Convention, in particular the work of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.”

35. At the 7th session of the meeting, on 27 May 2010, the Working Group took up a draft recommendation on the science-policy interface on biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being and consideration of the outcome of the intergovernmental meetings, submitted by the Chair.

36. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Barbados, Cuba, Grenada, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Malawi, Mexico, the Philippines and Spain (on behalf of the European Union and its member States).

37. A statement was made by a speaker representing the Forest Peoples Programme, the International Indigenous Biodiversity Forum, German Scientists and other organizations.

38. The Working Group agreed to take up the draft recommendation, as orally amended, at a subsequent meeting as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3L.10.

ITEM 5. POST-2010 STRATEGIC PLAN AND MULTI-YEAR PROGRAMME OF WORK OF THE CONVENTION

5.1. Revising and updating of the Strategic Plan beyond 2010

39. The Working Group took up agenda item 5.1 at the first session of the meeting, [to be completed]. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note prepared by the Executive Secretary on the draft Strategic Plan of the Convention for post-2010 period, further views submitted by Parties and observers, and inputs from relevant regional, subregional and global meetings held on the subject. (UNEP/CBC/WG-RI/3/3), further views submitted by Parties and observers as well as key recommendations from a number of regional, subregional and global meetings organized in this regard (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/3/Add.1) and an information document on national biodiversity targets for 2010 and Beyond 2010 (UNEP/CBC/WG-RI/3/INF/7).

40. Statements were made by the representative of the Environment Management Group of the United Nations and by the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.

41. At the 2nd session of the meeting, a representative of the Secretariat pointed out that there were some inconsistencies in the list of goals and targets contained in annex I to the note by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/3) and proposed that the list in annex II should be used as a basis for the discussions. He said that target 10 in annex I should read: "by 2020 manage the multiple pressures on coral reefs and other vulnerable species and ecosystems impacted by climate change and ocean acidification so as to maintain their integrity and functioning." and that target 11 should include a reference to freshwater areas: "by 2020 at least 20 per cent of land, freshwater and sea areas". Target 14 should begin "By 2020 ecosystems that provide services and contribute to local livelihoods are identified and safeguarded", and target 15 should refer to all degraded lands: "the contribution of biodiversity to ecosystem and to carbon storage and sequestration is enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded lands, thereby contributing to climate-change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification."

42. The Chair proposed that the members of the Working Group should firstly read through the draft Strategic Plan as there would be a need for further discussion on the document. He suggested that they could then move on to the multi-year programme of work of the Convention with a view to embarking on agenda item 6 at a subsequent meeting.

43. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Spain (on behalf of the European Union and its member States) and Switzerland.

44. Statements were also made by the representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), as well as by the representatives of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB), the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), and Econexus (on behalf of Ecoropa).

/...

45. At the suggestion of the Chair, the Working Group decided to establish an open-ended contact group for informal discussion on the post-2010 Strategic Plan co-chaired by Mr. Ashgar Fazel (Islamic Republic of Iran) and Mr. Finn Katerås (Norway). The Chair suggested that the terms of reference for the group would be to assist the Chair to prepare a text for consideration by the plenary with a view to recommending to the Conference of the Parties at its tenth meeting a revised Strategic Plan for the period 2011–2020. He urged members of the group to avoid bracketed text and seek compromise language where possible.

46. At its 4th session, on 26 May 2010, the co-chair of the contact group on the Strategic Plan 2011–2020 provided an update on the progress achieved by the contact group.

47. Thanking them for their work, the Chair said that, following discussion with the co-chairs of the contact group, he had decided to expand the terms of reference of the group to allow them to review the recommendation set out in the note by the Executive Secretary on updating and revision of the Strategic Plan for the post-2010 period (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/3), as appropriate and as time allowed. In addition, he had requested the co-chairs to establish whether the draft recommendation on an International Decade on Biodiversity proposed by Japan had the support of the Working Group and to report to him thereon to enable the establishment of an open-ended group of the friends of the chair to consider the matter, if necessary.

48. At the 6th session of the meeting, on 27 May 2010, the co-chair of the contact group on the Strategic Plan provided an update on the progress achieved by the group to date. He explained that a number of brackets remained in the text and further discussion was required.

49. At the 6th session of the meeting, on 27 May 2010, the Working Group took up the draft recommendation on updating and revision of the Strategic Plan for the post-2010 period, submitted by the co-chairs of the contact group on the Strategic Plan.

50. Introducing the draft, the Chair invited the Working Group to focus its comments on the annex to the decision in a paragraph-by-paragraph review. He urged the Working Group to attempt to reach consensus on words that were currently bracketed in order to take full advantage of the high-level segment on biodiversity of the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly to be held on 22 September 2010.

51. The representative of the Secretariat introduced new text agreed upon by the contact group on the Strategic Plan.

52. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina; Brazil; Canada; China; Cuba; Ethiopia; Guinea; the Islamic Republic of Iran; Japan; Malawi; Malaysia; Mexico; New Zealand; Norway; Peru; Spain (on behalf of the European Union and its member States).

53. During the discussion, the representative of Mexico stated for the record the interrelationship between climate change and biodiversity should be reflected more adequately in the targets contained in the draft recommendation before the Working Group.

5.2. *Multi-year programme of work of the Convention and national reporting*

and

8.1. *Periodicity of meetings of the Conference of the Parties*

54. The Working Group took up agenda item 5.2 simultaneously with agenda item 8.1 at the 2nd session of the meeting, in the afternoon of 24 June 2010. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it notes by the Executive Secretary on the multi-year programme of work of the convention for the period 2011–2022 (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/5); national reporting: review of experience and proposals for the fifth national report (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/6 and Add.2); draft guidelines for the fifth national report (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/6/Add.1); periodicity of meetings and organization of work of the conference of the parties (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/11). It also had before it as an information document . a preliminary analysis of information in the fourth national reports (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/INF/1).

55. Introducing the item, the Chair invited the Working Group to make observations on the two agenda items.

56. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina; Brazil; Canada; China; Grenada; India; Islamic Republic of Iran; Japan; Liberia; Mexico; New Zealand; Spain, on behalf of the European Union; Switzerland; Uganda.

57. At the suggestion of the Chair, the Working Group agreed that the draft recommendations on the multi-year programme of work and draft guidelines for the fifth national report would be amended by the Secretariat in the light of the statements made.

58. Regarding the periodicity of meetings, at the suggestion of the Chair, the Working Group agreed that more intense discussions on the matter were required.

59. At the 5th session of the meeting, on 26 May 2010, the Working Group took up a draft recommendation submitted by the Chair on the multi-year programme of work of the Convention for the period 2011-2020

60. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Canada, China, Ethiopia, Grenada, Haiti (on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries), India, Iran, Japan, Kenya, Malawi, Mexico, New Zealand, the Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Spain (on behalf of the European Union and its member states), Switzerland, the United Republic of Tanzania.

61. The representative of Mexico asked for clarification from the Secretariat on the status of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention.

62. The representative of the Secretariat, in response, said that working groups were established by decisions of the Conference of the Parties, that their remit was to make recommendations rather than decisions and that they were ad hoc rather than permanent bodies.

63. At the suggestion of the Chair, the Working Group agreed to establish a small, informal group of friends of the Chair to hold consultations on the revised draft recommendation, taking into account the comments made. The group consisted of the representatives of Botswana, Grenada, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand and Spain (representing the European Union and its member States), to be chaired by the representative of Japan.

/...

64. The revised draft recommendation was subsequently circulated as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/L.7 for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

65. Also at the 7th session of the meeting, on 27 May 2010, the Working Group took up a draft recommendation on review of experience and proposals for the fifth national report, submitted by the Chair.

66. Statements were made by the representatives of Grenada, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Malawi and Spain (on behalf of the European Union and its member States).

67. The Working Group agreed to take up the draft recommendation, as orally amended, at a subsequent meeting as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/L.5.

ITEM 6. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGY FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

6.1. List of initiatives to implement the strategy and indicators

and

6.2. Innovative financial mechanisms

68. The Working Group took up agenda items 6.1 and 6.2 at the 3rd session of the meeting, on 25 May 2010. In considering the items, the Working Group had before it a compilation of submissions on concrete activities and initiatives including measurable targets and/or indicators to achieve the strategic goals contained in the strategy for resource mobilization and on indicators to monitor the implementation of the strategy (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/7), and a note on policy options concerning innovative financial mechanisms (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/8). It also had before it, as information documents, the submissions of concrete activities and initiatives including measurable targets and/or indicators to achieve the strategic goals contained in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization and on indicators to monitor the implementation of the strategy (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/INF/4), the report of the proceedings of the International Workshop on Innovative Financial Mechanisms, held in Bonn from 27 to 29 January 2010 (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/INF/5) and a note on advancing the biodiversity agenda: - a United Nations system-wide contribution (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/INF/12)..

69. Introducing the items, the Chair said that in its decision IX/11, the Conference of the Parties had requested the Working Group on Review of Implementation to prepare at its third meeting a list of concrete activities and initiatives to achieve the strategic goals of the strategy for resource mobilization and on indicators to monitor the implementation of the Strategy, and also to identify a series of options and policy recommendations concerning innovative financial mechanisms, based on information received from the Executive Secretary and the submissions received from Parties in response to the invitation contained in paragraph 6 of that decision, for submission to the Conference of the Parties at its tenth meeting for its consideration. He noted that due to a lack of submissions from Parties, no draft recommendation had been elaborated by the Secretariat on innovative financial mechanisms; he stressed, however, the importance of resources, including innovative financial mechanisms, in advancing the implementation of the updated and revised Strategic Plan for the period 2011–2020.

70. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina; Brazil; Botswana; Canada; China; Cuba; India; the Islamic Republic of Iran; Japan; Jordan; Kenya; Mexico; New Zealand; Niger; Norway; Peru; the Philippines; Senegal; South Africa; Spain (on behalf of the European Union and its member States); Switzerland; Ukraine (on behalf of the Central Eastern European region).

71. A statement was made by the representative of the Global Environment Facility.

72. The representative of the Global Forest Coalition also made a statement.

6.3. Review of the guidance to the financial mechanism

73. The Working Group took up agenda item 6.3 at the 3rd session of the meeting, on 25 May 2010. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a compilation of existing guidance as well as suggestions for consolidation (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/9).

74. Statements were made by the representatives of Brazil, Canada, Ethiopia, Haiti, Jordan, the Philippines, Spain (on behalf of the European Union and its member States) and Switzerland.

75. A statement was also made by the representative of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity.

76. At the suggestion of the Chair, the Working Group decided to establish an open-ended contact group on resource mobilization to consider all the statements and written submissions that had been made under agenda item 6, with a view to preparing three draft recommendations, to be co-chaired by Mr. Damaso Luna (Mexico) and Ms. Maria Schultz (Sweden).

77. At the 4th session of the meeting, on 26 May 2010, the Co-Chair of the contact group on resource mobilization provided an update on the progress achieved by the contact group.

78. Thanking them for their work, the Chairman urged Parties to seek to achieve constructive discussion within the contact group.

79. At the 6th session of the meeting, the co-chair of the contact group on resource mobilization provided an update on the progress achieved by the group to date. He said that the draft recommendation derived from the one set out in document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/8 was being prepared for distribution to the Working Group.

80. At the suggestion of the Chair, the Working Group agreed that an informal group of friends of the chair comprising the representatives of Brazil, Canada, India, Spain (on behalf of the European Union and its member States) and South Africa, under the leadership of the representative of Switzerland, would attempt to further refine the draft recommendations on resource mobilization.

81. The representative of Brazil, speaking on behalf of the group of Like-Minded Megadiverse Countries and the group of Latin America and the Caribbean countries, welcomed the establishment of a group of friends of the Chair. Expressing the view that it was essential to put the discussion of financial matters first, however, he stressed that correct, adequate and predictable funding was necessary to enable the analysis of the new targets and indicators contained in the Strategic Plan. He said that future implementation of the Convention was dependent on the flow of resources to developing countries to complement their efforts to implement the Convention, including the Strategic Plan for the period 2010–2022.

82. Responding to the representative of Brazil, the Chair underscored the need to build trust and close the gap between the divergent views prior to discussing resource mobilization. He affirmed that nothing would be decided with regard to the Strategic Plan until the group of friends of the Chair on the draft recommendation on resource mobilization had reported to plenary on progress made on that issue.

83. The representative of Malawi, speaking on behalf of the African Group, expressed his agreement with the stance taken by the representative of Brazil.

/...

84. In the interests of time and the spirit of cooperation, the representative of Brazil, speaking on behalf of the Group of Like-minded Megadiverse Countries and the Latin American and Caribbean Group, agreed to proceed with the discussion on the Strategic Plan while reserving the right to await the outcome of the discussions on resource mobilization.

ITEM 7: FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSED BIODIVERSITY TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE

85. The Working Group took up agenda item 7 at the 4th session of the meeting, on 26 May 2010. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary containing options in designing a possible Biodiversity Technological Initiative and a list of criteria for selecting a host institution (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/10).

86. Introducing the item, the representative of the secretariat said that by paragraph 9 of its decision IX/14, the Conference of the Parties had requested the Executive Secretary, in cooperation with relevant partner organizations, to identify options for activities to be included in a prospective Biodiversity Technology Initiative as well as for the structure, functioning and governance of a Biodiversity Technology Initiative and to complete, as necessary, the list of criteria for selecting the host institution of the Biodiversity Technology Initiative, bearing in mind the possibility of the Initiative being hosted by the Secretariat of the Convention.

87. The Chair said that a significant amount of work had been carried out on the subject as explained in the document before the Working Group. He invited the Working Group to review the options and list of criteria contained therein together with the elements of the draft recommendation with a view to finalizing them for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties at its tenth meeting.

88. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina; Brazil; Canada; China; Guinea; India; Jordan; Kenya; Malawi, on behalf of the African region; New Zealand; Philippines; Senegal; Serbia (on behalf of the Central and Eastern European region); Spain (on behalf of the European Union); Switzerland; Turkmenistan; and the United Republic of Tanzania;

89. The Chair said that the Secretariat would circulate a revised draft recommendation based on chapter V on the suggested way ahead of the document before the Working Group (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/10) and that it would be submitted to the Working Group at a later session.

90. At the 5th session of the meeting, on the morning of 27 May 2010, the Working Group took up consideration of the draft recommendation on further consideration of the proposed biodiversity technology initiative, submitted by the Chair.

91. Statements were made by the representatives of Burkina Faso; Ethiopia; Grenada; Haiti; Kenya; Malawi; New Zealand; Norway; Philippines; South Africa; Spain (on behalf of the European Union and its member States); and the United Republic of Tanzania.

92. The Working Group agreed to take up the draft recommendation, as orally amended, at a subsequent meeting as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/L.5.

ITEM 8: OPERATIONS OF THE CONVENTION

8.1. Periodicity of meetings

93. The Working Group took up agenda item 8.1 at the [*to be completed*] session of the meeting, [to be completed]. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it the report by the Executive Secretary on options for the meeting schedule and organization of its work after 2010 (UNEP/CBD/COP/9/22/Add.1) and a note on the periodicity of meetings and organization of work of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/11).

94. Agenda item 8.1 was taken up in conjunction with item 5.2 (see paragraphs [5454-3134](#)) above.

8.2. Retirement of decisions

95. The Working Group took up agenda item 8.2 at the 3rd session of the meeting, on 25 May 2010.

96. Introducing the item, the Chair invited a representative of the Secretariat to report on progress to date with regard to the process to retire decisions and elements of decisions from the fifth and sixth meetings of the Conference of the Parties pursuant to decision IX/29. The representative reported that the Executive Secretary communicated proposals to Parties, governments and other organisations on 9 April 2010. He noted that the deadline for the submission of written comments was 15 June 2010 and that, to date, no submissions had been received. The working group took note of the progress to date.

ITEM 9: OTHER MATTERS

Statement by Brazil, on behalf of the Group of Like Minded Megadiverse Countries on access and benefit-sharing for the new Strategic Plan 2010-2020

97. At the 3rd session of the meeting, on 25 May 2010, the representative of Brazil, speaking on behalf of the Group of Like Minded Megadiverse Countries, said that, in the context of the discussions of a new Strategic Plan to the Convention on Biological Diversity for the post-2010, and regarding the urgency to halt the loss of biodiversity, by effectively implementing the threefold objective of the Convention, the Group of Like Minded Megadiverse Countries would like to make the following statement

- "1. The negotiations on the Protocol to Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge are the most important political negotiating process in progress in the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- "2. Without an effective International Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing, aimed at stopping biopiracy and providing legal certainty, the underlying causes that lead to the loss of biodiversity and the implementation deficit regarding the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources will not be fully addressed;
- "3. We welcome the progress made in the Cali meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit Sharing, and we reiterate our commitment to jointly work in the resumed session of WG-ABS 9, and complete the negotiations so as to adopt a strong, effective and balanced Protocol at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties on the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP-10), in Nagoya, Japan.
- "4. We look forward to see this Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge as an essential element of an enhanced and revised new Strategic Plan to the Convention on Biological Diversity for the post-2010."

/...

United Nations Decade on Biodiversity

98. At the 7th session of the meeting, on 27 May 2010, the Working Group took up a draft recommendation on the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity 2011–2020, submitted by Japan on behalf of the Bureau. The Chair said that Parties should continue their consultations on the draft and revert to it at a subsequent session.

ITEM 10: ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

99. At the 8th session of the meeting, on 28 May 2010, the Working Group agreed that all references in its recommendations to “the joint work programme among the three Rio conventions” should be bracketed.

100. The present report was adopted at the 10th session of the meeting, on 13 July 2007, on the basis of the draft report prepared by the Rapporteur (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/2/L.1) and on the understanding that any requests for corrections or amendments would be submitted to the Secretariat after the meeting.

ITEM 11: CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

101. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the second meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention was closed at [*to be completed*].
