

## WGRI 4 HIGHLIGHTS: MONDAY, 7 MAY 2012

The fourth meeting of the *ad hoc* Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation (WGRI 4) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) opened today at the headquarters of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) in Montreal, Canada.

Participants discussed: the review of progress in implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and progress in providing support to parties in the context of the Strategic Plan and Aichi Biodiversity Targets; and resource mobilization.

In closing the meeting, Kazuaki Hosino (Japan), Chair of the meeting, announced the establishment of two informal contact groups. He invited representatives of India and Belgium to chair the contact group on resource mobilization. He noted that details of the contact group on the Strategic Plan would be announced in the morning.

### OPENING PLENARY

In the morning, on behalf of Ryu Matsumoto, President of the Conference of the Parties (COP), Kazuaki Hosino (Japan) highlighted the importance of the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. He also stressed that countries should develop national biodiversity targets in line with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and mainstream biodiversity into society.

New CBD Executive Secretary Bráulio Ferreira de Souza Dias noted that this meeting and the twelve tabled draft recommendations represent the first opportunity for parties to review progress towards the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. He highlighted challenges in implementing the Convention, including mismatch between commitments and implementation, and proposed more focused negotiations at the next COP. He suggested focusing on a streamlined number of decisions that should consider: integrating cross-cutting issues; reducing the complexity of the CBD portfolio; revising National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs); strategic resource mobilization; efficient monitoring of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets; support for least developed countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS); community-based approaches to conservation and sustainable use to complement work on protected areas; and timely ratification of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization.

Carlos Blasco Villa, on behalf of Achim Steiner, UNEP Executive Director, highlighted the interlinkages between sustainable development and the implementation of the Convention.

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS:** Delegates adopted the agenda and organization of work (UNEP/CBD/UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/1 and Add.1/Rev.1) without amendments. They then, elected Snežana Prokic (Serbia) as rapporteur.

On behalf of COP President, Kazuaki Hosino (Japan) noted that document UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/4 on the Message to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) contained separate technical and political messages and differed from an earlier version.

### IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020 AND PROGRESS TOWARDS THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

In the morning, the Secretariat introduced documents on review of progress in implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and review of progress in providing support to parties in the context of the Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/2 and UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/3).

Many countries recognized exemplary contributions through the Japan Biodiversity Fund. JAPAN urged all countries to continue efforts for implementing their NBSAPs and national targets, noting his country's support for capacity building in developing countries. CANADA urged that the draft recommendations more closely follow CBD COP 10 Decision X/2 on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

SOUTH AFRICA noted that ambitious targets are important but should not hinder progress, emphasizing the importance of addressing the underlying causes of biodiversity loss. The EU, on behalf of its 27 member states, expressed support for developing a comprehensive approach to ongoing initiatives aimed at achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, rather than proposing new ones. SWITZERLAND, supported by UGANDA, proposed text requesting parties participate in a peer review process of the status of implementation of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets to be defined before 2015. BRAZIL noted that implementation requires more effective commitments from developed countries and stressed the need for enhanced technical and scientific cooperation. NORWAY, with YEMEN, stressed partnership and cooperation at all levels to meet the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. GUATEMALA and VENEZUELA underscored that national strategies should take a bottom-up approach and prioritize benefits to local communities. ZAMBIA called for jointly addressing the implementation of the Strategic Plan and resource mobilization. PAPUA NEW GUINEA, on behalf of several SIDS, highlighted that the island biodiversity programme of

work can contribute to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. REPUBLIC OF KOREA recognized the importance of integrating the Aichi Biodiversity Targets into national strategies to strengthen the legal basis for their implementation.

Many countries noted their lack of progress in updating NBSAPs, citing lack of financing and capacity. TAJIKISTAN, among other countries, noted it is in the process of revising its NBSAP thanks to Secretariat support. LEBANON suggested providing additional support and capacity to countries who have not updated their NBSAPs. BOTSWANA noted that support is especially needed on various thematic issues, including the Nagoya Protocol and the study on The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB). Georgia, on behalf of the COMMONWEALTH OF INDEPENDENT STATES (CIS), called for more capacity-building activities. BURKINA FASO expressed concern regarding the slow process of allocating funds for implementing the Strategic Plan.

On the Clearing-House Mechanism in support of the Strategic Plan (CHM), JORDAN, supported by SUDAN, called for establishing focal points to facilitate information exchange. MEXICO stressed the need to disseminate information to appropriate scales and, echoed by PERU, said the CHM should consist of a website as well as a network of experts for decision-making. Namibia, for the AFRICAN GROUP urged strengthening the CHM as a priority. NIGER underscored the lack of practical support for strengthening CHMs. MOROCCO called for text to promote implementing the Strategic Plan in support of the CHM, while INDIA supported establishing a work programme on the CHM. UKRAINE suggested referencing the development of national targets as opposed to the setting of national targets. BURUNDI asked the Secretariat to help increase the visibility of national CHMs.

INTERNATIONAL INDIGENOUS FORUM ON BIODIVERSITY (IIFB) expressed concern about the lack of mainstreaming of community-based natural resource management and sustainable use in NBSAPs. The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) urged parties to facilitate outcomes that could promote the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and use NBSAPs as policy instruments.

CONSERVATION INTERNATIONAL, on behalf of several groups, stressed the importance of transboundary collaboration on the development of NBSAPs.

## RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

**STRATEGY FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION: REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION AND A PROGRESS REPORT ON THE ASSESSMENT OF FINANCING NEEDS AND GAPS:** In the afternoon, the Secretariat introduced documents on the implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization and progress in assessing financing needs and gaps (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/6, INF/8, INF/9, INF/15).

Maria Schultz, Sweden, reported on findings from a seminar on Scaling up Biodiversity Finance, convened by the governments of Sweden, Ecuador, Norway, India and Japan. SENEGAL, MEXICO and the EU said they were pleased with the seminar on biodiversity finance.

SOUTH AFRICA, supported by MEXICO, SWITZERLAND and SENEGAL, called for an online finance portal to be established with the Global Environment Facility (GEF), adding that capacity building and technology transfer are crucial to the success of such a portal. SWITZERLAND additionally noted the need to pursue private and domestic resources in addition to international funds. The EU acknowledged the difficulty of establishing clear baselines but underscored their importance for establishing targets and identifying resource gaps. The EU said human and technical resources should be balanced alongside financial resources in the Strategic Plan. BRAZIL, supported by

GUATEMALA, said that while flexible financing is important it should not be a substitute for existing commitments under the Convention.

SENEGAL and SOUTH AFRICA said that adequate finance is critical for implementation of the convention, and ECUADOR pointed to the need for “fresh and additional resources.”

MEXICO called on the Executive Secretary to support balanced participation in decisions on resource mobilization through adequate training and funding, and underscored the need for flexible rules to identify objectives and implement strategic plans.

The EU said the preliminary reporting framework is sufficient to commence reporting on resource mobilization and urged countries to exchange experiences and mechanisms for meeting the wide range of national priorities and needs.

CANADA noted that resources may have to be leveraged in a more “creative” manner. PERU stressed the importance of the private sector in resource mobilization as well as engaging countries at the local level. NORWAY urged implementing a simple reporting format. TIMOR LESTE requested that the Secretariat establish a mandatory allocation of financial resources to implement the Strategic Plan. CONSERVATION INTERNATIONAL, on behalf of several groups, called for an agreement on reliable and predictable funding at COP 11. IUCN encouraged parties to adopt a broad view with regards to the use and mobilization of resources, noting that this includes financial, human and natural resources.

**THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM: REVIEW OF GEF-5 AND NEEDS FOR GEF-6:** The Secretariat introduced the agenda item on the review of the fifth replenishment of the GEF (GEF-5) and the assessment of needs for GEF-6 (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/7). Gilles Kleitz, France, provided an overview of the first draft of the GEF-6 needs assessment, noting that a final draft will be presented to COP 11. He said that a team of five experts had prepared the report, drawing on information from regional and subregional consultations and questionnaires circulated to parties. He noted that preliminary results indicated that between US\$ 17 billion and US\$ 41 billion will be needed from GEF-6, including GEF-leveraged funds, to implement the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. SAUDI ARABIA noted that financial needs are crucial and stressed that the GEF must strengthen capacity in developing countries. The EU welcomed the focus on implementation of the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets but noted that the cost estimates should not be included in the recommendations. CANADA noted that more analysis is required to put forward a programme for GEF-6. AUSTRALIA emphasized the funding disparity between GEF-5 and GEF-6.

## IN THE CORRIDORS

After six days of long negotiations, many of the participants of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) reconvened today for WGRI. Many delegates expected smooth sailing this week, with the exception of some rough patches on resource mobilization and funding. The day started with statements calling for funding and capacity building for reviewing NBSAPs and ended with a review of the GEF-6 needs assessment report. While developing countries called for bigger investments, developed countries viewed innovative and alternative financial mechanisms as an untapped source. Such innovative mechanisms could be a potential solution for meeting increased biodiversity conservation needs, especially in light of the disparity between the GEF-5 and GEF-6 funding requests—“a disparity many donor countries do not appear to be too happy about.”

## WGRI 4 HIGHLIGHTS: TUESDAY, 8 MAY 2012

In the morning, Chair Hosino announced a contact group on the Strategic Plan and related issues had been established and would be co-chaired by Spencer Thomas (Grenada) and Andrew Bignell (New Zealand).

Throughout the day participants discussed: options for sending a technical and/or political message to Rio+20; integrating biodiversity into poverty eradication and development; cooperation with other conventions; engaging with business; and south-south cooperation. When adjourning the plenary mid-afternoon, Hosino announced that the contact group on the Strategic Plan and related issues would convene in the evening. The contact group on resource mobilization and the financial mechanism will convene Wednesday morning.

### MESSAGE TO THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (RIO+20)

The Secretariat introduced documents UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/4 and UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/8, inviting parties to discuss options for sending a technical and/or political message to Rio+20 and to discuss the process for its presentation. Executive Secretary Dias reported that: the Rio+20 process currently has “too much text” and delegates should lower expectations for inserting new text at this stage, noting that there would likely be opportunities after Rio+20 to incorporate biodiversity messages into a list of sustainable development goals. He recommended providing a brief, focused message. Chair Hosino proposed dropping the technical message (Annex I) and retaining the political message (Annex II), and attaching the Strategic Plan to the message.

Argentina, for the GROUP OF LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES (GRULAC), supported by JORDAN, preferred a single message, based on the Strategic Plan, using agreed language reflecting the three objectives of the Convention, to be delivered during the high level segment. LAOS also preferred a single message, with a detailed focus on technical and scientific aspects, especially man-made risks to biodiversity. INDIA supported one message based on Annex II and using agreed language, noting the need to optimize the available time. ETHIOPIA supported sending two messages based on the Strategic Plan.

The EU, on behalf of its 27 member states, preferred sending one political message based on Annex II, and proposed inserting emphasis that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets would help achieve a green economy. AUSTRALIA, VENEZUELA and CHINA favored mentioning the Strategic Plan in a political message, and LEBANON, JAPAN and VENEZUELA stressed the importance of including the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

PAKISTAN, SUDAN, UGANDA, VENEZUELA and NIGER said that the political message should reference funding, with TUNISIA adding that the text failed to mention equitable sharing and access to benefits of genetic resources. CHINA proposed a message emphasizing the conservation of biodiversity for livelihoods and the green economy, the three objectives of the Convention, Strategic Plan for 2011-2020, Aichi Biodiversity Targets, Nagoya Protocol, and mainstreaming of biodiversity. EGYPT said that the message to Rio+20 should highlight commitments to respect national sovereignty and common but differentiated responsibility. GHANA urged stressing that biodiversity should be the primary environmental issue for the global community to address.

IUCN supported the proposal to append the Strategic Plan to the message to Rio+20, in order to emphasize the agreed global strategy for biodiversity conservation.

Chair Hosino noted that the majority of parties favored drafting one “short, concise and punchy” political message, and that further discussion should focus on this.

### BIODIVERSITY FOR POVERTY ERADICATION AND DEVELOPMENT

In the morning, the Secretariat introduced the item on integrating biodiversity into poverty eradication and development (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/5). M. F. Farooqi, India, provided an overview of the outcomes of the First Expert Meeting on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development that met in Dehradun, India in December 2011 to further elaborate on the linkages between the three objectives of the CBD and poverty reduction. He noted that the Expert Group discussed ways in which to: build capacity; mainstream payments for ecosystem services; and assign a value to natural resources. He noted the revised outcomes will be submitted for consideration at COP11.

SOUTH AFRICA, supporting the outcomes of the Expert Group, underscored the importance of biodiversity for impoverished communities. MALI stressed the importance of traditional knowledge and lessons learned when integrating biodiversity into poverty eradication and development plans. THAILAND questioned whether a tool could be developed to create linkages between the Ramsar Convention and CBD.

The PHILIPPINES proposed ensuring traditional user rights in policy and project design. GHANA requested the Executive Secretary to report on progress in mainstreaming poverty eradication and development at COP 12. The EU welcomed the report but said the CBD should avoid overlap and duplication with other fora. BRAZIL, supported by URUGUAY, expressed concern about sustainable biotrade, noting that this phrase is not clear and cautioning against trade barriers.

ARGENTINA said the CBD is not the appropriate forum for addressing poverty eradication.

IIFB stressed the role of indigenous peoples, including their rights to free, prior and informed consent (PIC), in the planning, design, and implementation of biodiversity and development programmes.

### **COOPERATION WITH OTHER CONVENTIONS AND ENGAGEMENT WITH BUSINESS**

In the morning, the Secretariat introduced documents on cooperation with other conventions: the biodiversity-related conventions and the Rio conventions (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/8) and engagement with business (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/9).

**COOPERATION WITH OTHER CONVENTIONS:** MEXICO highlighted the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora's (CITES) approach to cooperation with other conventions and expressed support for strengthening coordination and cooperation among multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). He also proposed adding reference to the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) also supported engagement with business.

SWITZERLAND underscored the crucial importance of cooperation, recognizing the role of the Liaison Group of the Biodiversity-related Conventions in facilitating the implementation of MEAs. He requested the Secretariat to compile recommendations on future synergies and contributions of biodiversity and Rio-related conventions to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets for COP 11. The EU underscored that coherent implementation of the Convention is critical. He emphasized, supported by NORWAY, that it is timely to focus on cooperation at the national level, with NBSAPs being a key tool for providing national frameworks. NORWAY stated she could not endorse the *modus operandi* of the Liaison Group of the Biodiversity-related Conventions.

The PHILIPPINES and INDIA stressed NBSAPs as central tools for collaboration on the implementation of the Strategic Plan. SOUTH AFRICA proposed "urging," rather than "inviting," parties to strengthen cooperation and synergy among convention focal points and other partners to enhance capacity and "to avoid duplication of activities and further enhance the effective use of resources in utilizing NBSAP as central tool for such collaboration."

**ENGAGEMENT WITH BUSINESS:** IUCN, with JAPAN, highlighted the first meeting of the Global Partnership for Business and Biodiversity held in Tokyo in December 2011. JORDAN suggested encouraging businesses to adopt core principles for biodiversity conservation. CANADA proposed language emphasizing the role of business in pursuing sustainable development and biodiversity conservation goals. Noting that voluntary standards are not a substitute for binding rules and regulations, the PHILIPPINES proposed to "adopt policies that halt biodiversity loss." ARGENTINA expressed concern that certification and standard schemes might present barriers to trade. MOROCCO invited international organizations and donors to increase cooperation on resource mobilization. On inviting parties to adopt biodiversity-friendly policies to leverage market forces, VENEZUELA proposed "to take into account" rather than "adopt." The EU welcomed progress, highlighted useful information on incentive measures and suggested summarizing best practices on business engagement for COP 11.

GHANA offered text calling on business to adopt the revised International Finance Corporation (IFC) Performance Standard 6 on biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of living natural resources, and inviting parties to enforce biodiversity-friendly policies. BURKINA FASO suggested that biodiversity-friendly policies include the use of sustainable

products. GHANA, ETHIOPIA and EcoNexus said the document should recognize the negative impacts of business on biodiversity.

ETHIOPIA, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO), and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) urged further collaboration between national focal points of the biodiversity-related conventions.

### **MULTI-YEAR PLAN OF ACTION FOR SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION ON BIODIVERSITY FOR DEVELOPMENT**

The Secretariat introduced the relevant document on the updated Multi-Year Plan of Action for South-South Cooperation (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/10) and invited delegates to consider linkages between this item and the review of progress in providing support to parties in the context of the Strategic Plan and Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

REPUBLIC of KOREA underscored the findings of the Third Expert Meeting on South-South Cooperation, and noted value of the CHM; efficient technology transfer; collaboration among scientific and technical partners; and building capacity for the review of NBSAPs and other commitments of the Convention.

JORDAN said that south-south and tripartite cooperation are crucial for linking the sustainable use of biodiversity with poverty reduction and economic and social development, and called on funders to provide material support for the Steering Committee on South-South Cooperation. The EU supported south-south cooperation for achieving the Strategic Plan and cross-thematic work of the Convention but said that a Multi-Year Plan of Action is not ready for adoption at COP 11. JAPAN said that cooperation could be enhanced through voluntary activities.

### **CONTACT GROUP ON STRATEGIC PLAN AND RELATED MATTERS**

Delegates reconvened in a contact group on the implementation of the Strategic Plan and related matters. The session proceeded slowly, as delegates debated whether to "emphasize" or "bear in mind" challenges to setting implementation targets. Eventually delegates agreed "to take challenges into account." Delegates also debated whether to request parties and others to provide continued or additional support for NBSAPs and stakeholder consultations on targets and indicators.

### **IN THE CORRIDORS**

It was not just the rain in Montreal that set the tone of the meeting as delegates reconvened in plenary to discuss a message to bring to Rio. With as many as 400 paragraphs that the "informal informal" consultations on the Rio+20 process did not succeed in agreeing to, participants wondered whether there was room for a message from the CBD and what kind of attention it would get. That said, most of the delegates expressed the view that biodiversity conservation is key to sustainable development and thus a "punchy" political message is of utmost importance. Returning to the WGRI agenda, delegates have plenty to do here to make progress on implementation. But at least one insider was left wondering, based on the lethargic mood, if "we have already decided we are not going to accomplish anything" in terms of resource mobilization. "This week's contact groups will be telling," said another, "there's a lot to bear in mind." Delegates had plenty of time to ponder their level of ambition, as Tuesday's meeting adjourned one and a half hour after the beginning of the session.

## WGRI 4 HIGHLIGHTS: WEDNESDAY, 9 MAY 2012

Throughout the day, contact groups met on financing for biodiversity and the Strategic Plan and related issues. The contact group on financing for biodiversity considered a first reading of a non-paper on the Strategy for Resource Mobilization. In the afternoon, the group considered a non-paper on review of guidance to the GEF. The group reconvened briefly in the evening to review the revised non-paper on the Strategy for Resource Mobilization.

The contact group on the Strategic Plan and related issues considered non-papers on the Strategic Plan and the Clearing-House Mechanism; CBD's message to Rio+20; and biodiversity and development. The contact group reconvened in the evening to finalize text on biodiversity and development. Co-Chair Bignell announced that the non-paper on south-south cooperation would be forwarded to WGRI plenary as a CRP.

### **CONTACT GROUP ON FINANCING FOR BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION:**

In the morning, the contact group, chaired by Ines Verleye (Belgium) and M.F. Farooqui (India), considered a first reading of a non-paper on review of implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization. Argentina, for GRULAC, said ongoing discussions on mobilization need to result in a clear commitment by parties, cannot be discussed apart from the Strategic Plan and are necessary for further discussion on mobilization and benefit sharing. JAPAN said it was vital to mobilize all public and private resources and explore all options, including innovative financing, and that recent global economic challenges must be taken into account when considering funding target levels. ECUADOR emphasized that countries need greater resources in developing countries to enhance capacity and increase effectiveness of international and national financial flows.

On country-level resource mobilization strategies, CANADA, with JAPAN, proposed replacing "funding targets" with "resource mobilization" since targets are only one component of COP 11 discussion. GUATEMALA noted the difficulty for finance ministries to mobilize resources for biodiversity rather than traditional outlets. On the proposal to establish a finance portal on biodiversity, GHANA highlighted that not everyone has internet access and thus it is important to find other means through which countries can have access to information on financing. Parties then debated the nature of the portal and what kind of resources need to be leveraged, whether solely financial or human and technical as well. On the funding gap for the

targets, SWITZERLAND proposed referencing synergies as a way of bridging the funding gap. On organizing regional and expert workshops, AUSTRALIA proposed adding "based on availability of resources."

On the operative text, on new and innovative financing mechanisms, CANADA proposed language from the Strategy on Resource Mobilization from CBD COP 9 calling for the exploration of new and innovative financial mechanisms to support the objectives of the Convention.

CANADA, MEXICO, GUATEMALA and BRAZIL said it was premature to encourage parties to consider the recommendations of the High-Level Panel on Global Assessment of Resources for implementing the Strategic Plan before those recommendations have been made. The EU suggested acknowledging the panel's "initial findings" instead of considering its recommendations. Delegates agreed to replace the use of the term "innovative financing mechanisms" with "biodiversity financing mechanisms." The EU said parties should be encouraged but not urged to integrate needs assessments into decisions on funding targets.

Countries differed over whether to invite parties to provide "continued" or "additional" funds, with the EU and CANADA favoring the former and ECUADOR, BRAZIL and ZAMBIA preferring the latter. UKRAINE said that resources should be directed to economies in transition, in addition to developing countries. CANADA, NORWAY and the EU, opposed by GUATEMALA, strongly supported the further use and development of existing systems for reporting resource mobilization, including the "Rio Markers" and systems for reporting overseas development assistance.

**REVIEW OF GUIDANCE TO THE GEF:** Co-Chair Farooqui introduced a non-paper on review of guidance to the GEF, saying it incorporated views from plenary. On the fourth review of the effectiveness of the GEF, CANADA suggested alternative text urging the Executive Secretary "to examine reallocating funds within existing resources and to complete this review before CBD COP 11." Regarding the request to revise NBSAPs, GHANA, supported by ECUADOR, highlighted that past amounts earmarked for NBSAPs were more than halved before delivery and so all future references to requests for "additional resources" should be considered in this context. DENMARK, with MEXICO, proposed that the programme priorities also take into account the Nagoya Protocol. Regarding capacity building, delegates agreed to "strengthening capacity building initiatives," based on GHANA and SOUTH AFRICA's proposals.

On the operative text, CANADA, supported by the EU, proposed to delete paragraphs inviting the GEF to diversify and intensify its contributions and prioritize funding of the Strategic Plan, given that the recommendation to adopt the four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities for 2014-2018 incorporates such paragraphs. Discussions ensued on whether to recognize the increase of funds made available under GEF-5 while asking for an increase in financial contributions during the GEF-6 period.

On GEF allocation of financial resources, the EU expressed concerns regarding equity in the GEF resource allocation system. INDIA and NORWAY proposed adding language referring to allocating resources as a way to optimize global environmental benefits. BRAZIL and others proposed deleting the paragraph.

During the second reading of the paragraph on facilitating the mobilization of financial resources beyond the replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund, CANADA, backed by SWITZERLAND, favored replacing “GEF, regional development banks, and the Conference of the Parties” with “GEF, its network of implementing agencies, other international financial institutions and development organizations, national governments, and the private sector.” On the fourth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism, MEXICO proposed, and delegates agreed, adding a paragraph to reflect the fact that regular reviews of the effectiveness of the mechanism have not been carried out because of a lack of funding.

#### **CONTACT GROUP ON THE STRATEGIC PLAN AND OTHER MATTERS**

##### **STRATEGIC PLAN AND CLEARING-HOUSE**

**MECHANISM:** During the morning’s contact group on the Strategic Plan, co-Chair Bignell opened discussion on the non-paper on the CHM and the Strategic Plan. A number of parties made suggestions to streamline the text, while others called for including that actions take place at “national, regional and sub regional levels” throughout the document. On the Secretariat and its partners’ efforts to support parties in implementing the Strategic Plan and achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, ETHIOPIA called for wording that reflects that training modules were prepared. Delegates agreed to these suggestions.

On the work programme of the CHM, MEXICO with GEORGIA and others, called for including the need to build the capacity of national focal points. On establishing information sharing on the CHM, CANADA proposed emphasizing connections between central and national CHMs. JAPAN requested the Secretariat “to implement the work program of the CHM and provide updates.” Delegates agreed to both suggestions. Delegates also agreed to ask the Secretariat to “continue to implement” the use of automated translation tools to facilitate information exchange.

UGANDA proposed deleting text noting the potential contribution of IPBES on cooperation and capacity building for the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan. NORWAY opposed, stressing the importance of noting such synergies and linkages. Delegates retained the paragraph, amended with language, *inter alia*, reaffirming the need for enhanced technical and scientific cooperation, and agreed to move it to the preambular text.

On facilitating technical and scientific cooperation to implement the Strategic Plan, CANADA requested the Secretariat develop “an implementation plan” and “submit” it to SBSTTA and WGRI for review.

KIRIBATI, on behalf of the Pacific Island states, proposed text on a capacity building network of national and regional centres of excellence on south-south and triangular cooperation

to support implementation of the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. MEXICO proposed referring to centres of excellence in “biodiversity.” Delegates welcomed the proposal. JAPAN requested bracketing reference to south-south and triangular cooperation. Delegates agreed to “take into account” such cooperation.

Brazil urged including text that emphasizes the linkages between the Strategic Plan, financial resources, technology transfer and benefit sharing. Delegates then agreed to address the merged text of the two non-papers on the agenda item on implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. A CRP will be prepared for plenary discussion.

**MESSAGE TO RIO+20:** In the afternoon, the discussion on a non-paper on the CBD’s message to Rio+20 focused on the relationship between biodiversity and sustainable development, with JAPAN and CANADA stressing simplicity. Delegates eventually referenced biodiversity as “the fundamental basis for sustainable development” and recognized “implementing the Strategic Plan and achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as essential prerequisites to conserve biodiversity and achieve sustainable development.”

The EU and others supported referring to green economy. BRAZIL, EGYPT and INDIA opposed. PALAU preferred green/blue economy. Delegates agreed to delete references to green and green/blue economy. UGANDA requested text on financing for biodiversity, and ETHIOPIA called for text on climate change. Co-Chair Bignell asked the Secretariat to include one sentence on each, using agreed language. A CRP will be prepared for plenary.

**BIODIVERSITY AND DEVELOPMENT:** In the afternoon, co-Chair Bignell opened discussions on the non-paper on biodiversity and development. On the operative paragraph calling for the Expert Group on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development to continue its work, JAPAN urged including text on “mainstreaming biodiversity into poverty eradication and development processes by fulfilling the three objectives of the Convention.”

EGYPT queried the meaning of “customary and traditional user rights.” The PHILIPPINES noted that these are unwritten laws and customs that are still respected. Participants agreed to confer to reach an agreement.

#### **IN THE CORRIDORS**

As Montreal weather vacillated between gloomy rain and optimistic sun, so did the moods and pace of delegates. Delegates rapidly agreed on text during Wednesday morning, suggesting that Tuesday’s early ending may have allowed exhausted SBSTTA-WGRI delegates a bit of rejuvenation. While some delegates admitted to “counting down the days until I’m home,” referring to the long stretch of UN biodiversity events, participants generally showed a commitment to approve text and compromise when necessary. Colorful discussions on the green economy versus the blue economy dominated the afternoon’s discussions in the contact group on the Strategic Plan and the CBD message to Rio+20. However, there was no pot of gold at the end of this rainbow, due to the lack of clarity on what a green or blue economy actually is, and what it entails. Overall, while delegates occasionally got stuck in the mud, debating alternative text in non-papers in both working groups, the general sentiment was expressed by one large group member that said “we’re all very optimistic that, sooner or later, we will get to a nice agreement.”

## WGRI 4 HIGHLIGHTS: THURSDAY, 10 MAY 2012

In the morning plenary, the chairs of the contact groups reported on progress in their sessions, with Co-Chair Bignell noting the “good spirit and humor” in CG I and Co-Chair Verleye commenting on CG II’s “good collaboration and good progress.” Co-Chair Bignell noted the completion of all issues in CG I, with the exception of some brackets that “are likely better addressed in COP 11.” Chair Hosino then encouraged delegates not to “go into details or heavy negotiation” on bracketed text. Before adjourning, Yeon-chul Yoo presented the REPUBLIC OF KOREA’s bid to host CBD COP 12. He emphasized the Republic of Korea’s commitment to contribution and balance in: terrestrial and marine conservation; traditional knowledge and modern science; and common ground between developed and developing countries in biodiversity conservation.

A Friends of the Chair group then met to discuss Somalia’s request to compile information on the impact of military conflicts on biodiversity.

In the afternoon, the contact group on financing for biodiversity met to review non-papers on the Strategy for Resource Mobilization and the Financial Mechanism.

In the evening, the plenary reconvened to consider CRPs on the engagement of business, cooperation with other conventions, the message to Rio+20 and south-south cooperation.

### MORNING PLENARY

#### STRATEGIC PLAN AND AICHI BIODIVERSITY

**TARGETS:** The Secretariat introduced UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/CRP.3 on implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. On WGRI’s recommendation to the COP, delegates’ interventions focused on a section on further support for revision and update of NBSAPs, which included brackets on “continued” and “additional” support. The EU preferred parties and other governments “continue to provide support for” revision and updating of NBSAPs “and to provide additional support” to enhance stakeholder consultations. BRAZIL proposed “to continue to provide and at the same time increase support for” the revision and update of NBSAPs. The Chair asked the EU, BRAZIL and ZAMBIA to consult on this issue. ZAMBIA proposed that all suggested language remain in brackets.

Delegates also discussed a link to IPBES in relation to capacity building, with the EU requesting the Secretariat to collaborate with IPBES as appropriate, opposed by CHINA, but supported by NORWAY, BRAZIL, ARGENTINA, MEXICO, PERU, AUSTRALIA, COLOMBIA and SAUDI ARABIA. CHINA proposed requesting the Executive Secretary to “strengthen North-South cooperation” in addition to helping to establish a capacity-building network of national and regional centers of excellence in biodiversity.

GUATEMALA suggested a new paragraph requesting the Executive Secretary to support the consolidation of IPBES, but the EU, JAPAN and others opposed, saying this issue was adequately covered in SBSTTA 16 and elsewhere. BURKINA FASO noted the Executive Secretary should be requested to “promote the implementation,” rather than “implement,” the strategy for the UN Decade on Biodiversity.

Following an informal consultation with JAPAN, CANADA, SOUTH AFRICA, YEMEN and the EU, SOMALIA proposed an additional paragraph requesting the Executive Secretary to “compile information on the impact of military conflicts on biodiversity.”

MEXICO, with BRAZIL, expressed concern with delays, lack of debate, and remaining brackets on text on further funding for NBSAPs and on urging effective commitment of developed country parties. He highlighted the need to make links between the Strategic Plan and resource mobilization, and the importance of removing brackets to have a clear direction on financing, with BRAZIL reiterating that discussions should not be avoided.

**BIODIVERSITY AND DEVELOPMENT:** The Secretariat introduced UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/CRP.5 on the report of the Expert Meeting on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development.

ETHIOPIA, supported by the EU, noted that the title of the document should not be “Report of the Expert Group.” The EU proposed deleting “report” in the title. SOUTH AFRICA proposed deleting “when appropriate” from the paragraph asking parties to make available through the CHM best practices on integrating biodiversity into poverty eradication and development. ARGENTINA objected. They agreed to “as appropriate.” GHANA proposed, and delegates agreed, that the Expert Group complete its work by COP 12. BURKINA FASO suggested that the Executive Secretary “transmit” instead of “compile” the report on the progress of the Expert Group. With this amendment, the CRP was accepted.

**CONTACT GROUP ON FINANCING FOR BIODIVERSITY**

M.F. Farooqui (India) opened the afternoon's discussion on the revised non-paper on the financial mechanism, Ines Verleye (Belgium) then chaired discussion on the non-paper on the Strategy for Resource Mobilization.

**FINANCIAL MECHANISM:** On the text requesting the GEF to implement a four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities for the period 2014-2018 and report back to COP 13, delegates agreed to delete text on the details of programme priorities, as this could be considered "micro management." Delegates also agreed to delete text that implied that GEF provides funds, as opposed to its true function of allocating funds provided by donors.

Delegates then agreed to text requesting consideration of the high-level panel on financing for biodiversity and other relevant technical information on the costs of implementing the Strategic Plan when further developing the report on the needs assessment of funds required from GEF-6.

**STRATEGY FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION:** On applying a preliminary reporting framework to be adopted by COP 11, delegates agreed to invite parties to submit information on applying the framework. The EU, supported by NORWAY and SWITZERLAND, proposed using a tentative baseline of either the average of annual biodiversity funding for 2006-2010 "or a single year during this period." NORWAY stressed flexibility. SWITZERLAND recognized a solid baseline would be needed in the future but highlighted that this baseline is tentative. ECUADOR and others preferred retaining an average only. CANADA proposed, and delegates agreed, including the EU's proposal and bracketing baseline language.

On urging parties to consider all possible resources to meet resource allocations, delegates considered three options, focusing on a previous Brazilian proposal. BRAZIL said "sources" include public and private resources. MEXICO suggested considering "all possible sources and needs." The EU preferred "mobilization" rather than "allocation" and proposed "resources" instead of "sources." ECUADOR, SOUTH AFRICA and BRAZIL preferred "required" rather than "adequate." MEXICO suggested "needed" resources as a compromise. ZAMBIA, supported by the AFRICAN GROUP, requested, and delegates agreed, deleting "mobilization." Delegates agreed to urge parties to consider all possible sources and means to meet levels of resource needed.

The EU, opposed by ARGENTINA, requested the Secretariat develop guiding principles and safeguards for the use of innovative financing mechanisms, taking into account the Quito Seminar and a forthcoming Montreal workshop. NORWAY agreed, noting a range of examples, experiences and the Quito outcomes that could be used. BRAZIL suggested that the Secretariat prepare a document, expressing concern about time needed to develop guiding principles. SOUTH AFRICA said there was not sufficient time before COP 11. CANADA supported the text and recalled Decision X/3 inviting parties and others to submit information on innovative financial mechanisms that have the potential to generate new and additional resources and requesting the Secretariat to synthesize submitted information. Following discussions over, *inter alia*, reference to the Quito Seminar on Scaling up Biodiversity Finance and the forthcoming Montreal workshop, delegates agreed to compromise on text requesting the Secretariat to prepare a synthesis report for COP 11, taking into consideration the party submissions and other sources of information.

**EVENING PLENARY**

**MESSAGE TO RIO+20:** Delegates considered document UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/CRP.6 on the Message to Rio+20 and adopted it with minor amendments, including the addition of a title "Living in Harmony with Nature."

**COOPERATION WITH OTHER CONVENTIONS:** Delegates considered and adopted, with minor amendments, UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/CRP.2 on cooperation with other conventions. The EU introduced two new paragraphs: one highlighting the contribution of the Environment Management Group; and another stressing the role of NBSAPs in developing a coherent approach at the national level, and encouraging parties to incorporate the objectives of the biodiversity-related conventions and Rio Conventions into NBSAPs, with ETHIOPIA adding "as appropriate." GUATEMALA proposed that parties should also "support the objectives with all sources and means available."

MEXICO proposed a paragraph welcoming the establishment of IPBES and encouraging the platform to support the implementation of the Convention by providing information. ETHIOPIA said that IPBES should also provide capacity building.

**SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION:** Delegates considered UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/CRP.4 on the Multi-Year Plan of Action for South-South Cooperation on Biodiversity for Development and agreed to it with amendments. Some text remains in brackets. CHINA noted that the wording in the operative paragraph recalling Decision X/23 is not consistent with the Decision, since the Decision does not refer to the Multi-Year Plan of Action. ARGENTINA proposed "welcoming" the invitation to establish a trust fund for the implementation of the Strategic Plan and the Multi-Year Plan of Action. NORWAY and the Secretariat proposed alternative text, but no agreement was reached and the text was bracketed.

**ENGAGEMENT OF BUSINESS:** Delegates considered UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/CRP.1 on engagement of business and agreed to most of the preambular paragraphs with minor changes. Discussion will continue on Friday morning.

**IN THE CORRIDORS**

On the eve of the final day, participants were left with questions: was WGRI 4 successful, and was substantial work left to COP 11? While the delegates' mood mirrored the weather, which turned rainy again, issues clouding progress on the financial mechanisms were resolved more easily than anticipated. Contentious issues, such as paragraphs on innovative financial mechanisms in the text on resource mobilization, were dealt with superficially and left largely for COP 11 to resolve. Some participants indeed suggested that this strategy of delaying contentious decisions to COP 11 was not accidental but a recognition of the political decision-making role of the COP. A flash flood of productivity won't save WGRI 4 from the doldrums. Decisions will leave the Secretariat with a hail storm of tasks in the months leading up to COP 11, and COP 11 participants with many outstanding substantial decisions. But hopefully the skies will clear for a successful COP 11, despite foreboding signs at WGRI 4.

**ENB SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:** The *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* summary and analysis of WGRI 4 will be available on Monday, 14 May 2012 online at: <http://www.iisd.ca/biodiv/wgri4/>

**SUMMARY OF THE FOURTH MEETING  
OF THE AD HOC OPEN-ENDED  
WORKING GROUP ON THE REVIEW OF  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION  
ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY:  
7-11 MAY 2012**

The fourth meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Open-ended Working Group on the Review of Implementation (WGRI 4) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) convened at the headquarters of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) in Montreal, Canada, from 7-11 May 2012.

WGRI 4 adopted eight recommendations that will be submitted to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the CBD, to be held from 8-19 October 2012, in Hyderabad, India. The recommendations address: the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets; the Strategy for Resource Mobilization; the Financial Mechanism (GEF); the message to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20); cooperation with other conventions; biodiversity for poverty eradication and development; engagement of business; and South-South cooperation.

**A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CONVENTION**

The CBD entered into force on 29 December 1993. There are currently 193 parties to the Convention, which aims to promote the conservation of biodiversity, the sustainable use of its components, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources. The COP is the governing body of the Convention. It is assisted by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA), which is mandated, under CBD Article 25, to provide the COP with advice relating to the Convention's implementation. COP 7 in 2004 established the WGRI with the mandate to address a range of implementation-related issues, such as progress in the implementation of the CBD's successive Strategic Plans and impacts and effectiveness of existing CBD processes.

**COP 1:** At its first meeting (November - December 1994, Nassau, the Bahamas), the COP set the general framework for the Convention's implementation by establishing the Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) and SBSTTA and by designating the Global Environment Facility (GEF) as the interim financial mechanism.

**COP 2:** At its second meeting (November 1995, Jakarta, Indonesia), the COP adopted a decision on marine and coastal biodiversity (the Jakarta Mandate) and established the Open-ended *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Biosafety to elaborate a protocol on biosafety, specifically focusing on transboundary movement of living modified organisms (LMOs) that may have an adverse effect on biodiversity.

**COP 3:** At its third meeting (November 1996, Buenos Aires, Argentina), the COP adopted work programmes on agricultural and forest biodiversity, as well as a Memorandum

**IN THIS ISSUE**

A Brief History of the Convention . . . . .	1
WGRI 4 Report . . . . .	2
Implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and Progress Towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets . . . . .	3
Resource Mobilization . . . . .	5
Message to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) . . . . .	6
Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development.	7
Cooperation with other Conventions . . . . .	7
Engagement of Business . . . . .	8
Multi-Year Plan of Action for South-South Cooperation on Biodiversity for Development. . . . .	8
Closing Plenary . . . . .	9
A Brief Analysis of WGRI 4 . . . . .	9
Upcoming Meetings. . . . .	11
Glossary . . . . .	12

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Catherine Benson, Kate Louw, Chad Monfreda, Tanya Rosen and Liz Willetts. The Digital Editor is Francis Dejon. The Editors are Deborah Davenport, Ph.D., and Pamela S. Chasek, Ph.D. <pam@iisd.org>. The Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The Sustaining Donors of the *Bulletin* are the European Commission (DG-ENV), the Government of the United States of America (through the Department of State Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs), the Government of Canada (through CIDA), the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), and the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU). General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2012 is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Government of Australia, the Ministry of Environment of Sweden, the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, SWAN International, the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Japanese Ministry of Environment (through the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies - IGES), the Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (through the Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute - GISPRI), and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Funding for translation of the *Bulletin* into French has been provided by the Government of France, the Belgium Walloon Region, the Province of Québec, and the International Organization of the Francophone (OIF and IEPF). The opinions expressed in the *Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD or other donors. Excerpts from the *Bulletin* may be used in non-commercial publications with appropriate academic citation. For information on the *Bulletin*, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services at <kimo@iisd.org>, +1-646-536-7556 or 300 East 56th St., 11D, New York, NY 10022, United States of America.

of Understanding with the GEF, and called for an intersessional workshop on Article 8(j) and related provisions.

**COP 4:** At its fourth meeting (May 1998, Bratislava, Slovakia), the COP established a Working Group on Article 8(j) and a panel of experts on access and benefit sharing (ABS), adopted the Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI) and a work programme on marine and coastal biodiversity, and took decisions on inland water, agricultural and forest biodiversity, and cooperation with other agreements.

**EXCOP:** Following six meetings of the Biosafety Working Group between 1996 and 1999, delegates at the first Extraordinary Meeting of the COP (ExCOP) (February 1999, Cartagena, Colombia) did not agree on a compromise package to finalize negotiations on a biosafety protocol, and the meeting was suspended. The resumed ExCOP (January 2000, Montreal, Canada) adopted the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and established the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to undertake preparations for COP/MOP 1. The Protocol addresses the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs that may have an adverse effect on biodiversity, taking into account human health, with a specific focus on transboundary movements.

**COP 5:** At its fifth meeting (May 2000, Nairobi, Kenya), the COP adopted work programmes on dry and sub-humid lands and on agricultural biodiversity and decisions on ABS, Article 8(j) (traditional knowledge), the ecosystem approach, sustainable use, biodiversity and tourism, invasive alien species (IAS), incentive measures, GTI, and the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC).

**COP 6:** At its sixth meeting (April 2002, The Hague, the Netherlands), the COP adopted the Convention's Strategic Plan for 2002-2010, including the target to reduce significantly the rate of biodiversity loss by 2010. The meeting also adopted: an expanded work programme on forest biodiversity; the Bonn Guidelines on ABS; guiding principles for IAS; the GSPC; a work programme for the GTI; and decisions on incentive measures and Article 8(j).

**COP 7:** At its seventh meeting (February 2004, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia), the COP adopted work programmes on mountain biodiversity, protected areas (PAs), and technology transfer and cooperation, and mandated the Working Group on ABS to initiate negotiations on an international regime on ABS. The COP also adopted: a decision to review implementation of the Convention, its Strategic Plan and progress towards achieving the 2010 target; the Akwé: Kon Guidelines for cultural, environmental and social impact assessments; the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for sustainable use; and decisions on Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA), incentive measures, inland waters, and marine and coastal biodiversity.

**COP 8:** At its eighth meeting (March 2006, Curitiba, Brazil), the COP adopted a work programme on island biodiversity and decisions on a range of issues including: Article 8(j); CEPA; cooperation with other conventions and private sector engagement; PAs, including high seas PAs; incentive measures; biodiversity and climate change; and forest, marine and coastal,

and agricultural biodiversity. COP 8 reaffirmed the COP 5 ban on the field-testing of genetic use restriction technologies, and instructed the ABS Working Group to complete its work with regard to an international regime on ABS at the earliest possible time before COP 10.

**COP 9:** At its ninth meeting (May 2008, Bonn, Germany), the COP adopted: a roadmap for the negotiation of the international ABS regime before the 2010 deadline; scientific criteria and guidance for marine areas in need of protection; and the Resource Mobilization Strategy for the Convention. It established the *Ad Hoc* Technical Working Group on Biodiversity and Climate Change, and adopted decisions concerning a wide range of issues, including biofuels, genetically modified trees, PAs, and language cautioning against ocean fertilization.

**WGRI 3:** The third meeting of the CBD Working Group on the Review of Implementation of the Convention (WGRI) (May 2010, Nairobi), adopted twelve recommendations to COP 10, including: an updated and revised strategic plan for the post-2010 period, which remained bracketed pending resolution of financial issues and negotiations on ABS; a proposed UN Decade on Biodiversity 2011-2020; business engagement; a proposed biodiversity technology initiative; the multi-year programme of work of the Convention for the period 2011-2020; integration of biodiversity into poverty eradication and development; and a science-policy interface on biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well being.

**COP 10:** At its tenth meeting (October 2010, Nagoya, Japan), the COP adopted as a package: the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization; the CBD Strategic Plan for the period 2011-2020, including a mission, strategic goals and the Aichi Targets aiming to inspire broad-based action by parties and stakeholders; and a decision on activities and indicators for the implementation of the Resource Mobilization Strategy adopted at COP 9. The COP also adopted over 40 decisions, including on: inland water biodiversity, sustainable use, climate change and biodiversity, GTI, IAS, and ways and means to improve SBSTTA's effectiveness.

## WGRI 4 REPORT

On Monday, 7 May 2012, on behalf of Ryu Matsumoto, President of the COP, Kazuaki Hosino (Japan) highlighted the importance of the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. New CBD Executive Secretary Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias noted that this meeting and the twelve tabled draft recommendations represent the first opportunity for parties to review progress towards the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. He highlighted challenges in implementing the Convention, including the mismatch between commitments and implementation, and encouraged more focused negotiations at the next COP. He called for consideration of: integrating cross-cutting issues; reducing the complexity of the CBD portfolio; revising National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs); strategic resource mobilization; efficient monitoring of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets; support for least

developed countries (LDCs) and small island developing states (SIDS); community-based approaches to conservation and sustainable use to complement work on protected areas; and the timely ratification of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization.

Delegates adopted the agenda and organization of work (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/1 and Add.1/Rev.1) without amendments. Snežana Prokić (Serbia) was elected as rapporteur.

This report summarizes discussions and recommendations on each agenda item.

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020 AND PROGRESS TOWARDS THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS**

Delegates considered documents on review of progress in implementation of the Strategic Plan and review of progress in providing support to parties in the context of the Strategic Plan and Aichi Biodiversity Targets in plenary on Monday, Thursday and Friday and in Contact Group I, co-chaired by Spencer Thomas (Grenada) and Andrew Bignell (New Zealand), on Tuesday and Wednesday (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/2 and UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/3). Delegates initially discussed separate non-papers on the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and then agreed to discuss a merged text. Delegates debated a number of issues, *inter alia*: the relationship among the Strategic Plan, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and other agenda items; implementation levels; the Clearing-House Mechanism (CHM); progress in updating NBSAPs; and capacity building.

Several parties stressed the relationship among the Strategic Plan, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and other agenda items are closely related. Zambia called for jointly addressing the implementation of the Strategic Plan and resource mobilization, and Mexico highlighted the need for formal linkages between the Strategic Plan and resource mobilization. Brazil advocated including text that emphasizes the linkages between the Strategic Plan, financial resources, technology transfer and benefit sharing. Republic of Korea recognized the importance of integrating the Aichi Biodiversity Targets into national strategies to strengthen the legal basis for their implementation. The European Union (EU), on behalf of its 27 member states, supported developing a holistic approach to ongoing initiatives aimed at achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, rather than proposing new ones. Canada urged that the draft recommendations closely follow COP 10 Decision X/2 on the Strategic Plan. Switzerland, supported by Uganda, proposed text requesting parties to participate in a peer review process on the status of implementation of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, to be agreed before 2015.

Delegates discussed the appropriate level of implementation for various activities mentioned in the documents. Norway, with Yemen, stressed partnership and cooperation at all levels to meet the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Guatemala and Venezuela underscored that national strategies should take a bottom-up approach and prioritize benefits to local communities. Mexico stressed the need to disseminate information to the appropriate

levels. A number of parties called for including that actions take place at “national, regional and subregional levels” throughout the document.

On the CHM work programme in support of the Strategic Plan, Jordan, supported by Sudan, called for establishing focal points to facilitate information exchange. Mexico and Peru said the CHM should consist of a website as well as a network of experts for decision-making. Canada proposed emphasizing connections between central and national CHMs. Burundi asked the Secretariat to help increase the visibility of national CHMs. Japan requested the Secretariat to implement the work programme of the CHM and provide updates. Delegates also agreed to ask the Secretariat to “continue to implement” the use of automated translation tools to facilitate information exchange.

Many countries noted their lack of progress in updating NBSAPs, citing lack of financing and capacity. Georgia, on behalf of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), called for more capacity-building activities. Mexico, with Georgia and others, called for building the capacity of national focal points. Botswana noted that support is especially needed on various thematic issues, including the Nagoya Protocol and The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) study. Burkina Faso expressed concern regarding the GEF’s slow process of allocating funds for implementing the Strategic Plan. The International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB) bemoaned the lack of mainstreaming of community-based natural resource management and sustainable use in NBSAPs.

Many countries recognized the exemplary contributions that had been made through the Japan Biodiversity Fund, with Japan highlighting his country’s support for capacity building in developing countries. Many interventions focused on “continued,” “additional,” and/or “increased” support for revision and update of NBSAPs. The EU preferred that parties and other governments “continue to provide support for” revision and updating of NBSAPs and “provide additional support” to enhance stakeholder consultations. Brazil proposed “to continue to provide and at the same time increase support for” the revision and update of NBSAPs.

On Wednesday, in the contact group, Kiribati, on behalf of the Pacific Island States, proposed a capacity-building network of national and regional centers of excellence on South-South and triangular cooperation to support implementation of the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Mexico proposed referring to centers of excellence in “biodiversity.” Delegates welcomed the proposal but debated whether to “take into account” South-South and triangular cooperation. Japan suggested urging the establishment of “a capacity-building network of national and regional centers of excellence, taking into account the promotion of South-South cooperation, supported by North-South cooperation and triangular cooperation.” China suggested text that strengthens North-South cooperation while considering South-South cooperation and triangular cooperation. Following informal consultations, China and Japan agreed to delete references to North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation.

On Thursday, on noting the potential contribution of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) on capacity building, many countries, including the EU, Norway, Brazil, Australia, Saudi Arabia and others, supported requesting the Secretariat to collaborate with IPBES. China objected and proposed requesting the Secretariat to “strengthen North-South cooperation” in addition to helping establish a capacity-building network of national and regional centers of excellence in biodiversity. The EU added that such requests should occur “in collaboration with IPBES, as appropriate.”

In Friday’s plenary, on a paragraph asking the Secretariat to undertake a review of the short- and long-term impacts of conflict and disasters on biodiversity, Mexico favored deleting the text, citing the existence of a formal procedure for introducing new and emerging issues for consideration by the parties. Somalia, who originally proposed the text, urged that it remain in brackets and be left for parties’ consideration at COP 11. Brazil, with Pakistan, called for retaining the text, noting its relevance to the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Mali said that the text should be clarified, so that “conflict” refers only to armed conflict. Following informal consultations, delegates agreed to the text and considered deletion of reference to “short- and long-term” impacts, and text suggestions by Mexico to, *inter alia*, invite the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) Executive Director to integrate this work and ask the Secretariat to submit a report to the next meeting of SBSTTA, in keeping with SBSTTA procedures for considering new and emerging issues.

On highlighting the need for adequate means of implementation, both Brazil and Mexico called for keeping in brackets the entire text on enabling developing countries to implement the Strategic Plan and urging the effective commitment of the developed country parties related to the provision of financial resources, transfer of technology and benefit sharing, for discussion at COP 11. The EU, supported by Canada, Norway and Switzerland, proposed: referring to CBD Article 20 on financial resources in its entirety, rather than only paragraph 4 on the commitments of developed and developing countries; urging “implementation of commitments of all parties;” and deleting “benefit-sharing.” Brazil, supported by Argentina and Uganda, preferred retaining the original text. Delegates adopted the final recommendation with amendments but left phrases on continued and additional financial support and the paragraph on adequate means for implementation bracketed.

**Final Recommendation:** In the recommendation on the Implementation of the Strategic Plan and Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/L.3), the WGRI, *inter alia*:

- emphasizes the importance, and challenges, of setting specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound national targets as a means of implementing the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets; and
- invites parties to report on their plans for and progress on revising and/or updating their NBSAPs and national targets, preferably by 30 June 2012, so that this information can be made available to COP 11.

The WGRI requests the Executive Secretary to, *inter alia*:

- compile relevant information from parties, including revised and updated NBSAPs and examples of best practices related to national targets, and update the information contained in this document and make it available for consideration by COP 11; and
- redouble efforts to promote the Strategic Plan and the Nagoya Protocol at international, regional and subregional events organized or attended by the Secretariat to assist national actions in pursuing ratification or accession of the Nagoya Protocol.

The WGRI recommends that the COP, *inter alia*:

- consider an update of this review in light of information available at COP 11 and issue guidance as appropriate; and
- urge those parties that have not yet done so to develop, revise or update, as appropriate, their NBSAPs in line with the Strategic Plan.

The WGRI further recommends that the COP consider four options, each of which contains bracketed text on continuing to provide additional support and at the same time to increase support, *inter alia*:

- call upon parties and invite others to continue to provide additional support for the revision and updating of NBSAPs, to enhance wider stakeholder consultations for setting national targets and indicators at the national level and to ensure completion and review of NBSAPs in a timely manner [option 1];
- call upon parties and invite others to continue to provide support for the revision and updating of NBSAPs and to provide additional support to enhance wider stakeholder consultations for setting national targets and indicators at the national level, and to ensure completion and review of NBSAPs in a timely manner [option 2];
- call upon parties and invite others to continue to provide and at the same time increase support for the revision and updating of NBSAPs and to provide additional support to enhance wider stakeholder consultations for setting national targets and indicators at the national level, and to ensure completion and review of NBSAPs in a timely manner [option 3]; or
- call upon parties and invite others to continue to provide support for the revision and updating of NBSAPs, to enhance wider stakeholder consultations for setting national targets and indicators at the national level, and to provide additional support to ensure completion and review of NBSAPs in a timely manner [option 4].

The WGRI further recommends that the COP:

- welcome the establishment of the Japan Biodiversity Fund and express its appreciation to Japan for its support to developing countries, particularly the LDCs and SIDS, and countries with economies in transition, in implementing the Strategic Plan and achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets;
- reiterate the request to the Executive Secretary to facilitate the continued exchange of best practices and lessons learned from the preparation, updating and revision of NBSAPs, through appropriate forums and mechanisms, such as the CHM, and strengthened cooperation with regional and subregional

processes, South-South cooperation and voluntary peer-review;

- welcome the work programme for the CHM in support of the Strategic Plan and agree to: keep the work programme for the CHM under review to contribute to the implementation of the Convention and its Strategic Plan and to promote and facilitate technical and scientific cooperation, knowledge sharing and information exchange; strengthen communication with and build capacity of the national focal point for the CHM; call on parties to share information through national CHM or other relevant mechanisms on results from monitoring progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and for projects funded through Articles 20 and 21 of the Convention;
- request the Executive Secretary to establish a standard information-exchange mechanism for the CHM to interconnect the central and national CHMs and use automated translation tools to facilitate exchange of technical and scientific information, in line with Articles 17 and 18 of the Convention;
- request the Executive Secretary to engage in a process towards establishing a capacity-building network of national and regional centers of excellence in biodiversity to support the implementation of the Strategic Plan and achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in developing countries, particularly LDCs and SIDS, and in countries with economies in transition, and to collaborate with IPBES, as appropriate;
- request the GEF, urge parties, in particular developed country parties, and invite donor organizations to support enhanced technical and scientific cooperation and the CHM for implementation of the Strategic Plan;
- request the Executive Secretary to promote the implementation of the Strategy for the UN Decade on Biodiversity; and
- request the Executive Secretary to undertake a review of the short- and long-term impacts of disasters and conflicts on biodiversity and ways and means to take action for implementing the Strategic Plan and achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets under such conditions, and invite the Secretariat to submit a report to the next meeting of SBSTTA in accordance with procedure.

## RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

### REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGY

**FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION:** Delegates discussed resource mobilization (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/6) in plenary on Monday and Friday, and in Contact Group II, co-chaired by Ines Verleye (Belgium) and M.F. Farooqui (India), on Wednesday and Thursday.

In plenary on Monday, Mexico, Senegal and South Africa stressed that adequate finance underpins successful implementation of the Convention. The EU recommended balancing financial with human and technical resources. Ecuador called for “fresh and additional resources,” and Canada noted that resources may have to be leveraged in a more “creative” manner. Peru pointed to opportunities for mobilizing resources

through the private sector and local-level engagement. Brazil, with Guatemala, said flexible financing is important but should not substitute for existing commitments under the Convention.

South Africa, supported by Mexico, Switzerland and Senegal, called for an online finance portal to be established within the GEF, adding that capacity building and technology transfer are crucial to the success of such a portal.

In Wednesday’s contact group, countries differed over whether to invite parties to provide “continued” or “additional” funds, with the EU and Canada favoring the former and Ecuador, Brazil and Zambia preferring the latter. Delegates debated how to urge parties to consider options for meeting resource allocation. Brazil said “sources” include public and private resources. Mexico suggested considering “all possible sources and needs.” The EU preferred “mobilization” rather than “allocation” and proposed “resources” instead of “sources.” Ecuador, South Africa and Brazil preferred “required” rather than “adequate.” Mexico suggested “needed” resources as a compromise. Zambia, supported by the African Group, requested deletion of “mobilization.” Delegates also agreed to urge parties to consider all possible sources and means to meet levels of resources needed.

On Friday, Co-Chair Verleye reported to plenary that all text related to intersessional work on resource mobilization was free of brackets, while brackets remain on some draft decisions that are still “premature,” including on whether to invite the financial mechanism and other institutions to “continue to allocate” or “allocate additional” funds.

Ghana, supported by the Philippines, stressed the urgency of developing the preliminary reporting framework and proposed amending the text accordingly. Brazil agreed on the urgency of the framework but cautioned that decisions on the baseline should be decided at COP 11. Delegates eventually agreed to invite parties to use the preliminary framework to provide information to the Secretariat by the end of June 2012.

Delegates adopted the document on resource mobilization without amendment. The final text retained brackets in four paragraphs.

**Final Recommendation:** In the recommendation on the review of implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/L.7), the WGRI recommends that the COP, *inter alia*:

- encourage parties to undertake institutional mapping/analysis, covering the whole range of biodiversity resourcing options, as part of the process of developing country-specific resource mobilization strategies within the framework of revising their NBSAPs;
- encourage parties to integrate national resource mobilization strategies, including existing needs assessments, into the decision-making process on their funding targets, in order to address the funding gap as soon as possible; and
- urge parties to consider all possible sources and means that can help to meet the level of resources needed, in accordance with Article 20 and consistent with Decision X/3 of the Convention.

**THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM: REVIEW OF GEF-5 AND NEEDS FOR GEF-6:** Delegates discussed the financial mechanism (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/7) in plenary on Monday and Friday, and in contact group II on Wednesday and Thursday. On Monday, Gilles Kleitz (France) provided the plenary with an overview of the first draft of the GEF-6 needs assessment, noting that a final draft will be presented to COP 11. Preliminary results of the needs assessment indicated that between US\$17 billion and US\$41 billion will be needed from GEF-6, including GEF-leveraged funds, to implement the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The EU welcomed the focus on implementation but noted that cost estimates should not be included in the recommendations. Canada said that more analysis is required to put forward a programme for GEF-6. Australia noted a wide funding disparity between GEF-5 and GEF-6, and discussions ensued on whether to recognize the increase of funds made available under GEF-5 while asking for an increase in financial contributions during the GEF-6 period.

With regard to facilitating the mobilization of financial resources beyond the replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund, delegates accepted a proposal from Canada, supported by Switzerland, to replace “GEF, regional development banks, and the Conference of the Parties” with “GEF, its network of implementing agencies, other international financial institutions and development organizations, national governments, and the private sector.”

The contact group agreed to text requesting the expert group conducting the GEF-6 needs assessment to consider the work of the high-level panel on financing for biodiversity and other relevant technical information on the costs of implementing the Strategic Plan. Delegates decided to delete reference to detailed programmatic priorities in text requesting the GEF to implement a four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities for the period 2014-2018 and report back to COP 13.

On Friday, plenary considered the financial mechanism paper as a Conference Room Paper (CRP).

**Final Recommendation:** In the recommendation on the financial mechanism (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/CRP.7), the WGRI recommends that the COP, *inter alia*:

- adopt a four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities for the period 2014-2018 and request the GEF to implement it and report back to COP 13;
- encourage the GEF to further improve the timeliness of providing financial support;
- emphasize that the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets provide the overall framework for the implementation of the Convention for the decade, including for the activities during the period of GEF-6 (2014-2018); and
- take note of the range of funding needs estimated for GEF-6, which includes both what might be provided through the replenishment of the GEF trust fund for the biodiversity focal area as well as what might be provided through other funds leveraged through the financial mechanism.

**MESSAGE TO THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (RIO+20)**

This topic was addressed on Tuesday, Thursday and Friday in plenary, and on Wednesday in Contact Group I. On this issue (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/4 and UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/8) the Secretariat invited delegates to discuss options for sending a technical and/or political message to the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) and to discuss the procedure for its presentation. Executive Secretary Dias reported that the Rio+20 process currently has “too much text” and recommended providing a brief, focused message. Chair Hosino proposed dropping the technical message (Annex I) and retaining the political message (Annex II), and attaching the Strategic Plan to the message.

Many delegates favored sending a single message to Rio+20, stressing the need to include mention of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Strategic Plan. Delegates considered references to, *inter alia*, funding, equitable sharing and access to benefits of genetic resources, conservation of biodiversity for livelihoods and the green economy, and the three objectives of the Convention. Ghana urged stressing that biodiversity should be the primary environmental issue for the global community.

Delegates eventually agreed to reference biodiversity as “the fundamental basis for sustainable development” and recognize “implementing the Strategic Plan and achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as essential prerequisites to conserve biodiversity and achieve sustainable development.”

The final message includes the addition of a title “Living in Harmony with Nature,” and was adopted in plenary on Friday afternoon without amendment.

**Final Recommendation:** In its recommendation (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/L.6), the WGRI invites the President of the COP to deliver the message on the importance of sustainable development, in line with the annex and the Strategic Plan, to Rio+20. It further invites national focal points and others to share the annex and the Strategic Plan with officials in charge of the Rio+20 preparations, to ensure that the importance of biodiversity is fully reflected in national positions.

The annex provides an overview of the importance of biodiversity for sustainable development, highlighting, *inter alia*, that:

- the CBD was opened for signature 20 years ago at the Rio Conference on Environment and Development, recognizing that the earth’s biodiversity forms the basis of our health, cultures, wealth, and our well-being;
- immense progress has been made, leading to the adoption and entry into force of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the Nagoya Protocol and the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress;
- mainstreaming the value of biodiversity into national policies, and in private sector decision-making, has resulted in progress towards sustainable development and poverty eradication;
- the Strategic Plan, including the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, was adopted at COP 10 to assist in safeguarding biodiversity for future generation;

- mobilization of financial resources, from all sources, should increase substantially, but there is a need to ensure that adequate and timely financial resources are mobilized; and
- world leaders should ensure that biodiversity considerations are integrated in all the relevant outcomes of Rio+20.

### **BIODIVERSITY FOR POVERTY ERADICATION AND DEVELOPMENT**

This topic was addressed on Tuesday and Friday in plenary and in the contact group on Wednesday. On Tuesday morning, the Secretariat introduced the item on integrating biodiversity into poverty eradication and development (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/5). M.F. Farooqui (India) provided an overview of the outcomes of the First Expert Meeting on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development that met in Dehradun, India in December 2011. He noted that the Expert Group discussed ways in which to build capacity, mainstream payments for ecosystem services and assign values to natural resources. He said the revised outcomes of the meeting will be submitted for consideration at COP 11.

South Africa underscored the importance of biodiversity for impoverished communities, while Mali stressed the role of traditional knowledge and lessons learned when integrating biodiversity into poverty eradication and development plans. The Philippines proposed mentioning safeguards to ensure traditional user rights in policy and project design. Ghana requested that the Executive Secretary report on progress in mainstreaming poverty eradication and development at COP 12. The EU said the CBD should avoid overlap and duplication with other fora. Brazil, supported by Uruguay, stressed sustainable biotrade, and cautioned against trade barriers. Argentina said the CBD is not the appropriate forum for addressing poverty eradication.

IIFB stressed the role of indigenous peoples, including their right to free, prior and informed consent, in the planning, design, and implementation of biodiversity and development programmes.

On Wednesday afternoon, Japan called for including text on “mainstreaming biodiversity into poverty eradication and development processes by fulfilling the three objectives of the Convention.” Egypt queried the meaning of “customary and traditional user rights” in the text. The Philippines responded that these are unwritten laws and customs that are still respected.

On Thursday morning, Ghana proposed, and delegates agreed, that the Expert Group should complete its work by COP 12. Burkina Faso suggested that the Executive Secretary “transmit” instead of “compile” the report on the progress of the Expert Group.

On Friday, in plenary, the draft recommendation on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development was adopted without amendment.

**Final Recommendation:** In the recommendation (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/L.2), the WGRI recommends the COP, *inter alia*:

- decide that the Expert Group on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development continue its work and submit a report before COP 12 for moving towards a road map for integrating biodiversity into poverty eradication and

- development in the context of the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets;
- encourage all partners and stakeholders to protect and encourage the customary use of biological resources, in accordance with traditional cultural practices that are compatible with conservation or sustainable use requirements;
- request the Executive Secretary to transmit a report on the progress of the Expert Group on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development for consideration at COP 12; and
- invite the UN Development Programme (UNDP) and other relevant organizations to make available best practices on integrating biodiversity into poverty eradication and development through the CHM.

### **COOPERATION WITH OTHER CONVENTIONS**

Delegates discussed cooperation with the other biodiversity-related conventions and Rio conventions (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/8) on Tuesday, Thursday and Friday.

On Tuesday, Mexico highlighted the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora’s (CITES) approach to cooperation with other conventions and called for strengthening coordination and cooperation among multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). He also proposed adding reference to IPBES. Switzerland underscored the crucial importance of cooperation, recognizing the role of the Liaison Group of the Biodiversity-related Conventions in facilitating the implementation of MEAs. The EU, supported by Norway, emphasized that it is timely to focus on cooperation at the national level, with NBSAPs being a key tool for providing national frameworks.

On Thursday, delegates considered and made minor amendments to UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/CRP.2 on cooperation with other conventions.

On Friday, delegates adopted the draft recommendation without amendment.

**Final Recommendation:** In the recommendation (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/L.5), WGRI recommends that the COP, *inter alia*:

- reiterate the importance of cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions and the Rio conventions for achieving full implementation of the CBD and the Strategic Plan;
- welcome the work carried out under the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) and CITES to support parties to incorporate the objectives of these conventions in the revision of their NBSAPs;
- welcome the establishment of IPBES and encourage the platform to provide relevant biodiversity information in order to support the implementation of the objectives of the CBD and the Strategic Plan; and
- stress the role of the NBSAPs in developing a coherent approach at the national level, encouraging parties to incorporate the objectives of the biodiversity related-conventions and the Rio conventions into their revised NBSAPs, as appropriate, and supporting them with all sources and means available.

## ENGAGEMENT OF BUSINESS

Delegates discussed engagement of business (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/9) on Tuesday, Thursday and Friday.

On Tuesday, noting that voluntary standards are not a substitute for binding rules and regulations, the Philippines called for text on adopting policies that halt biodiversity loss. On inviting parties to adopt biodiversity-friendly policies to leverage market forces, Venezuela proposed “to take into account” rather than “adopt.” The EU highlighted useful information on incentive measures and suggested summarizing best practices on business engagement for COP 11. Ghana offered text calling on business to adopt revised International Finance Corporation (IFC) Performance Standard 6, on biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of living natural resources, and inviting parties to enforce biodiversity-friendly policies. Ghana, Ethiopia and EcoNexus said the document on engagement of business should recognize the negative impacts of business on biodiversity.

On Thursday, delegates considered a draft WGRI recommendation on engagement of business (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/CRP.1) and agreed to most of the preambular paragraphs with minor changes.

On Friday, delegates continued discussion on the CRP. In the morning, Guatemala expressed concern that its previous comments on the rights of indigenous peoples had not been included in the document. On preambular text on voluntary standards and certification bodies, Ethiopia, supported by Argentina, Zambia, Ghana and Brazil, proposed deleting “invaluable.” Delegates agreed to this change.

On linkages between biodiversity and environmental sustainability, Ethiopia, supported by Uganda and others, called for a reference to the Convention and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Canada proposed noting the responsibility of business “to take action on” climate change and desertification, rather than “respect.” Brazil preferred, and delegates agreed, to refer to “sustainable development” rather than “environmental sustainability.” On calling upon businesses and other groups to formulate actions for biodiversity conservation, Burkina Faso proposed deleting reference to the Nagoya Protocol. The paragraph remained bracketed. Ghana proposed new text further calling upon businesses to endorse the revised 2012 IFC Performance Standards. Argentina favored “consider” instead of “endorse.” The text was bracketed.

In the afternoon, delegates adopted the recommendation with several amendments and minor text left in brackets. On noting that the engagement with business must assume the three objectives of the Convention, Uganda, supported by Ukraine, proposed replacing “assume” with “taking into account” or “take responsibility for.” Both words were left in brackets. Delegates then agreed to delete the brackets around the reference to the revised 2012 IFC Performance Standards.

On policies that halt biodiversity loss in government procurement policies, Zambia proposed considering policies to reduce incentives, including subsidies, in government procurement policies that are harmful to biodiversity. Ethiopia suggested adding reference to policies “and national legislation.”

The amendment was accepted. Delegates then agreed to delete reference, as suggested by Zambia, to “biodiversity-friendly” policies and to the Nagoya Protocol.

**Final Recommendation:** In its recommendation (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/L.8), WGRI recommends that the COP, *inter alia*:

- call upon businesses to continue liaising with national governments, civil society organizations, academia, and other stakeholders, to formulate relevant actions for biodiversity conservation, for sustainable use of ecosystem services and for the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources, which align with the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets;
- call upon businesses to fully consider the revised 2012 IFC Performance Standards; and
- consider, according to priorities and national circumstances, policies and legislation to reduce incentives, including subsidies harmful to biodiversity in government procurement policies.

WGRI further invites parties to, *inter alia*, promote the full integration of biodiversity and ecosystem services value into private sector activities, taking into account the findings and recommendations of the TEEB for Business Report and the work undertaken in the framework of national ecosystem assessments.

## MULTI-YEAR PLAN OF ACTION FOR SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION ON BIODIVERSITY FOR DEVELOPMENT

Delegates first considered the Multi-Year Plan of Action for South-South Cooperation (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/10) on Tuesday, discussed a CRP on Thursday and considered revised text on Friday in plenary and at a lunchtime Friends of the Chair group.

Republic of Korea underscored the findings of the Third Expert Meeting on South-South Cooperation. Jordan said that South-South and triangular cooperation is crucial for linking the sustainable use of biodiversity with poverty reduction and economic and social development, and called on funders to provide material support for the Steering Committee on South-South Cooperation. The EU supported South-South cooperation for achieving the Strategic Plan and cross-thematic work of the Convention but said that a Multi-Year Plan of Action is not ready for adoption at COP 11. Japan said that cooperation could be enhanced through voluntary activities.

Discussion focused on language on the establishment of a trust fund for the implementation of the Strategic Plan and the Multi-Year Plan of Action. Argentina and Norway then proposed compromise text that welcomes criteria development and invites the GEF to consider establishing a South-South biodiversity cooperation trust fund, which the EU opposed because they wished to retain “reiterate.” This language remains bracketed in the final recommendation.

**Final Recommendation:** In the recommendation on the Multi-Year Plan of Action for South-South Cooperation (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/L.4), WGRI recommends that the COP, *inter alia*:

- welcome the outcomes of the Third Expert Meeting on South-South Cooperation;
- recognize that South-South cooperation, complemented and supported by North-South and triangular cooperation, are

important contributions to the implementation of the Strategic Plan;

- encourage parties and others to implement the Multi-Year Plan of Action for South-South Cooperation in the context of nationally determined priorities, capacities, and needs;
- reiterate its invitation to the GEF to consider establishing a South-South biodiversity cooperation trust fund for the implementation of the Strategic Plan, including the Multi-Year Plan of Action for South-South Cooperation, based on voluntary contributions (this entire sub-paragraph remains bracketed); and
- request the Secretariat to promote South-South cooperation and triangular cooperation as part of a coherent, consistent and coordinated approach to technical and scientific cooperation and information exchange.

### **CLOSING PLENARY**

On Friday, the Rapporteur, Snežana Prokić (Serbia), introduced the draft report (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/4/L.1). The report was adopted with minor amendments.

Chair Hosino thanked delegates for their spirit of cooperation in achieving positive results over the course of the week. CBD Executive Secretary Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias lauded delegates' success, noting that while COP 11 faces many challenges, the results and conclusions of WGRI 4 bodes well for COP 11's success.

Ghana, for the African Group, stressed the importance of reviewing and revising NBSAPs for implementing the CBD, urging continuous support and catalytic action to aid Africa in achieving the 2014 deadline for the revision of NBSAPs. The EU stressed that the NBSAPs underpin implementation of the CBD at the national level. Georgia, for the CIS, outlined the importance of a financial mechanism for achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and said that additional sources will be needed to effectively implement the Strategic Plan. Samoa, for SIDS, urged Rio+20 to address and discuss biodiversity to its fullest. The IIFB called for more involvement of indigenous peoples implementing the CBD in the future. Chair Hosino closed the meeting at 6:07 pm.

## **A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF WGRI 4**

### **THE FOCUS ON IMPLEMENTATION**

The fourth meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (WGRI 4) produced eight outcomes, including recommendations advancing the work on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development, Cooperation with Other Conventions, and producing the CBD's message to Rio+20. Other recommendations tied into financing the Convention's work made less headway.

Awareness of the rapidly approaching 2020 deadline for achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, as set out in the Strategic Plan, has increased attention to implementation. Both of this spring's intersessional CBD meetings—the sixteenth meeting of the CBD's Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical

and Technological Advice (SBSTTA 16) as well as WGRI 4—have recognized implementation is paramount to achieving the 2020 deadline. At WGRI 4, review of implementation of the Strategy on Resource Mobilization was a centerpiece of discussion. However, debates on this and related issues were unusually tame, even “peaceful,” according to some participants. The mild tone called into question the purpose and efficacy of WGRI 4 in the CBD process.

This analysis discusses the outcomes of WGRI 4, focusing on resource mobilization and the emergence of “innovative finance,” and will consider how these outcomes may influence implementation in the lead-up to eleventh Conference of the Parties to the CBD (COP 11) in October 2012.

### **THE WGRI 4 HOLDING PATTERN**

Now that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets have set global conservation priorities, discussions on the means to achieve the Targets can, and indeed may need to, bear more weight. The CBD COP 10 decision on implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization (Decision X/3) provided the foundation for taking first steps in this direction. This Strategy was intended to assure developing countries that funds would be “mobilized” for national level assessments and action plans as called for in the Strategic Plan. WGRI 4 was expected to review the implementation of the Strategy and address issues related to enhancing financial flows with a view to making progress on implementation. Given the circumstances, the content of discussion at WGRI 4 seemed to have the potential to be both urgent and contentious. But, to some participants' surprise, the WGRI 4 negotiations were not only “strangely quiet” but were even somewhat “lethargic” at times.

Hearty whittling, watering down and deferring of text to COP 11 characterized much of the negotiation on financial topics, even those that underpin the expected COP 11 decisions on funding targets. On the reporting framework—a dynamic database of country-level biodiversity and biodiversity funding data—agreement proved elusive on whether the COP should “take note of,” “welcome,” or “adopt” a “preliminary” framework, although parties were invited to build upon it. Other brackets were retained, after little or only brief discussion, on such matters as a funding baseline and whether to “continue to” allocate or to “allocate additional” funds for the reporting process.

Soft language was also used on the issue of South-South cooperation, despite initial speculation that the issue would be a stumbling block. Developed countries are eager to welcome this option as a new funding stream, although some economically robust developing countries oppose it. At WGRI 4, the initial draft recommendation called for COP 11 to adopt a Multi-Year Plan of Action, invite contributions and urge donor support for the implementation of the Plan, and request the GEF to consider establishing a South-South trust fund. However, as adopted, the recommendation only calls for COP 11 to recognize the potential of such a trust fund, encourage parties and others to implement the Plan of Action and request the Executive Secretary to promote the concept. Delegates also seemed strangely

apathetic about a recommendation that the COP urge developed countries to provide “adequate means” and to make “effective commitments” for implementation. The text was bracketed and sent to COP 11.

Despite references to the “good spirit” throughout the week, tempered debates at WGRI 4 appeared to be less about consensus and more about avoiding or deferring difficult issues. Positions on funding—i.e., developing countries needing funds and developed countries hesitancy to provide them—are deeply entrenched. Perhaps delegates, as one insider conjectured, did not want to spend too much energy on contentious issues that could get undone at COP 11. Delegations are also expected to send in their top negotiators to Hyderabad; thus, some parties may have preferred just leaving WGRI 4 with bracketed text than trying to battle it out. Others said “delegates were simply not ready” for the conversations WGRI 4 hosted, hinting at a sense of resignation that big issues, like “continued” vs. “additional” funding were not going to be resolved this week.

Moreover, this stage of implementation decision-making awaits important national-level data-gathering. COP 10 called on COP 11 to decide on funding targets “if” a “robust baseline” and “effective reporting framework” is established. However, an initial paragraph of WGRI 4’s recommendation to the COP on implementing the Strategic Plan “takes into account the challenges” in setting targets, while Executive Secretary Dias welcomed delegates with an acknowledgment that mobilizing resources is “complex.” These complexities cause real and practical holdups in the Secretariat’s 2015 deadline for aggregating indicators based on national-level input and consolidating them into a framework for measuring progress on conservation. According to one seasoned delegate, this work “creates an entire industry.” Another delegate agreed, stating that his country has begun this work and it is “very heavy lifting.” Thus, until robust data can define an “effective reporting framework,” as was called for at COP 10, parties will make slow progress on targets. At this stage, as a contact group chair reported, further negotiations on review of implementation may simply be “premature.” While the developing country claim that funds are needed may sound very familiar, the call for funds must now be answered in some way, or data delays will hold up implementation measures already agreed. One insider suggested that key developed country parties came to WGRI 4 without a clear mandate on implementation. However, continued lack of a mandate would leave the Convention in poor stead if maintained at COP 11.

Translating old funding arguments into new outcomes will be a key issue for COP 11 to address. Given that parties are now responsible for implementing the Strategic Plan, difficult discussions are on the horizon. Perhaps the lethargy, and what some participants perceived as “meager” outcomes, of WGRI 4 reflect a holding pattern for the politics and substance of the CBD. On the other hand, such outcomes may merely reflect a transitional phase as the CBD finally sets in motion its Strategic Plan.

## **CREATIVE FINANCING AND NEW PARADIGMS FOR BIODIVERSITY**

Now that the task of implementation has finally come into stark focus, delegates are embarking on a number of ways to finance the work needed to achieve the Strategic Plan. The need for “cold hard cash,” coupled with slow allocation of Global Environment Facility (GEF) funding and reduced developed country contributions due to the financial crisis, makes alternative, or “innovative,” sources of funding much more important. While many delegates made reference to the need to use all resources possible, others reiterated that South-South cooperation is supplementary and innovative financial mechanisms are secondary to the GEF.

The lack of debate on mobilizing resources from innovative financial mechanisms, which includes payments for ecosystem services, a topic long taboo to parties and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) who are worried about the “marketization of nature,” was also “unexpected and uncharacteristic,” in the words of one delegate. The usual voice against monetary valuation was not even at the meeting, and other parties who had expressed concerns at previous CBD meetings did not elect to speak. After a fairly brief debate, the contact group agreed to invite parties to implement concrete actions and initiatives, including the innovative mechanisms, and to also request the Secretariat to organize workshops “exploring relevant financing mechanisms” and to compile information already requested on the topic for review at COP 11.

The work done outside formal CBD meetings is also telling. Some parties noted the work done behind the scenes on this issue, including at the Quito dialogue seminar on Scaling-Up Biodiversity Finance, the 12 May 2012 workshop on innovative financial mechanisms and other regional and subregional workshops sharing knowledge and perspectives on The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity study (TEEB) for uptake in national biodiversity funding strategies and business practices. This suite of initiatives makes clear that innovative funding is being integrated at multiple levels from the bottom up—implying that a new paradigm for biodiversity conservation is perhaps starting to be put in motion.

Valuation is a complicated undertaking, however, and there are many reasons to be cautious over its adoption. COP 11 will need to reassess and further direct its uptake, and as one party said, “it will not escape the need to have something” on guiding principles and safeguards. However, the Strategic Plan will likely need to rely on new and innovative financing to achieve some of its targets in light of the continued difficult economic situations of many traditional donor parties. COP 11 will need to continue to prioritize such creative options and will likely revisit the issue in review of country-specific resource mobilization strategies.

## **LOOKING AHEAD TO HYDERABAD AND RIO**

Looking ahead to Hyderabad, and based on the lackluster, “visionless” discussions at WGRI 4, delegates are left wondering how resource mobilization discussions have been positioned for COP 11. Although incremental progress will be possible on aspects of resource mobilization, the initial outcomes on the

“preliminary” reporting framework for monitoring progress, with bracketed baselines, may not set COP 11 up to make its expected decisions on funding targets. Old funding debates are also sure to receive heightened pressure as well, since gaps in financial flows will delay further work on data-gathering.

The Rio+20 conference takes place well before COP 11, however, in little more than one month. Can it have a positive effect on addressing these challenges? The CBD’s message to Rio+20, written as a call from 193 parties, urges world leaders to ensure that biodiversity considerations are integrated into future decision-making and punctuates the need for adequate and timely financial resources to be mobilized. Time will tell if it packs the “punch” to bring biodiversity onto an already busy stage.

## UPCOMING MEETINGS

### **Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group Meeting on the Second Assessment and Review of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety:**

The *Ad Hoc* Technical Expert Group Meeting on the Second Assessment and Review of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety will take place in May. **dates:** 14-16 May 2012 **location:** Vienna, Austria **contact:** CBD Secretariat **phone:** +1-514-288-2220 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** secretariat@cbd.int **www:** <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=BSAR-01>

**AEWA MOP 5:** The fifth session of the Meeting of the (MOP 5) to African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA) is organized by the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat. **dates:** 14-18 May 2012 **location:** La Rochelle, France **contact:** UNEP/AEWA Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-24143 **fax:** +49-228-815-2450 **email:** secretariat@cms.int **www:** [http://www.unep-aewa.org/meetings/en/mop/mop5\\_docs/mop5.htm](http://www.unep-aewa.org/meetings/en/mop/mop5_docs/mop5.htm)

**CBD Subregional Workshop on Valuation and Incentive Measures for South America:** Organized by the CBD Secretariat, the UN Development Programme (UNDP) and the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) through its Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean and its Coordinating Office on The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB), this workshop aims to support countries in making use of the findings of the TEEB study, as well as similar work at national or regional levels. **dates:** 15-17 May 2012 **location:** Santiago, Chile **contact:** CBD Secretariat **phone:** +1-514-288-2220 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** secretariat@cbd.int **www:** <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=RWIM-SA-01>

**CBD Regional Workshop on Valuation and Incentive Measures for Eastern Europe and Central Asia:** Organized by the CBD Secretariat, UNEP through its Coordinating Office on TEEB, and IUCN, this workshop seeks to: provide decision makers in Eastern Europe and Central Asia with economic arguments for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity; promote synergies and enhanced cooperation among relevant policy areas and sectors by mainstreaming biodiversity and ecosystem services; and support the revision and review of national biodiversity strategies and action plans in light of the new Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. **dates:** 29-31 May 2012 **location:** Tbilisi, Georgia **contact:**

CBD Secretariat **phone:** +1-514-288-2220 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** secretariat@cbd.int **www:** <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=RWIM-EECASI-01>

**Third Round of Informal-Informal Negotiations on the Zero Draft of the Outcome Document:** This round of informal informal negotiations was announced on 4 May to continue to negotiate the draft outcome document for Rio+20. **dates:** 29 May - 2 June 2012 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** UNCSD Secretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** <http://www.uncsd2012.org/>

**GEF 42nd Council Meeting:** The Global Environment Facility (GEF) Council will meet in June to develop, adopt, and evaluate GEF programmes. Council members meet for three days, twice each year. **dates:** 4-7 June 2012 **location:** Washington, DC, US **contact:** GEF Secretariat **phone:** +1-202-473-0508 **fax:** +1-202-522-3240 **email:** secretariat@thegef.org **www:** <http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/4578>

**African Regional Indigenous and Local Community Preparatory Meeting for CBD COP 11:** This regional workshop aims to increase the number of indigenous and local community (ILC) representatives, with an emphasis on women, effectively involved in the CBD processes, as well as to build their capacity to do so. The workshop will focus on Articles 8(j) (traditional knowledge), 10(c)(customary sustainable use), and related provisions, as well as the Nagoya Protocol on access and benefit-sharing, and aims at preparing ILC representatives for CBD COP 11. **dates:** 12-15 June 2012 **location:** Bujumbura, Burundi **contact:** CBD Secretariat **phone:** +1-514-288-2220 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** secretariat@cbd.int **www:** <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=8J-PREPCOP11COP11-01>

**Third PrepCom for UNCSD:** This meeting will take place in Brazil prior to the UNCSD. **dates:** 13-15 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** UNCSD Secretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** <http://www.uncsd2012.org/>

**Rio Conventions Pavilion at Rio+20:** This event is a collaborative outreach activity of the Secretariats of the Rio Conventions (UNFCCC, UNCCD and CBD), the GEF, and 25 other international, national and local partners. It aims to promote and strengthen synergies between the Rio Conventions at implementation levels by providing a coordinated platform for awareness-raising and information-sharing about the linkages in science, policy and practice between biodiversity, climate change and combating desertification/land degradation. **dates:** 13-22 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** Rio Conventions Pavilion **phone:** +1-514-288-6588 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** info@riopavilion.org **www:** <http://www.riopavilion.org/>

**ICLEI - 2012 World Congress:** This triennial congress will address themes including: green urban economy; changing citizens, changing cities; greening events; and food security and how biodiversity protection can be integrated into municipal planning and decision-making. **dates:** 14-17 June 2012 **location:** Belo Horizonte, Brazil **contact:** ICLEI World Secretariat **phone:** +49 228 97 62 9900 **fax:** +49 228 97 62 9901 **email:** world.congress@iclei.org **www:** <http://worldcongress2012.iclei.org>

**UN Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20):** The UNCSO will mark the 20th anniversary of the UN Conference on Environment and Development (Earth Summit), which convened in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1992. **dates:** 20-22 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** UNCSO Secretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** <http://www.uncsd2012.org/>

**Global Biodiversity Informatics Conference 2012:** The Global Biodiversity Informatics Conference (GBIC) aims to discuss how informatics can best meet the challenges posed by biodiversity science and policy. It will focus on the practical steps needed to provide the information needs of global commitments such as the Aichi 2020 targets to halt biodiversity loss. Attendance at GBIC is by invitation only. **dates:** 2-4 July 2012 **location:** Copenhagen, Denmark **contact:** Conference organizers **email:** gbic2012@gbif.org **www:** [www.gbic2012.org](http://www.gbic2012.org)

**ICNP-2:** The second meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Equitable Sharing of Benefits arising from their Utilization (ABS) will consider guidance to the financial mechanisms and on resource mobilization, and the need for, and modalities of, a global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism. **dates:** 2-6 July 2012 **location:** New Delhi, India **contact:** CBD Secretariat **phone:** +1-514-288-2220 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** [secretariat@cbd.int](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int) **www:** <http://www.cbd.int/icnp2/>

**Ramsar COP 11:** The 11th meeting of the contracting parties (COP 11) to the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat will be preceded by the 44th meeting of Standing Committee planned for 4 July 2012. The broad theme for World Wetlands Day 2012 and COP 11 is "Wetlands, Tourism and Recreation." **dates:** 6-13 July 2012 **location:** Bucharest, Romania **contact:** Ramsar Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-999-0170 **fax:** +41-22-999-0169 **email:** [ramsar@ramsar.org](mailto:ramsar@ramsar.org) **www:** <http://www.ramsar.org>

**62nd Meeting of the CITES Standing Committee:** The CITES Standing Committee provides policy guidance to the Secretariat concerning the implementation of the Convention and oversees the management of the Secretariat's budget; coordinates and oversees, where required, the work of other committees and working groups; carries out tasks given to it by the Conference of the Parties; and drafts resolutions for consideration by the Conference of the Parties. **dates:** 23-27 July 2012 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **phone:** +41-22-917-81-39/40 **fax:** +41-22-797-34-17 **email:** [info@cites.org](mailto:info@cites.org) **www:** <http://www.cites.org/eng/com/sc/index.php>

**Southern Indian Ocean Regional Workshop to Facilitate the Description of Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs):** This workshop aims to facilitate the description of EBSAs through the application of scientific criteria adopted at CBD COP 9 as well as other relevant compatible and complementary nationally and intergovernmentally-agreed scientific criteria, as well as the scientific guidance on the identification of marine areas beyond national jurisdiction. **dates:** 30 July - 3 August 2012 **location:**

Mauritius **contact:** CBD Secretariat **phone:** +1-514-288-2220 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** [secretariat@cbd.int](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int) **www:** <http://www.cbd.int/meetings/>

**IUCN World Conservation Congress 2012:** The Congress theme will be Nature+, a slogan that captures the fundamental importance of nature and its inherent link to every aspect of people's lives, including: nature+climate, nature+livelihoods, nature+energy and nature+economics. **dates:** 6-15 September 2012 **location:** Jeju, Republic of Korea **contact:** IUCN Congress Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-999 0336 **fax:** +41-22-999-0002 **email:** [congress@iucn.org](mailto:congress@iucn.org) **www:** <http://www.iucnworldconservationcongress.org/>

**CBD COP 11:** The agenda for the next meeting of the CBD COP includes consideration of, *inter alia*: the status of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits arising from their Utilization; implementation of the Strategic Plan 2011-2020 and progress towards the Biodiversity Targets; issues related to financial resources and the financial mechanism; and biodiversity and climate change. This meeting will be preceded by the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. **dates:** 8-19 October 2012 **location:** Hyderabad, India **contact:** CBD Secretariat **phone:** +1-514-288-2220 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** [secretariat@cbd.int](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int) **www:** <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=COP-11>

## GLOSSARY

CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CHM	Clearing-house Mechanism
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
COP	Conference of the Parties
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IIFB	International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity
ILCs	Indigenous and local communities
IPBES	Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
NBSAPs	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans
Rio+20	UN Conference on Sustainable Development
SBSTTA	Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice
SIDS	Small island developing states
TEEB	The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity
UNEP	UN Environment Programme
WGRI	Working Group on the Review of Implementation of the Convention