

WGPA 2 HIGHLIGHTS: THURSDAY, 14 FEBRUARY 2008

Delegates to the second meeting of the *Ad hoc* Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas (WGPA 2) convened in plenary throughout the day where they considered a conference room paper (CRP) on Options for Mobilizing, as a Matter of Urgency, through Different Mechanisms Adequate and Timely Resources for the Implementation of the Programme on Work for Protected Areas (PoWPA) and a revised CRP on Review of Implementation of the PoWPA.

PLENARY

OPTIONS FOR MOBILIZING FINANCIAL

RESOURCES: Chair Ositadinma Anaedu, invited comments on a CRP on the Mobilization of Financial Resources for PoWPA implementation. The BAHAMAS, for GRULAC, suggested amending the CRP's title to include "mobilizing financial resources for PoWPA implementation by developing countries," thereby deleting reference to the use of different mechanisms, which was opposed by CANADA. Slovenia, for the EU, preferred retaining the original title. Underlining the need to balance traditional and innovative funding mechanisms, ARGENTINA and MALAYSIA stressed that the latter should not replace donor funding. BRAZIL and SOUTH AFRICA, said discussions must take into account international agreements on financing for development and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. AUSTRALIA and CANADA observed that text referring to new and additional funding was inconsistent with the mandate provided by decision VIII/24 (Protected Areas). CANADA suggested using this language as a preamble for a paragraph urging parties, governments and multilateral funding bodies to provide the necessary financial support to developing countries for PoWPA implementation.

Stressing that PAs have critical impacts on the rights of indigenous peoples, the INTERNATIONAL INDIGENOUS FORUM ON BIODIVERSITY (IIFB), protested against their restricted participation. She expressed disappointment that IIFB proposals had not been included in the CRPs, and announced the withdrawal of all indigenous and local community representatives from the meeting. Chair Anaedu responded that the IIFB intervention was ill-timed; efforts had been made to accommodate indigenous and local community participation; and that intergovernmental processes should not be abused for publicity. The meeting was then suspended to facilitate consultation following requests from the EU and CANADA.

When plenary reconvened, Chair Anaedu reiterated that the process remained open to observer participation and made assurances that the IIFB's proposals would be incorporated in the text with the endorsement of parties, which was welcomed by delegates.

Delegates made a number of interventions regarding language urging developed countries to contribute to modifying financial resources. Ukraine, for CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE, supported by the Bahamas, for the SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES (SIDS), stressed that references to Least Developed Countries, SIDS and countries with economies in transition should be included throughout the text. PANAMA, supported by COSTA RICA, GUATEMALA, PERU and ECUADOR, called for a reference to "ecological and financial gap analysis and capacity building plans." The EU, supported by CANADA, underscored the responsibility of developed countries regarding funding for the PoWPA and suggested a number of amendments to the text, including deleting reference to "developed country parties" and adding the "private sector" to the list of funding providers.

NEW ZEALAND, supported by CANADA, called for reference to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, which was opposed by BRAZIL. The AFRICAN GROUP, submitted text referring to an increase in the size and scope of UNDP/GEF investments in projects to address further elements of the PoWPA and additional targets. SIDS, supported by YEMEN, proposed to add language to "facilitate greater access" to UNDP funding and a further paragraph referring to the role PAs can play in climate change adaptation. ECUADOR suggested an amendment to provide wider scope for GEF funding not only for sustainable financing plans but also for their "implementation in national PA systems," while PERU added language on the valuation of ecosystems services from PAs. The AFRICAN GROUP proposed adding language stating that GEF procedures should be reviewed to remove impediments to developing countries accessing GEF funding. The UNDP urged African countries to collaborate with others in order to access GEF funding.

The EU proposed additional text including: recognizing that innovative mechanisms, including market based approaches, can complement public funding and development assistance; and urging parties to consider the equitable sharing and distribution of finances. The EU also proposed text recommending further study on the financing mechanism listed in (UNEP/CBD/WG-PA/2/4) and suggested annexing this list to the recommendations. CANADA and ARGENTINA requested specifying that the list is not exhaustive.

CHINA, supported by CUBA, BRAZIL and others, proposed deleting reference to innovative financial mechanisms, opposed by the AFRICAN GROUP and the EU. CUBA proposed deleting reference to “payment for ecosystem services” as well as language on removing “legislative barriers that may hinder the diversification of incomes for PAs.” The EU suggested integrating PAs within the development agenda of “both donors and developing countries,” while COLOMBIA supported the development of measures to promote the evaluation of ecosystem services in PAs to achieve greater linkages between conservation, poverty alleviation and the MDGs.

On sharing costs and benefits from PAs, the AFRICAN GROUP, opposed by CANADA, requested deletion of “costs.” Regarding language on enhancing effective resource utilization by improving the quality of PA project proposals, CANADA suggested specifying “financial” resource utilization, while ETHIOPIA requested deleting reference to “effective resource utilization.” On PA contributions to development, CANADA proposed inviting parties to “demonstrate the diverse values of PAs” rather than “develop economic justifications,” while the AFRICAN GROUP proposed “socioeconomic values,” PANAMA “economic arguments,” and GREENPEACE “social and economic justifications.” On fundraising targets, CANADA and NEW ZEALAND said they should be “national” targets, and the AFRICAN GROUP proposed that targets be set biennially.

Regarding exploring funding opportunities in the context of climate change, CANADA suggested “global efforts to mitigate” climate change. SIDS and NORWAY proposed “opportunities for PA design, establishment and effective management in the context of climate change adaptation and mitigation.” GREENPEACE proposed adding “a special focus on mitigation of emissions from deforestation and unsustainable land use, taking into account synergies between the CBD and UNFCCC regarding avoided deforestation.” PANAMA proposed stating that countries should earmark, as appropriate, resources for capacity building for the analysis of threats and pressures facing PA systems. On diversification of income sources, NEW ZEALAND requested deletion of a reference to the retention of revenues generated at site level.

Delegates turned their consideration to text relating to donor countries. ETHIOPIA called for the deletion of reference to the reporting process. CANADA added “based on priorities identified in national biodiversity strategies and action plans” to text on further actions to support implementation of the PoWPA, with the AFRICAN GROUP, adding that donors “take further actions by collaborating with developing countries.” ETHIOPIA called for additional Official Development Assistance (ODA) for PAs in addition to the “promised 0.7%” of GDP, with SIDS calling for those funds to establish, manage and support PAs, to which NEW ZEALAND added “taking into account the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.” CHINA, supporting an intervention by GREENPEACE, suggested linking reference to ODA to text on additional resources to “ensure increased financing to assist the implementation of PoWPA in developing countries, including significantly increasing contributions to the next replenishment of the GEF.”

On donors and other funding organizations, BRAZIL, supported by ECUADOR and CHILE, said the chapeau should reference multilateral and bilateral funding agencies. CAMEROON stated that funding should be made available for the designation of new “ecologically representative” PAs, with BRAZIL adding that such funding should be “adequate, predictable and timely.”

On projects that demonstrate the role PAs can play in supporting climate change adaptation and mitigation, BRAZIL, opposed by NORWAY, called for the deletion of “mitigation,” and PANAMA, supported by PERU, underscored the need to

earmark funds from the GEF and the World Bank. ETHIOPIA, opposed by CANADA, added that PAs could assist in the recovery of degraded environments. GREENPEACE urged developing countries to prioritize the importance of PAs within their ODA funds.

On financing for PAs, BRAZIL, supported by CHINA and CANADA, and opposed by the EU, requested deletion of text concerning the Executive Secretary’s role in promoting awareness on the importance of financing for PAs. BRAZIL, opposed by the EU, also proposed that the Executive Secretary submit to COP 10 a proposal on tools, increased financial and technical support and capacity building to further the implementation of the PoWPA by developing countries.

REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POWPA:

In the evening, delegates considered a revised CRP on review of PoWPA implementation.

On finalizing the gap analysis, delegates agreed to delete reference to “social and cultural” analysis thereby referring only to ecological gap analysis. Developing countries supported specifying that gap analyses be conducted with donor assistance, while developed countries preferred stating that such analyses could also be performed independently.

Regarding implementation of PoWPA element 2 (governance, participation, equity and benefit-sharing), delegates agreed to the EU and Brazil’s proposal to specify that states should give it “special attention.” On promoting the application of tools to better integrate PA into broader land and seascapes, BRAZIL opposed reference to integrated spatial planning. After discussion, delegates agreed to “including, as appropriate, integrated spatial planning.”

There were divergent views concerning alternative language on transmitting to the Secretariat information on sites identified to be designated PAs and no consensus was reached. After a lengthy debate, delegates agreed to an EU proposal to refer to “multisectoral advisory committees.”

Delegates were able to agree on language urging “efforts to facilitate and improve transfer of technologies to developing countries” in order to enhance management effectiveness of PAs. Discussions will continue on Friday.

IN THE CORRIDORS

The day began with a walk-out and ended with a sit-in. A short while after the morning session began, delegates representing indigenous peoples staged a walk-out in protest of what they described as the previous day’s violation of their right to participate. The move prompted an hour long cessation of plenary and a meeting of the Bureau to prepare an official response. While many delegates supported the protest, some were surprised that indigenous peoples’ representatives did not re-engage with the process once their right to full participation was upheld. While acknowledging that the walk-out was important, one participant said it may become a “pyrrhic victory” if they did not exercise their right to speak.

Notwithstanding the morning’s interruption, negotiations picked up speed during an afternoon session that extended into the evening. As the Chair proposed to adjourn the meeting, some delegates welcomed the end of a long day, whilst others, eager to continue until the end of the second reading of the review document, warned that it left “a long race to run in a short time.”

ENB SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS: The *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* summary and analysis of WGPA 2 will be combined with the summary from SBSTTA 13 and will be available on Monday, 25 February 2008, online at: <http://www.iisd.ca/biodiv/wgpa2>