CBD COP 11 HIGHLIGHTS
WEDNESDAY, 17 OCTOBER 2012

WG I and WG II addressed several draft decisions. The budget group, and contact groups on resource mobilization and REDD+ met concurrently, but held no formal plenaries. The high-level segment heard statements from ministers and high-level representatives, and held two panel discussions on implementation of the Strategic Plan, and biodiversity for livelihoods and poverty reduction.

HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT
On behalf of UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, CBD Executive Secretary Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias called for innovative solutions, urging particular attention to protection of life in oceans. GEF CEO Naoko Ishii announced plans for a long-term strategy in concert with the Aichi targets, prioritizing targets that enable cross-sectoral action, valuation of natural capital, and mainstreaming biodiversity. UNDP Associate Administrator Rebecca Grynspan said biodiversity loss is undermining hard-won development gains, and announced the launch of the Biodiversity and Ecosystems Global Framework. World Bank Vice-President for Sustainable Development Rachel Kyte highlighted the need to account for natural capital in national accounts, for gross domestic product (GDP), to replace short-term decisions based on ignorance with long-term decisions based on evidence.

WORKING GROUP I
MARINE BIODIVERSITY: Delegates addressed outstanding text in the draft decision and a non-paper. The EU proposed “to take note of the particular need for a regional meeting” and organized of a workshop to be organized in the Mediterranean region to finalize the description of EBSAs in its time for its report to be considered by SBSTTA prior to COP 12.” The EU, supported by NORWAY, but opposed by AUSTRALIA, proposed that the description of EBSAs allows continued updating “including the addition and/or withdrawal of areas,” Chair González Posse highlighted that “updating” already reflects the EU’s concern.

On the EBSA summary report transmitted by SBSTTA 16, JAPAN suggested, and many opposed, referring to “areas that could meet the EBSA criteria.” The EU insisted on “endorsing” the summary report. CHINA suggested reflecting that COP 11 could neither endorse nor approve the report. CANADA suggested reflecting progress made on the procedure for the consideration of EBSAs established by COP 10. Following informal consultations, delegates eventually agreed to: request the Secretariat to include the SBSTTA 16 summary report on the description of areas that meet the EBSA criteria in the repository “as referred to in decision X/29” and making summary reports available for COP consideration with a view to including them in the repository “in line with the purpose and procedures set out in decision X/29 and this decision.” The decision was adopted with these amendments, with CHINA requesting that the meeting report reflect that the COP did not endorse the summary report.

ARTICLE 8(j): Delegates considered whether to request that the next Article 8(j) Working Group consider changing terminology in COP decisions to “indigenous peoples and local communities” for COP 12 consideration. COLOMBIA, BOLIVIA, PERU, NORWAY, BRAZIL, ECUADOR, SWITZERLAND and ARGENTINA proposed to make such decision at COP 11. The IIFB emphasized that the term “indigenous peoples and local communities” is already included in Agenda 21, the Rio + 20 Outcome and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION: The EU requested bracketing text regarding financial resources to implement ecosystem restoration programmes in developing countries, pending decisions from the resource mobilization group.

BIODIVERSITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE: Delegates debated whether to “endorse” or “take note” with appreciation of SBSTTA recommendations XV/18 to strengthen knowledge and information on linkages between biodiversity and climate change. The EU requested bracketing references to resource mobilization, pending decisions from the resource mobilization group.

SUSTAINABLE USE: Delegates considered a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.1/CRP.9). On the annexed revised recommendations of the CBD Liaison Group on bushmeat, CANADA requested, and delegates agreed, reverting to SBSTTA 15 text on transferring access, rights and associated accountability to ILCs, rather than on “rights and tenure, and TK.”

The EU called for reinserting text calling on national REDD+ programmes to take into account the importance of wildlife for healthy ecosystems and ecological services. BRAZIL, supported by BOLIVIA, ECUADOR, SUDAN, QATAR, MEXICO, COLOMBIA, ETHIOPIA and ARGENTINA, opposed references to REDD+ and proposed to discuss it in the REDD+ group. Delegates could not agree on whether to “welcome” the revised recommendations on bushmeat.

IAS: Delegates considered a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/ COP/11/WG.1/CRP.10). The EU preferred stating that the Guiding Principles on IAS continue to be relevant for addressing the risks “associated with,” rather than “of,” introducing IAS as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, live bait and live food.

The EU, opposed by COLOMBIA, requested that the development of a toolkit be subject to available financial resources. NEW ZEALAND, opposed by the PHILIPPINES and ETHIOPIA, questioned including in the toolkit information on the application of specific provisions of the SPS Agreement. ISRAEL suggested including in the toolkit countries’ experiences in risk assessment on IAS.
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Delegates also discussed: establishing a target on the removal, reform or phasing out of subsidies harmful to biodiversity at COP 12, requesting using language from Decision X/3; a section on review of implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization; and a section on a roadmap, including on adopting at COP 12 a global indicative target on aggregated financial flows.

Algeria, on behalf of G-77/CHINA and MEXICO, stressed that developing countries engaged in good faith and made significant commitments in Nagoya with the expectation that financial resources would be forthcoming. He underscored that, unless COP 11 address the issue of targets for the resource mobilization strategy, the gains of Nagoya will be negated and the momentum towards realizing the Aichi targets lost. He noted that developing countries made major concessions and agreed to work on interim targets, hoping that developed countries will reciprocate, agreeing on specific targets and commitments while addressing the roadmap. He feared that failure to reach agreement on a target will result in suspension of implementation of the Aichi targets until sufficient resources are available.

**CONTACT GROUP ON REDD+**

Delegates discussed a list of possible adverse impacts of REDD+ on biodiversity-related issues, noting they were identified by the Global Expert Workshop on Biodiversity Benefits of REDD+. One delegate remarked that the workshop was held before the UNFCCC meeting in Cancun.

Delegates discussed whether to refer to “lack of benefit distribution,” “lack of benefit-sharing” or “lack of equitable distribution of benefits” between relevant stakeholders as a possible threat to the success of REDD+ national strategies. One participant cautioned against using “benefit-sharing” due to its connotations under the Nagoya Protocol. Delegates then discussed whether the safeguard processes could also benefit from national experiences related to the ABS provisions of the Convention and Nagoya Protocol. Parties further considered text on land tenure, land planning, and the Convention’s contribution to the work of the UNFCCC, with discussions continuing into the evening.

**BUDGET GROUP**

Discussions focused on the merger of trust funds, increases in core budget programming, the use of indicators of achievements and performance of the programme budget, and attaining operational efficiencies in the budget. Delegates discussed options in the core budget given different budget growth scenarios, highlighting that the financial crisis will mean that activities carried out by the Secretariat will have to be prioritized.

**IN THE CORRIDORS**

As COP 11 entered its final days, discussions became increasingly intense. In the air-conditioned room of the budget group, deliberations heated up as concerns about the impact of the financial crisis on the budget were translated into “real numbers.” “With over 140 requests to the Secretariat on the table, we need to prioritize activities” commented a worried delegate emerging from the room. At the same time, progress in the Working Groups was painfully slow: more and more decisions were marred with bracketed language subjecting their implementation to availability of funding. “We do not wish to be bound by a list of tasks that the Secretariat will have no dedicated funds to carry out,” noted a seasoned participant. The dilemma remains, as a member of the budget group remarked, “should the budget dictate policy, or must policy dictate the budget?”

Meanwhile, copies of the G-77/China/Mexico statement on resource mobilization could be found all over the corridors of the conference center. One of its readers commented: “There is a clear message here: no implementation without resource mobilization.”