

SIXTH MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY AND ELEVENTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY: 1-19 OCTOBER 2012

The sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP/MOP 6) opens today in Hyderabad, India, and will continue until 5 October 2012. It will be followed by the eleventh meeting of the CBD COP (COP 11) which will meet from 8-19 October. COP/MOP 6 will address a number of substantive issues, including: capacity building; handling, transport, packaging and identification (HTPI) of living modified organisms (LMOs); notification requirements; unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures; risk assessment and risk management; socio-economic considerations; monitoring and reporting; and the second assessment and review of the Protocol's effectiveness. The meeting will also address standing agenda items relating to the Compliance Committee; the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH); financial resources and mechanism; and cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives. COP/MOP 6 is also expected to consider the status of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.

CBD COP 11 will address the status of the Nagoya Protocol on access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing (ABS); implementation of the Strategic Plan 2011-2020 and progress towards the Aichi biodiversity targets; and issues related to financial resources and mechanism, cooperation, outreach and the UN Decade on Biodiversity, operations of the Convention, and administrative and budgetary matters. Delegates will also review the programme of work on island biodiversity, and address: ecosystem restoration; Article 8(j) (traditional knowledge); marine and coastal biodiversity; biodiversity and climate change; biodiversity and development; and several other ecosystem-related and cross-cutting issues. From 16-19 October 2012, the high-level segment will focus on: implementation of the Strategic Plan; biodiversity for livelihoods and poverty reduction; marine and coastal biodiversity; and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CBD AND THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

The CBD was adopted on 22 May 1992, and 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. Among its achievements, the COP has adopted:

- the Jakarta Mandate on marine and coastal biodiversity (COP 2, November 1995, Jakarta, Indonesia);
- work programmes on agricultural and forest biodiversity (COP 3, November 1996, Buenos Aires, Argentina);
- the Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI) (COP 4, May 1998, Bratislava, Slovakia);
- work programmes on dry and sub-humid lands, and incentive measures (COP 5, May 2000, Nairobi, Kenya);
- the Bonn Guidelines on ABS and the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (COP 6, April 2002, The Hague, the Netherlands);
- work programmes on mountain biodiversity, protected areas and technology transfer, the Akwé: Kon Guidelines for cultural, environmental and social impact assessments, the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for sustainable use (COP 7, February 2004, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia);
- a work programme on island biodiversity (COP 8, March 2006, Curitiba, Brazil); and
- a resource mobilization strategy, and scientific criteria and guidance for marine areas in need of protection (COP 9, May 2008, Bonn, Germany).

COP 10: At its tenth meeting (October 2010, Nagoya, Japan), the CBD COP adopted the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization, which, after seven years of negotiations, sets out rules and procedures for implementing the Convention's third objective. The Protocol requires 50 ratifications to come into force. To date, six Parties have ratified the Protocol.

The COP also adopted, among many other decisions: the CBD Strategic Plan for the period 2011-2020, including the Aichi biodiversity targets; and a decision on activities and indicators for the implementation of the resource mobilization strategy.

NEGOTIATION OF THE BIOSAFETY PROTOCOL: Adopted in January 2000 following protracted negotiations, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety addresses the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs that may have adverse effects on biodiversity, taking into account human health, with a specific focus on transboundary movements of LMOs. It includes an advance informed agreement (AIA) procedure for imports of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment, and also incorporates the precautionary approach and mechanisms for risk assessment and risk management. The Protocol establishes the BCH to facilitate information exchange, and contains provisions



on capacity building and financial resources, with special attention to developing countries and those without domestic regulatory systems. It entered into force on 11 September 2003 and currently has 164 parties. The Protocol's governing body is the COP/MOP.

COP/MOP 1: At its first meeting (February 2004, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia), the COP/MOP adopted decisions on information sharing and the BCH; capacity building; decision-making procedures; monitoring and reporting; the Secretariat; guidance to the financial mechanism; and the medium-term work programme. Delegates also agreed on elements of documentation of LMOs for food, feed, and processing (LMO-FFPs), pending a decision on detailed requirements; and reached agreement on more detailed documentation requirements for LMOs destined for direct introduction into the environment. The meeting established the Compliance Committee, and launched the Working Group on Liability and Redress (WGLR), to elaborate international rules and procedures in the field of liability and redress for damage resulting from transboundary movements of LMOs in the context of the Protocol in line with Protocol Article 27 (Liability and Redress).

COP/MOP 2: At its second meeting (May/June 2005, Montreal, Canada), the COP/MOP adopted decisions on capacity building, and public awareness and participation; and agreed to establish an intersessional technical expert group on risk assessment and risk management. COP/MOP 2 did not reach agreement on detailed requirements for documentation of LMO-FFPs that were to be approved "no later than two years after the date of entry into force of this Protocol."

COP/MOP 3: At its third meeting (March 2006, Curitiba, Brazil), the COP/MOP adopted detailed requirements for documentation and identification of LMO-FFPs, and considered various issues relating to the Protocol's operationalization, including funding for the implementation of national biosafety frameworks, risk assessment, the rights and responsibilities of transit parties, the financial mechanism and capacity building.

COP/MOP 4: At its fourth meeting (May 2008, Bonn, Germany), the COP/MOP decided to extend the deadline for negotiating an international regime on liability and redress, and adopted decisions on, among other issues: the Compliance Committee; HTPI; the BCH; capacity building; socio-economic considerations; risk assessment and risk management; financial mechanism and resources; and subsidiary bodies.

NEGOTIATIONS ON LIABILITY AND REDRESS: The negotiations on international rules and procedures on liability and redress spanned more than five years. The first two meetings of the WGLR (May 2005 and February 2006, Montreal, Canada) considered expert presentations and started compiling views and draft texts submitted by parties. WGLR 3 and 4 (February 2007 and October 2007, Montreal, Canada) developed options for core elements of an international regime, including on a definition of damage, administrative approaches and civil liability.

WGLR 5 (March 2008, Cartagena de Indias, Colombia) agreed on a number of core elements of the regime and decided to convene a Friends of the Co-Chairs group (CCLR) to complete the negotiations. The CCLR was unable to finalize negotiations before the COP/MOP 4 deadline, in part because of enduring divisions regarding the nature of the regime and whether or not it should include legally-binding provisions on civil liability. COP/MOP 4 therefore decided to reconvene the CCLR to finalize negotiations based on a compromise that envisioned a legally-binding supplementary protocol focusing on an administrative approach but including a legally-binding provision on civil liability complemented by non-binding guidelines on civil liability.

The CCLR met four more times. At the first meeting (February 2009, Mexico City, Mexico), delegates developed a draft protocol text. The second meeting (February 2010, Putrajaya, Malaysia) elaborated a legally-binding provision on civil liability but did not conclude negotiations on this and other

outstanding issues. The third meeting (June 2010, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia), reached agreement on civil liability and other issues, including "imminent threat of damage" and the definition of "operator." The CCLR convened a final time directly prior to COP/MOP 5 to resolve outstanding issues with regard to the definition of products of LMOs and financial security.

COP/MOP 5: At its fifth meeting (October 2010, Nagoya, Japan), the COP/MOP adopted the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress, which will enter into force 90 days after the 40th ratification. To date, three parties have ratified the Supplementary Protocol. COP/MOP 5 also adopted decisions on, among other issues: experiences with documentation requirements for HTPI of LMO-FFPs; HTPI standards; rights and/or obligations of parties of transit of LMOs; monitoring and reporting; assessment and review; the Strategic Plan and multi-year programme of work (MYPOW); risk assessment and risk management.

INTERSESSIONAL HIGHLIGHTS

ARTICLE 8(j): The CBD Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions (October–November 2011, Montreal, Canada) adopted recommendations on, among others: Tasks 7, 10 and 12 (benefit-sharing from, and unlawful appropriation of, traditional knowledge) of the Article 8(j) work programme; Article 10(c) (customary sustainable use); and terms of reference developing guidelines on repatriation.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS: A workshop on Capacity-building for Research and Information Exchange on Socio-economic Impacts of LMOs (November 2011, New Delhi, India) suggested next steps, including the development of general guidelines providing minimum common elements that could be used in the consideration of socio-economic impacts of LMOs while providing flexibility to take into account the situation in different countries.

SBSTTA: The Convention's Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) met twice (November 2011 and April/May 2012, Montreal, Canada) and adopted a series of recommendations for consideration by COP 11, including on: indicators for monitoring implementation of the Strategic Plan; a draft capacity-building strategy for the GTI; and ecosystem restoration. It also adopted two packages of recommendations on marine and coastal biodiversity, and biodiversity and climate change.

REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION: The first meeting of the AHTEG on Assessment and Review of the Protocol (May 2012, Vienna, Austria) reviewed information on implementation and developed recommendations regarding: domestic implementation; capacity building and resource mobilization; regional approaches; and information sharing and the BCH.

WGRI: The CBD Working Group on the Review of Implementation (May 2012, Montreal, Canada), adopted recommendations on, among others: the Strategic Plan; the resource mobilization strategy; cooperation with other conventions; biodiversity for poverty eradication and development; business engagement; and South-South cooperation.

RISK ASSESSMENT AND RISK MANAGEMENT: Supported by real-time online conferences and discussion forums, the fourth meeting of the *Ad hoc* Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on Risk Assessment and Risk Management (June 2012, Montreal, Canada) developed a revised version of the guidance on risk assessment of LMOs and a list of specific topics for the development of additional guidance.

ABS: The Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol on ABS met twice (June 2011, Montreal, Canada; and July 2012, New Delhi, India) and focused on: compliance; modalities of operation of the ABS Clearing-house; capacity building and awareness raising; and guidance for the financial mechanism and for resource mobilization. To date, six parties have ratified the Nagoya Protocol.

COP/MOP 6 HIGHLIGHTS MONDAY, 1 OCTOBER 2012

The sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol (COP/MOP 6) opened in Hyderabad, India on Monday 1 October. In morning plenary, delegates heard opening statements and reports on the Compliance Committee, financial mechanism and resources, cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives and administration and budgetary matters. In the afternoon, delegates convened in two working groups (WGs).

WG I addressed: compliance; handling, transport, packaging and identification (HTPI) of living modified organisms (LMOs); notification requirements; and liability and redress. WG II addressed the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH), capacity building and risk assessment and risk management.

OPENING PLENARY

Opening the session, COP/MOP 5 President Masamichi Saigo, Japan's Ministry of Agriculture, Forests and Fisheries, welcomed delegates and invited Jayanthi Natarajan, Indian Minister of Environment and Forests, to take over the COP/MOP 6 Presidency. COP/MOP 6 President Natarajan stressed the need to find a balance between health, technology and the environment, and urged parties to ratify the Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.

CBD Executive Secretary Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias announced new parties to the Protocol and ratifications of the Supplementary Protocol, outlined intersessional efforts and hailed the 90 percent submission rate for the second national reports. Bakary Kante, UNEP, highlighted the UNEP-GEF projects for building capacity for BCH participation and implementation of the Protocol.

Ekkadu Srinivasan Lakshmi Narasimhan, Governor of Andhra Pradesh State, said that the survival of humans should not come at the cost of other life forms, stressing the need to raise awareness to ensure the wise use of biotechnology. Tishyarakshit Chatterjee, Indian Ministry of Environment and Forests, called on delegates to find consensus on risk assessment and risk management, socio-economic considerations and other issues on the COP/MOP 6 agenda.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: COP/MOP 6 Chair Shri Farooqui, Indian Ministry of Environment and Forests, explained that the COP10 Bureau serves as the COP/MOP Bureau, with Mexico replacing Argentina, which is not a Protocol Party. Delegates elected Kauna Betty Schroder (Namibia) as the meeting's rapporteur and adopted the meeting's agenda (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/1) and organization of work (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/1/Add.1/Rev.1) moving agenda item 16 on socio-economic considerations from WG II to WG I.

Delegates then elected Bureau Members Ines Verleye (Belgium) and Spencer Thomas (Grenada) as chairs of WG I and WG II, respectively.

REPORTS: Delegates heard reports on: the Compliance Committee (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/2 and Add.1); financial mechanism and resources (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/4); cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/5); and the Protocol's administration and budgetary matters and the proposed budget and work programme for the biennium 2013-2014 (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/6 and 6/Add.1). The Global Environment Facility (GEF) reported that GEF funding during the first half of the reporting period focused on assisting parties with preparing their second national reports.

Delegates established a budget contact group, chaired by Conrad Hunte (Antigua and Barbuda).

STATEMENTS: Grenada, on behalf of the LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN GROUP (GRULAC), underscored the need for capacity building; urged countries to sign the Supplementary Protocol; and called on the GEF to fulfill its mandate. URUGUAY emphasized the value of the BCH for ensuring effective participation in key mechanisms of the Protocol. Serbia, for CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE (CEE), stressed the importance of cooperation with other organizations and conventions, especially with regard to information sharing. Denmark, for the European Union and its 27 member states and Croatia (the EU), prioritized work on capacity building; and handling, transport, and use of LMOs. Liberia, for the AFRICAN GROUP, emphasized challenges associated with risk assessment and risk management.

JAPAN reported that his government's donations to the CBD's intersessional work have been used for capacity building workshops and the development of e-learning training courses on biosafety. SAUDI ARABIA called for prioritizing regional capacity building programmes on risk assessment and risk management. KENYA highlighted the national implementation of the Biosafety Protocol in her country, including regulations on contained use, labeling, environmental release, and import, export and transit.

The US expressed its support for the Cartagena Protocol and called on parties to implement it in a manner that is the least restrictive on trade. BOLIVIA stressed the importance of coordination with the World Trade Organization (WTO) saying it would present a proposal in that regard.

Pointing to common objectives with the CBD, especially regarding sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) measures, the WTO reported on ongoing consideration of the CBD's application for observer status. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) reported on the implementation of its Memorandum of Understanding with the CBD to harmonize information sharing on biosafety aimed at improving their respective databases on LMOs.



WORKING GROUP I

COMPLIANCE: Delegates considered the report of the Compliance Committee (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/2). COLOMBIA requested financial resources for parties experiencing difficulties implementing the Protocol. Compliance Committee Chair Jürg Bally (Switzerland) suggested that such support be included in the budget. The EU expressed concern over gaps in compliance, including developing national biosafety frameworks and providing information to the BCH. UGANDA highlighted the importance of developing public awareness programmes on safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs.

HTPI: LMOs destined for contained use or for intentional introduction into the environment: Many delegates welcomed a synthesis of information contained in the second national reports (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/8). MALAYSIA, PARAGUAY, COLOMBIA and MEXICO said they already have legal requirements in place and opposed changes to documentation requirements.

BOLIVIA proposed ensuring implementation by requiring the incorporation of specific documentation and to review the issue at COP/MOP 8. LIBERIA supported a provision for countries who wish to prepare standalone documentation requirements, noting the particularities of issues regarding LMOs. COLOMBIA and the PHILIPPINES supported the use of commercial invoices for HTPI. NEW ZEALAND noted that most parties do not require standalone documentation but can do so if they see fit. PERU recommended future reviews to obtain information through other means in order to assess whether national frameworks are working.

HTPI Standards: Delegates considered UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/9 and INF/7. BOLIVIA and INDIA preferred deleting references to labeling. PARAGUAY, URUGUAY, MEXICO, COLOMBIA, NIGERIA and NEW ZEALAND opposed reference to the UN Model Regulations on Transport of Dangerous Goods. PARAGUAY, the EU and BRAZIL opposed adding new codes for LMOs into the existing coding systems of the World Customs Organization without more analysis. BRAZIL, NIGERIA and the EU also opposed adding reference to the Cartagena Protocol under standards of the WTO SPS Committee. PERU proposed text to promote the use of LMO databases prepared by the BCH.

Delegates agreed to a Chair's proposal to develop a single draft decision on HTPI.

NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS: Delegates considered UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/10. INDIA noted that only half the parties had established notification requirements for exporters and supported addressing gaps. The EU suggested that future review should only take place if parties demonstrate a substantial and documented need. BOLIVIA proposed linking the review provision to information from importing parties. MEXICO recommended exploring the use of parameters to assess if the existing rules and measures meet the objectives of the Protocol based on the experience of parties who have notification requirements.

LIABILITY AND REDRESS: The Secretariat presented document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/11, noting that three countries have ratified the Supplementary Protocol with 40 required for its entry into force. COLOMBIA, MEXICO and BOLIVIA requested a guide explaining the Supplementary Protocol. Parties reported on national efforts to achieve ratification of the Supplementary Protocol. The EU stressed capacity building and establishing national priorities. UGANDA emphasized awareness raising at the national level. The Public Research and Regulation Initiative (PRRI) emphasized capacity building to help countries understand liability and redress.

WORKING GROUP II

BCH: Delegates considered the report UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/3 on the BCH. Many parties supported continued GEF support for capacity building through extending the second phase of the UNEP-GEF capacity building support for the BCH (UNEP-GEF BCH II) project for a third phase. The EU called for progress on: inclusion of risk assessment summaries;

continuation of online fora and training; and evaluating the BCH before extending the UNEP-GEF BCH II project. NORWAY cautioned against budgetary implications of activities proposed in the draft decision. ECUADOR, PARAGUAY and BRAZIL emphasized the importance of financial resources. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA expressed willingness to further support regional capacity building workshops. JAPAN, MEXICO and the PHILIPPINES suggested improving cost effective mechanisms such as online fora.

COLOMBIA urged adjustments to encourage BCH use by all sectors, including the private sector. NEW ZEALAND requested investigating the data types being used. BRAZIL said parties, not the Secretariat, should decide what data to include in the BCH. The PHILIPPINES said the BCH should offer more training modules.

UNEP reported on the UNEP-GEF BCH II project, which aims to improve online training, increase access to data and the number of information sources. PRRI urged strengthening the sharing of scientific information through the BCH.

CAPACITY BUILDING: Status of capacity-building activities: Delegates considered UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7/ and 7/Add.1 on the status of capacity building and the comprehensive review of the capacity building action plan. Many parties supported regional capacity building initiatives while UGANDA and BRAZIL called for support to address national capacity needs. The EU with others called for continued coordination between donors and recipient parties. JAPAN, NEW ZEALAND and MEXICO called for continuous development of skills and advancement of e-learning. The PHILIPPINES suggested different levels of online training modules.

BOLIVIA called for shifting responsibility for capacity building on LMOs to parties and stakeholders responsible for their development. TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO said training of trainers should focus less on volume of information for trainers and include aspects of training approaches.

Roster of Biosafety Experts: Delegates considered UNEP/CBD/BS/COP MOP/6/7/Add.2. BOLIVIA suggested deleting a call for contributions to the voluntary fund to operationalize the roster. JAPAN, CUBA, ECUADOR, NIGER and TOGO supported adopting a revised form for nominating experts. PARAGUAY said new nominations should not replace the current roster. MALAYSIA urged nominating an expert on socio-economic issues. INDIA said funds should primarily support parties' activities.

RISK ASSESSMENT AND RISK MANAGEMENT: Delegates considered UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/13/ on risk assessment and risk management and the revised guidance on risk assessment of LMOs (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/13/ Add.1). Helmut Gaugitsch (Austria), Chair of the *Ad hoc* Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on risk assessment and risk management, outlined the AHTEG's final report (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/10) noting that the AHTEG's recommendations include extending the its mandate beyond COP/MOP 6 and adopting, implementing and providing feedback on the revised guidance. BOLIVIA emphasized the precautionary approach. PARAGUAY said the guidance requires consideration of national strategies and trials by parties.

IN THE CORRIDORS

Fears that COP/MOP 6 could be somewhat anticlimactic without the tense late night negotiations on liability and redress that had marked the last COP/MOPs were dissipated as delegates were quick to point to the expected highlights of COP/MOP 6. Many echoed the Executive Secretary's remark that the guidance on risk assessment was probably "the most beautiful pearl" to be crafted during the meeting, alluding to Hyderabad's famous tradition in producing fine jewelry.

Others were cautiously optimistic that COP/MOP 6 could become a turning point in the discussion on socio-economic considerations, noting that the inter-sessional work on this issue has yielded a sound basis from which to take pragmatic first steps.



CBD COP 11 HIGHLIGHTS: MONDAY, 8 OCTOBER 2012

The morning plenary heard opening and regional statements, and addressed organizational issues. In the afternoon, Working Group I (WG I) considered island biodiversity and ecosystem restoration. WG II addressed implementation of the Strategic Plan and progress towards the Aichi targets.

OPENING PLENARY

Hoshino Kazuaki, on behalf of the Minister of Environment of Japan, opened the meeting, underscoring support to the revision of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) through the Japan Biodiversity Fund. Ryu Matsumoto, former Minister of Environment of Japan and COP 10 President, called for urgency in implementing the COP 10 outcomes, including the Nagoya Protocol on access and benefit-sharing (ABS) and the Aichi targets. He then handed the COP Presidency to Jayanthi Natarajan, India's Minister of Environment and Forests.

COP 11 President Natarajan called for agreement on a roadmap and means of implementation for the Nagoya outcomes. Noting that COP 10 did not conclude on resource mobilization, she urged agreement on targets for funding. She said developing countries need to balance environmental concerns and poverty eradication. Amina Mohamed, UNEP Deputy Executive Director, said the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) opened potential pathways to sustainable development, including through inclusive green economy, and highlighted the need for more effective and targeted implementation processes.

CBD Executive Secretary Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias called for a pragmatic approach focusing on sharing experiences on implementation, as opposed to negotiation. He stressed the need for: enhancing the links between the Convention and its protocols; an effective and continuous monitoring system of the Aichi targets' implementation; a structured capacity-building process at the regional and local level, through strengthened collaboration with UN entities and stakeholders; and supporting community-based approaches.

Nallari Kiran Kumar Reddy, Chief Minister of the state of Andhra Pradesh, called for allowing each country to implement internationally agreed policies according to domestic circumstances. India's Secretary of Environment and Forests T. Chatterjee stressed the need to reach consensus on: financial issues; the Strategic Plan's implementation; biodiversity and poverty reduction; marine and coastal biodiversity; and the Nagoya Protocol's implementation.

ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES: Delegates adopted the agenda and organization of work (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/1 and Add.1 Rev.1); and elected Betty Kauna Schroder (Namibia)

as Rapporteur for the meeting, and Valeria González Posse (Argentina) and Andrew Bignell (New Zealand) as Chairs of WG I and WG II, respectively.

M.F. Farooqui, on behalf of the COP Presidency, noted that the COP is not in a position to adopt outstanding majority-voting rules in the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules; and introduced the reports of intersessional and regional preparatory meetings (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/2-7).

REGIONAL STATEMENTS: Argentina for the Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries (GRULAC) encouraged COP 11 to reflect on the Rio+20 outcome, common but differentiated responsibilities, poverty eradication and avoidance of trade restrictions. She prioritized financial resource mobilization for implementing the Strategic Plan and Aichi targets, maintenance of COP meetings' periodicity, and a strengthened core budget.

Syria for the ASIA-PACIFIC emphasized the linkages between the Convention objectives, as well as the need for effective financial resources and capacity building for implementation. Serbia for CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE (CEE) underscored the need for resource mobilization for ratification of the Nagoya Protocol. Benin for the AFRICAN GROUP recalled that the CBD is one of the rare international legally binding agreements on sustainable development; prioritized the Aichi targets on natural habitats, protected areas and the Nagoya Protocol; and underscored the need to maintain the COP meetings' periodicity.

The EU with CROATIA emphasized the need to focus on effective implementation through: policy frameworks and governance structures; a significant increase in financial, human and technical resources; and mobilization of new funding sources, including green economy and innovative financial mechanisms. Kiribati for SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES (SIDS) urged addressing the loss of island biodiversity and highlighted the need for capacity building and provision of financial resources in a timely manner.

The CBD ALLIANCE called for: keeping under review the Convention's implementation; adopting indicators on the Aichi targets; allocating financial resources for the forest biodiversity work programme, rather than focusing on non-binding guidelines for reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, as well as conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of carbon stocks (REDD+); ending subsidies and targets for biofuels; and extending the moratorium on geoengineering. The WOMEN'S CAUCUS called for integrating the gender dimension in social, environmental and cultural indicators, and committing to long-term action on gender equality. The INTERNATIONAL INDIGENOUS FORUM ON BIODIVERSITY (IIFB) highlighted remaining challenges, including respecting indigenous practices and livelihoods when establishing protected

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Kate Louw, Elisa Morgera, Ph.D., Dorothy Wanja Nyngi, Ph.D., Teya Penniman, Eugenia Recio and Elsa Tsioumani. The Digital Editor is Francis Dejon. The Editor is 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), the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), and the Government of Australia. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2012 is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 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). Specific funding for coverage of this meeting has been provided by the Belgium Federal Public Service for Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment, the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, the Indian Ministry of Environment and Forests, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and the Finnish Ministry of the Environment. 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, USA. The ENB Team at CBD COP 11 can be contacted by e-mail at <elsa@iisd.org>.



<http://enb.iisd.mobi/>

areas, and mainstreaming rights enshrined in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) in national CBD implementation.

ADMINISTRATION AND BUDGET: CBD Executive Secretary Dias presented the report (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/9-11 and INF/36), including the status of the Convention trust funds and staffing, and budget scenarios. Plenary established an open-ended informal group on the budget, to be chaired by Amb. Conrad Hunte (Antigua and Barbuda), noting that WG and budget group Chairs will liaise to coordinate policy and budget discussions.

WORKING GROUP I

ISLAND BIODIVERSITY: WG I Chair González Posse presented the SBSTTA recommendation on the in-depth review of the island biodiversity work programme (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/3). Many countries supported the SBSTTA recommendation. The Seychelles for SIDS said the review assisted in island biodiversity management.

The EU with CROATIA called for increased attention on poverty alleviation and ABS. With SOUTH AFRICA, he emphasized biodiversity loss in uninhabited and seasonally inhabited ecosystems. ARGENTINA said the work programme should not apply to disputed territories. Ethiopia for the AFRICAN GROUP called for integration of climate change adaptation and mitigation activities in island biodiversity conservation. THAILAND supported assessing islands' carrying capacities for anthropogenic activities.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO called for individual and institutional training. INDIA suggested considering sustainable tourism practices and promoting eco-friendly initiatives, such as establishing seed banks on resilient native species.

BRAZIL called for progress on Aichi Target 12 on preventing species extinction. CHINA called for reference to CBD Article 20 (Financial Resources).

ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION: Delegates addressed a draft decision based on a SBSTTA recommendation (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/2 and 21). The AFRICAN GROUP underscored the need to clarify the understanding of "ecosystem restoration" under the Convention, with SOUTH AFRICA suggesting more focus on ecosystem health and functioning.

The EU stated that ecosystem restoration should be integrated in the CBD work on specific ecosystems and, with the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, that it should be the last resort. SWITZERLAND proposed that the Secretariat not only identify, but also "use as appropriate" opportunities for collaboration with other conventions. SAINT LUCIA noted the importance of cooperation among biodiversity-related conventions.

THAILAND recommended compiling degraded ecosystem inventories to identify best practices and appropriate technology for restoration. NORWAY called for: user-friendly guidance to support restoration planning and to avoid negative net effects; consideration of existing land use, including pastoralism and low-impact agriculture; elaboration of safeguards including on land ownership in the identification of land suitable for restoration; and consideration of different financial mechanisms, including those from the private sector.

MEXICO cautioned that restoration should not be seen as an end in itself but rather as a long-term process subject to continuous management. GUATEMALA, ARGENTINA and EL SALVADOR stressed the need for financial support. CANADA acknowledged information, capacity and financial limitations, saying it is not an excuse for lack of conservation. INDIA asserted the need to adopt ecologically and socio-economically sound and user-friendly restoration practices, address the causes of degradation and support natural regeneration. FAO and the INTERNATIONAL MODEL FOREST NETWORK highlighted landscape approaches.

GHANA, ECUADOR and CANADA supported an *ad hoc* technical expert group (AHTEG) on ecosystem restoration. PERU and COLOMBIA urged compilation of existing information. The DOMINICAN REPUBLIC suggested that the mining sector be targeted in further development of practical guidance for restoration.

WORKING GROUP II

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTATION AND AICHI TARGETS: The Secretariat introduced the item, including sub-items on: progress in establishing national targets and updating NBSAPs (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/12 and 4); capacity building, the Clearing-house Mechanism (CHM) and technology transfer (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/4, 13, 13/Add.1 and 2, 31 and INF/5 and 8); and monitoring implementation, including indicators (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/2, 3 and 27).

Establishment of national targets and NBSAP updating: Several parties highlighted progress in updating their NBSAPs in line with the Strategic Plan. CHINA also highlighted formulation of provincial NBSAPs. The EU stressed integrating NBSAPs into relevant sectoral plans. INDONESIA stressed involving relevant stakeholders in all aspects of updating NBSAPs to remove barriers to implementation.

COSTA RICA called on parties to identify financial resources needed to reach national targets. JAPAN stressed enhancing synergies between the Japan Biodiversity Fund and GEF funding. BANGLADESH called for a simplified procedure for accessing GEF funds.

Capacity building: Many requested removing brackets around text urging the provision of financial resources, technology transfer and benefit-sharing. Egypt for the AFRICAN GROUP said unless the brackets were removed, "we are wasting our time." JAPAN proposed "inviting," rather than "urging," the commitment of developed countries. SOUTH AFRICA proposed preambular text based on CBD Article 20.

KENYA urged establishment of capacity-building networks. BRAZIL called for clarification on the classification and criteria for selecting centers of excellence in the proposed capacity-building network. The PHILIPPINES urged technology needs assessments be funded and undertaken as a matter of priority.

The EU supported enhancing the CHM and developing a consistent approach on technical and scientific cooperation. NORWAY prioritized biosafety and ABS for development of tools under the CHM. SWITZERLAND proposed the Secretariat facilitate a voluntary peer-review process to enhance information exchange on good practices.

Monitoring implementation: The EU supported the development of global indicators for use by the CBD and relevant processes. CANADA supported reaching consensus on a small set of indicators during COP 11, rather than further developing the draft list of indicators for discussion at COP 12. The AFRICAN GROUP called for support, warning of a shrinking timeframe for implementation. MEXICO welcomed the proposed indicators, but stressed further work to enable their implementation at the national level. BRAZIL questioned the inclusion of certain indicators proposed. INDIA urged keeping the proposed indicators as a flexible framework to be used according to national circumstances. Cautioning against commercialization of biodiversity and a development model based on unsustainable production and consumption, BOLIVIA suggested recognizing the different visions in achieving the CBD objectives and discussing indicators as part of a larger framework of social and environmental sustainability.

On traditional knowledge indicators, NEW ZEALAND highlighted the value of working with existing forest assessment processes to help reduce data burdens. ECUADOR and MALAYSIA called for developing indicators specific to indigenous peoples.

IN THE CORRIDORS

After the intense law-making session at COP 10 in Nagoya, many considered COP 11 in Hyderabad to be an opportunity to focus on "implementation, implementation, implementation." Initial views differed, however, on whether such a focus necessarily implies dealing with "thorny money issues," or could be addressed otherwise. More than one delegate affirmed that "the world's reality is much changed with the economic crisis," leaving doubts about who can pay and how much. Still, rumor in the corridors has it that financial issues, particularly the budget and targets for resource mobilization, will dominate the meeting's deliberations.



CBD COP 11 HIGHLIGHTS TUESDAY, 9 OCTOBER 2012

WG I addressed marine and coastal biodiversity, REDD+ safeguards and geoengineering. WG II continued discussions on implementation of the Strategic Plan and addressed issues related to financial resources and the financial mechanism. An evening contact group discussed REDD+.

WORKING GROUP I

MARINE AND COASTAL BIODIVERSITY: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/3, 22 and 23).

Ecologically and biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs): MEXICO, ARGENTINA and JAPAN emphasized that the description of EBSAs is a scientific and technical exercise, and cannot affect states' rights and obligations under international law or prejudice the work of competent international organizations.

CANADA supported the draft decision, noting that all relevant knowledge bases are taken into account. AUSTRALIA recommended "endorsing" the EBSA workshops' summary reports and establishing a supplementary process to include them in the repository. JAPAN, CHINA and PERU preferred "taking note" of the reports. NORWAY encouraged including the reports in the repository, distributing them to relevant bodies and improving EBSA descriptions when information becomes available. The EU called for endorsing the reports to stimulate further workshops and further EBSAs' identification, and urged regional groups to identify marine protected areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ) under a new implementing agreement under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). KIRIBATI called for further regional workshops to achieve global coverage.

INDONESIA highlighted including social and cultural criteria in description of EBSAs. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA called for cooperation between the CBD and the UN General Assembly (UNGA) on EBSAs beyond national jurisdiction. GREENPEACE urged parties to endorse the summary reports and request UNGA to urgently address EBSAs' governance. IUCN urged the COP to invite the UNGA Working Group on marine biodiversity in ABNJ to encourage states and international organizations to respond to EBSA information and report on action taken based on existing international obligations under UNCLOS. The IIFB called for integrating traditional knowledge in EBSA description.

EIA guidelines: CANADA welcomed the revised guidelines on environmental impact assessments (EIA). AUSTRALIA supported "noting" them. NORWAY underscored the need to refine language on flag state responsibility and the role of international organizations. INDIA, COLOMBIA, CHINA and the DOMINICAN REPUBLIC emphasized the voluntary nature of the guidelines, with MEXICO stressing that they do not prejudice the competence of UNGA and the International Seabed

Authority. The EU supported taking note of the guidelines, making them available as a reference, and encouraging their use and submission of information following their application. PERU opposed, calling for more consultation under UNGA and regional seas conventions. The US cautioned that the voluntary guidelines use mandatory language and undefined terms.

Other matters: NORWAY supported guidance on: underwater noise, taking into account limited scientific information; and marine debris, taking into account work in other fora. AUSTRALIA called for cooperation with the Convention on Migratory Species on marine debris. The AFRICAN GROUP highlighted ocean governance challenges related to geoengineering and ocean fertilization.

BIODIVERSITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/3, 24 and 25).

REDD+: The AFRICAN GROUP and MALAYSIA supported "taking note" of advice on the application of relevant country-specific biodiversity safeguards and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA preferred "welcoming" it. GRULAC said that countries should develop national safeguard systems according to UNFCCC COP decisions. The EU supported advice on safeguards, highlighting that the COP should consider means of monitoring and assessing the impacts of REDD+ on biodiversity.

BOLIVIA said there is not a common understanding on what REDD+ is, suggesting to either avoid reference to the abbreviation or add reference to the Bolivian Joint Mitigation and Adaptation Mechanism for the Integral and Sustainable Management of Forests as an alternative non-market based approach. EL SALVADOR underscored the need to emphasize both adaptation and mitigation. BRAZIL and INDIA said information on safeguards has to be country-driven. BRAZIL further cautioned that the issue of forests is not reduced to REDD+.

SOUTH AFRICA, NORWAY and SWITZERLAND supported retaining a reference to an indicative list of indicators. BRAZIL suggested deletion, and COLOMBIA said a list of indicators is premature.

Parties discussed a request to the Secretariat to develop further advice. The EU, with many, supported reporting progress to SBSTTA prior to COP 12. INDONESIA favored a mandate for the Secretariat to compile information on potential effects of REDD+ activities on indigenous and local communities. The FAO reported on exploring synergies with the Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade initiative. The GLOBAL FOREST COALITION lamented priority attached to REDD+ instead of other forest biodiversity issues.

Geoengineering: GHANA, supported by GRENADA and BOLIVIA, emphasized the precautionary approach and expressed concern about definitions from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). KUWAIT preferred a definition from the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report. CHINA affirmed that a geoengineering definition should be developed

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Kate Louw, Elisa Morgera, Ph.D., Dorothy Wanja Nyngi, Ph.D., Teya Penniman, Eugenia Recio and Elsa Tsioumani. The Digital Editor is Francis Dejon. The Editor is 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), the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), and the Government of Australia. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2012 is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 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). Specific funding for coverage of this meeting has been provided by the Belgium Federal Public Service for Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment, the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, the Indian Ministry of Environment and Forests, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and the Finnish Ministry of the Environment. 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, USA. The ENB Team at CBD COP 11 can be contacted by e-mail at <elsa@iisd.org>.



<http://enb.iisd.mobi/>

on the basis of those used by the IPCC and UNFCCC. GRULAC considered discussions on geoengineering premature and a mechanism for its regulation not best placed under the CBD. The PHILIPPINES affirmed that the biodiversity aspects of geoengineering should remain within the competence of the CBD. The GLOBAL FOREST COALITION and the ETC GROUP stated that CBD is the appropriate body to oversee the governance of geoengineering.

GHANA, the EU, ARGENTINA, SOUTH AFRICA, the PHILIPPINES and KUWAIT preferred recognizing the lack of, and a need for, a “comprehensive, science-based, global, transparent and effective framework for those geoengineering concepts that have the potential to cause significant adverse transboundary effects and are deployed in ABNJ and the atmosphere.” NORWAY and the US favored noting that “the need for a comprehensive science-based, global, transparent and effective mechanism may be the most relevant” for such geoengineering. INDIA, supported by BOLIVIA, recommended that application of geoengineering techniques be deferred until more robust scientific understanding and an appropriate legal framework are developed. The AFRICAN GROUP recommended retaining the moratorium and mandating SBSTTA to review the IPCC report on geoengineering due in 2014. BOLIVIA, the GLOBAL FOREST COALITION and the ETC GROUP recommended reinforcing the CBD moratorium by prohibiting open-air experiments.

ARGENTINA, opposed by SOUTH AFRICA, proposed deleting a reference to customary international law being relevant for geoengineering activities but still forming an incomplete basis for global regulation.

WORKING GROUP II

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTATION AND AICHI TARGETS: Establishment of national targets and NBSAP

updating: ARGENTINA called for a strong participatory process when reviewing NBSAPs. IUCN stressed that NBSAPs are essential to integrate biodiversity into broader societal goals. The FAO said its national focal points could contribute to designing NBSAPs.

Monitoring implementation: ARGENTINA expressed concern on some of the indicators. KIRIBATI called for including the source data used for establishing the indicators. UNEP, DIVERSITAS, the GROUP ON EARTH OBSERVATIONS and the GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY INFORMATION FACILITY presented on their work. The IIFB WORKING GROUP ON INDICATORS called for support of community monitoring systems, through partnerships between governments and indigenous peoples.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND MECHANISM: Review of implementation of the Resource Mobilization Strategy: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6/Add.1, UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/6 and 7, UNEP/CBD/COP/11/4/Rev.1, 14 and 14/Add.1-3). In a video message, Pavan Sukhdev, Chair of the high-level panel on global assessment of resources, introduced the panel’s report (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/14/Add.2) underscoring that implementation of some targets requires investment of several hundreds of billions of US dollars.

GRULAC highlighted the need for new, additional, predictable and adequate financial resources, and suggested that national trust funds complement the Convention’s financial provisions by channeling international resources. The AFRICAN GROUP called for a 20% annual increase in international financial flows to developing countries and for clarity on markets, offsets and innovative financial mechanisms. NORWAY underscored the need to combine efforts on resource mobilization, track biodiversity funding, and create enabling conditions. AUSTRALIA opposed setting quantitative targets specific to official development assistance.

CANADA stressed the need to monitor parties’ implementation of the strategy and the importance of national assessments to establish baselines, expressing readiness to discuss targets once parties have completed their data collection process. PERU highlighted the need for capacity building, and ARGENTINA for funding, for countries to undertake national assessments of needs and gaps. JAPAN considered it premature to adopt a baseline and targets at COP 12. KIRIBATI emphasized

the importance of agreeing on funding targets at this meeting, noting that available data is sufficient. INDIA explained that setting targets now, even on an interim basis, would build confidence among parties. MEXICO said it would be a “serious mistake” to delay implementation. COSTA RICA called for guidelines for information collection and analysis.

The PHILIPPINES supported adopting the preliminary reporting framework for resource mobilization. BOLIVIA affirmed that the framework’s indicators should also consider collective action taken by indigenous peoples and local communities. Highlighting the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, CHINA noted the framework should be voluntary for developing countries.

GEF: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/4, 8 and 15/Rev.2). Delegates heard reports on GEF’s biodiversity-related activities during the first two years of GEF-5 and the expert panel’s analysis of funding needs for GEF-6.

GEF report: MEXICO proposed a simpler methodology to improve clarity on GEF’s rationale for allocating resources.

Guidance to the financial mechanism: COLOMBIA stressed stable funding for NBSAPs. The PHILIPPINES said national portfolio formulation infringed on states’ sovereignty and should be revised. GHANA, with many, said the COP should request GEF to improve the timeliness of financial support. JAPAN and NORWAY suggested extending the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund (NPIF) until COP 12. NAMIBIA and KIRIBATI urged streamlining of GEF processes, with NAMIBIA suggesting calling on GEF to “contract directly through recipients rather than with the usual GEF agents,” for disbursements from NPIF.

Needs assessment for GEF-6: MEXICO supported extending the mandate of the high-level panel. COLOMBIA called for “urging” developed countries to increase their contributions to GEF, and proposed text noting that the lowest estimate of necessary funds for implementation is US\$5 billion. JAPAN called for also considering donors’ financial capacity. BRAZIL said the establishment of priorities for GEF-6 should take into account the Strategic Plan and countries’ needs assessments. INDIA highlighted the need to monitor the impact of GEF-6 projects in reaching the Aichi targets. SWITZERLAND cautioned against suggesting a figure and target for GEF-6 replenishment.

NAGOYA PROTOCOL: Janet Lowe (New Zealand) and Fernando Casas (Colombia), Co-Chairs of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol (ICNP), reported on ICNP 1 and 2 outcomes. The Secretariat introduced draft decisions (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/6).

NAMIBIA recommended the COP monitor implementation of CBD Article 15 (Access to Genetic Resources) by CBD parties that are not parties to the Protocol. MEXICO stressed that activities to promote the Protocol’s ratification and implementation be funded by the core budget. CAMEROON cautioned against delaying COP 12 to 2015, to increase momentum for ratification.

IN THE CORRIDORS

In the morning, participants who’d made it to Monday’s reception at Gachibowli stadium were still raving about the colorful light show and the feeling of connection that comes from trying out new dance steps with a few thousand other confused but jubilant people. But when the COP settled back into business, it was apparent those synchronized moves had been left on the dance floor; Chairs of both Working Groups struggled to keep interventions brief and the agenda on track.

ABBA’s “Money, money, money” would have been the right soundtrack for key discussions in both Working Groups. In WG II, calls for more “prescriptive” guidance to the GEF encountered the skepticism of those considering the GEF Council as the right forum for discussing funding targets. In WG I, certain participants lamented donors’ “disproportionate influence” over international decision-making on forests, giving priority to REDD+ over other urgent forest biodiversity-related matters, and pointing to donors’ potential to “impose” voluntary guidance on REDD+ safeguards on international funding-recipients.



CBD COP 11 HIGHLIGHTS WEDNESDAY, 10 OCTOBER 2012

WG I addressed Article 8(j), biodiversity of drylands and sub-humid lands, inland waters and protected areas (PAs). WG II considered the status of the Nagoya Protocol, and cooperation, outreach and the UN Decade on Biodiversity. A contact group on Article 8(j) and a Friends of the Chair group on GEF-related items met in the evening.

WORKING GROUP I

ARTICLE 8(j): The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/7; UNEP/CBD/WG8J/7/INF/5/Rev.1, 5/Add.1 and 7/Rev.1). Making reference to the Rio+20 outcome, UNGA resolutions and the Ramsar Convention, NORWAY, supported by GUATEMALA and IIFB, recommended referring to “indigenous peoples and local communities” under the Convention, rather than “indigenous and local communities” (ILCs).

Repatriation of traditional knowledge (TK): BRAZIL affirmed that no continued use of repatriated knowledge should be allowed without prior informed consent (PIC) and mutually agreed terms (MAT), and supported the development of best-practice guidance for international repatriation. JAPAN suggested deleting a proposed interpretation of TK under the Convention because of ongoing work on a definition of TK under the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO).

The AFRICAN GROUP proposed removing brackets around language on the repatriation of TK not impeding the continued use of such knowledge in the repatriating party, while COLOMBIA preferred deletion of such language. The AFRICAN GROUP further suggested removing brackets concerning interpreting repatriation in light of CBD Articles 8(j) and 17(2) (exchange of information, including TK).

Sustainable customary use: INDIA called for flexibility in the use of a new indicator on land-use change and land tenure in ILCs’ traditional territories.

On a list of indicative tasks for a plan of action on sustainable customary use, the AFRICAN GROUP, PACIFIC ISLANDS and BRAZIL supported a review of national and sub-national policies to ensure protection and encouragement of sustainable customary use. The AFRICAN GROUP and PACIFIC ISLANDS also supported guidelines on developing legislation to respect, protect and promote sustainable customary use and TK, with BRAZIL suggesting reference to “according to national legislation and circumstances.” INDIA recommended that the guidelines allow for consideration of national circumstances. The IIFB preferred “to develop mechanisms to recognize and respect customary laws, community protocols and procedures and traditional institutions and authorities in national and sub-

national legislation” and “to review and revise national and sub-national laws and policies taking into consideration customary laws and practices.” CANADA proposed instead compiling information on case studies on customary land use and community resource management practices, and providing tools and networks to enable ILCs to map their customary use; and inviting IUCN to initiate work on best practices on governance, harvesting, access to sacred sites and ILCs’ benefit-sharing in the context of IUCN PA categories. The AFRICAN GROUP, PACIFIC ISLANDS and the IIFB, opposed by BRAZIL, supported an indicative task to explore the relationship between climate change, sustainable customary use and TK.

DRYLAND BIODIVERSITY: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/25). ARGENTINA pointed to differences in terminology between the CBD and the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), and YEMEN underscored the need for harmonization.

KENYA highlighted the role of pastoralists, indigenous peoples and TK. FAO highlighted the recently adopted voluntary guidelines on tenure governance. The EU said the database of scientific knowledge between biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, and organic carbon stock conservation and restoration should be used for priority setting. Saudi Arabia for the ARAB GROUP underscored the need to document TK systems to preserve organic carbon stocks and the sound management of ecosystems.

INLAND WATERS: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/30 and INF/2). Parties addressed SBSTTA Recommendation XV/5. Many supported further synergies and cooperation among Secretariats of relevant agreements. The EU called for using common definitions and terms throughout conventions. NORWAY and NEW ZEALAND suggested recognizing the importance of the water cycle to most areas of the Convention and to achieving the Aichi targets. CANADA requested the Secretariat develop initiatives for water management prior to COP 12. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA suggested reference to the relevance of water as considered in the Rio+20 outcome. PERU supported including a reference to ecosystems that are shared and part of an area of international relevance.

PROTECTED AREAS: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/2 and 26). Several developing countries stressed the need for financial support to achieve Aichi Target 11 (PAs). The EU emphasized the need to: start negotiations of a new UNCLOS implementing agreement under UNGA in relation to marine PAs beyond national jurisdiction; establish a link between Nagoya Protocol Article 9 (contribution to conservation and sustainable use) and PAs; and provide capacity building to ILCs. The AFRICAN GROUP drew attention to the



effectiveness of PA management, livelihood issues, and support for harmonized management of transboundary PAs. BOLIVIA underscored the need to promote and financially support ILCs' participation in achieving Aichi Target 11.

CANADA queried reference to "extractive reserves" among community-based approaches for biodiversity. The PHILIPPINES supported the voluntary use and further development of the global registry of indigenous and community conserved areas (ICCAs) managed by UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC). COLOMBIA proposed strengthening the recognition and support to community-based approaches to biodiversity conservation, including ICCAs and other community areas classified under the IUCN PA categories.

SWITZERLAND called on the Secretariat and IUCN to provide guidance on qualifiers in Aichi Target 11 such as ecological representativeness and management effectiveness. THAILAND proposed inviting parties to assess the current status of ecosystems and prioritize degraded areas within PAs. The IIFB called for the free PIC of indigenous peoples and local communities before PA establishment.

WORKING GROUP II

NAGOYA PROTOCOL: All delegates supported reconvening ICNP for a third meeting, with SOUTH AFRICA and GHANA calling for strict timelines for completing its work. MALAYSIA, INDIA and TURKEY supported holding an expert meeting on the global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism. The EU suggested that COP 11 invite submissions on model clauses, codes of conduct and guidelines.

MICRONESIA highlighted its recent ratification of the Nagoya Protocol. MOROCCO, INDONESIA, SOUTH AFRICA, NAMIBIA, ECUADOR and INDIA reported on their imminent ratification. SUDAN and SENEGAL underscored workshops for capacity building and awareness raising targeted at decision makers. UGANDA suggested adding text to encourage parties to ratify the Protocol. IUCN suggested an analysis of obstacles to ratification and implementation.

GRULAC underscored the key role of ILCs for implementation and the need for building their capacities and suggested that activities to support implementation and early entry into force be supported by the core budget. ARGENTINA drew attention to translation of the Protocol into four indigenous languages.

JAPAN highlighted the importance of establishing an ABS clearing-house, and SWITZERLAND called for additional resources from the core budget. The PHILIPPINES suggested that access-related initiatives by research organizations should not be funded by the GEF in case the provider country has not set up its regulatory framework. BANGLADESH urged establishing a fast-track process within the NPIF. SENEGAL, GABON, NAMIBIA, COSTA RICA, ECUADOR, BENIN and PERU, opposed by CANADA, called for establishing a special window for ABS in GEF's STAR system.

The FAO COMMISSION ON GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (CGRFA) reported on the outcome of the first session of its Working Group on ABS for food and agriculture, held in September 2012 in Norway. The INTERNATIONAL TREATY ON PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (ITPGR) said implementation of the Protocol provides an opportunity to reinvigorate the dialogue between environment and agriculture experts with regard to plant genetic resources.

COOPERATION: The Secretariat introduced documents on the UN Decade on Biodiversity and cooperation with other organizations, including on agricultural and forest biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/4 and 16, 17 and 32, and INF/11, 27, 30, 31, 41, 44, 46 and 52/Rev.1).

UN Decade on Biodiversity: BELARUS proposed text calling on parties to step up activities related to the UN Decade and report on them annually.

Cooperation with international organizations: THAILAND proposed text to strengthen and enhance synergies between the CBD and the UNFCCC on low-carbon cities. The EU called for enhanced use of the guidelines on biodiversity and tourism development. On the joint work programme with UNESCO on biological and cultural diversity, AUSTRALIA proposed language on consistency with international obligations, while INDIA called for considering specific national contexts. SOUTH AFRICA said parties should "commit" to using IPBES.

Many called for coordination at the national level, and INDIA said NBSAPs can assist in ensuring policy coherence. YOUTH called for their participation in decision-making processes at all levels.

Forest biodiversity: The INTERNATIONAL TROPICAL TIMBER ORGANIZATION (ITTO) presented on projects on tropical forest biodiversity. NEW ZEALAND highlighted collaboration with FAO on the 2015 global forest resources assessment. Many proposed continuing cooperation with the ITTO to expand work on tropical forest biodiversity. The EU proposed lifting brackets on text inviting parties to provide funding for a joint staff position between CBD and the UN Forum on Forests (UNFF).

Agricultural biodiversity: The PHILIPPINES urged that implementation of the joint work plan between the CBD, FAO and CGRFA Secretariats takes into account farmers' rights. PRACTICAL ACTION called for collaboration with the FAO Committee on World Food Security. The IIFB called for revitalization of traditional agricultural systems. The FAO highlighted endorsement of the Global Soil Partnership by the FAO Council.

Business and biodiversity: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/18/Add.1). Egypt for the ARAB GROUP recommended that partnership initiatives focus on national plans and actions, with financing from the private sector. AUSTRALIA suggested that CBD business-related policies be flexible, voluntary and recognize national circumstances. GRULAC said any measures must be based on standards elaborated by recognized international institutions. SWITZERLAND encouraged businesses to report on their impacts on biodiversity.

Stakeholder engagement: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/18 and 32, and INF/1, 43 and 57). MEXICO called for capacity building for local authorities to develop local plans to implement the Aichi targets. SINGAPORE called for cities to develop indicators to monitor progress in implementation. INDIA, CANADA and the EU supported draft text on the gender plan of action. CAMEROON proposed inviting parties' submissions on indicators to monitor gender mainstreaming.

IN THE CORRIDORS

Traditional knowledge (TK) was woven throughout deliberations during the third day of the COP. In WG I, an enthusiastic applause followed Norway's proposal for the CBD to refer to "indigenous peoples and local communities," adopting the terminology used by UNGA and several other environmental and human rights fora. Many countries also expressed support for indigenous and community conserved areas, while a "happy family" feeling pervaded the update on the preparations for the entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol in WG II. Less positive, however, were the vibes in the evening contact group on Article 8(j), where controversies continued over CBD work on national legislation on TK, international repatriation and the relationship between climate change and TK. Outside the Hyderabad International Conference Center, the global conference of the International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative showcased that traditional knowledge remains, as one participant put it, "more relevant than ever" for biodiversity and sustainable livelihoods, providing a reminder that TK is the warp of the "rich tapestry of life."



CBD COP 11 HIGHLIGHTS THURSDAY, 11 OCTOBER 2012

WG I addressed: sustainable use; the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC); biofuels and biodiversity; invasive alien species (IAS); and incentive measures. WG II considered operations of the Convention, and biodiversity and development. The Friends of the Chair group on the financial mechanism met throughout the day. Contact groups on Article 8(j) and resource mobilization met in the evening.

WORKING GROUP I

SUSTAINABLE USE: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/2 and 29). The RUSSIAN FEDERATION, INDONESIA and others supported strengthening the application of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines. GRULAC, JAPAN, NEPAL and others supported recognizing the usefulness of the Satoyama Initiative as a platform to establish synergies among landscape-level initiatives. AUSTRALIA considered it premature to limit references to one specific platform and preferred retaining reference to its “potential” usefulness.

COLOMBIA stressed the need to include TK in the development of national plans and policies. On engaging others in developing alternatives to unsustainable management, ICELAND opposed including reference to the fishery sector.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION underscored that sustainable wildlife use includes both tropical and non-tropical areas. FAO volunteered as the convener of the proposed collaborative partnership on sustainable wildlife management. On the “transfer” of access, rights and the responsibility to sustainably manage wildlife resources to ILCs “whenever possible,” the IIFB, supported by ETHIOPIA, suggested that ILCs who can deliver sustainable solutions “should have access to these resources and be sufficiently empowered.” TRAFFIC, with the IIFB, suggested: “adopting,” rather than “welcoming,” the revised recommendations of the Liaison Group on Bushmeat; integrating them into NBSAPs; and identifying specific national focal points for bushmeat.

GSPC: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/3). Several delegations supported the draft decision. PERU called for support to national efforts to increase knowledge on flora diversity. THAILAND suggested encouraging countries and partners to identify holders of specimens and associated information, and assist them in making the information accessible with their consent. CANADA noted certain reservations regarding the annexes, but expressed willingness to accept the draft decision. BRAZIL stressed the need to take into account specific national conditions. ETHIOPIA pointed to the need for taxonomic capacity building and “predictable” financial support for GSPC implementation. The GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR PLANT CONSERVATION

expressed willingness to provide technical assistance at national and regional levels. Chair González Posse proposed, and delegates agreed, to record reservations in the meeting report and accept the draft decision as transmitted by SBSTTA.

BIOFUELS AND BIODIVERSITY: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/3). Several supported the draft decision, with EL SALVADOR, NIGER, SWITZERLAND and SOUTH AFRICA stressing the relevance of the precautionary approach.

QATAR expressed concern about: loss of food crops; uncertainty in measuring indirect impacts; social and economic impacts on ILCs; and water scarcity; and proposed clarifying that the decision was non-binding. KUWAIT proposed text emphasizing potential impacts on food security. BOLIVIA questioned the potential of biofuels to mitigate climate change, and highlighted concerns regarding food security and subsidies leading to monocrops. ETHIOPIA proposed requesting the CBD Secretariat and other relevant organizations to compile practical examples of both positive and negative impacts. Chair González Posse proposed, and delegates agreed, to note reservations in the meeting report and accept the draft decision as transmitted by SBSTTA.

IAS: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/2, 28 and INF/33 and 34). Many supported renewing the CBD application for observer status in the Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) of the World Trade Organization (WTO), with the EU, supported by SOUTH AFRICA, proposing to invite the SPS Committee to favorably address the application. The PHILIPPINES suggested adding that adequate international standards “take into account SPS Agreement Article 9.2 that require importing countries to reconsider SPS measures that create difficulties for developing countries.”

BRAZIL emphasized the practical and non-prescriptive nature of the proposed toolkit on IAS. ARGENTINA queried the compatibility of a toolkit with WTO law.

MEXICO, SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS and GRENADA highlighted impacts of the invasive lionfish. PACIFIC ISLANDS called for technical assistance at the sub-regional level in utilizing international standards. INDONESIA supported increasing cooperation among international bodies working on IAS. INDIA underscored the need to monitor trade agreements that may pose a threat to biosecurity. SWITZERLAND proposed focusing on measures to control and eradicate prioritized IAS after minimizing risks, in achieving Aichi Target 9 (IAS). COLOMBIA suggested including public health considerations in the future.

JAPAN opposed, and the INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION (IPPC) supported, requesting IPPC to, *inter alia*, invite its members to broaden their sanitary

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Kate Louw, Elisa Morgera, Ph.D., Dorothy Wanja Nyngi, Ph.D., Teya Penniman, Eugenia Recio and Elsa Tsioumani. The Digital Editor is Francis Dejon. The Editor is 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), the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), and the Government of Australia. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2012 is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 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). Specific funding for coverage of this meeting has been provided by the Belgium Federal Public Service for Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment, the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, the Indian Ministry of Environment and Forests, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and the Finnish Ministry of the Environment. 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, USA. The ENB Team at CBD COP 11 can be contacted by e-mail at <elsa@iisd.org>.



<http://enb.iisd.mobi/>

and phytosanitary measures for plant protection in marine, terrestrial and freshwater environments. ARGENTINA cautioned this proposal should be based on adequate risk assessments.

GTI: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/2). Delegates adopted the decision as submitted by SBSTTA.

INCENTIVE MEASURES: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/3 and INF/10). The EU emphasized that: incentives can help deliver the Aichi targets in the most cost-effective way; biodiversity funding needs must also be addressed through green economy and innovative funding mechanisms; the report on The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) should be used to review NBSAPs; and that the EU is committed to mainstreaming biodiversity in reforming its agricultural and fisheries policies. GRULAC pointed to regionally-uneven distribution of perverse incentives, calling for eliminating developed countries' agricultural and fisheries subsidies; and expressed support for payment for ecosystem services if they result in conservation and sustainable use.

CANADA underscored the need for additional efforts on non-market values of biodiversity. AUSTRALIA, supported by NEW ZEALAND, recommended ensuring harmony with relevant international obligations. BRAZIL proposed taking into account the adoption at Rio+20 of the 10-year programme on sustainable production and consumption patterns. COLOMBIA emphasized both economic and non-economic values, noting TEEB's limited focus on cost-effectiveness. Chair González Posse proposed, and delegates agreed, to agree on the draft decision as transmitted by SBSTTA.

WORKING GROUP II

FINANCIAL MECHANISM: BELGIUM reported on Wednesday's meeting of the Friends of the Chair on the issue, noting consideration of a non-paper on guidance to the financial mechanism. He said participants addressed language on timeliness of financial support from GEF and the need for increased financial contributions, without reaching agreement.

COOPERATION: On business and biodiversity, ECONEXUS said that adoption of biodiversity safeguards rests with governments and should not be left to business; SEARICE stressed that voluntary standards should not be prioritized over binding regulations; and UNEP-WCMC drew attention to its best policy guidance for integrating biodiversity ecosystem services into standards (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/59). FAO drew attention to World Food Day on 16 October focusing on agricultural cooperatives.

OPERATIONS OF THE CONVENTION: Periodicity of meetings and retirement of decisions: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/10 and Add.1, and INF/1). Most delegates, including the AFRICAN GROUP, BRAZIL, INDIA, the EU and SWITZERLAND, called for maintaining the current biennial schedule for COP meetings, with many highlighting the need to maintain momentum for implementation and that the predominant factor for decision making should not be financing. JAPAN called for further discussion at COP 12.

The EU opposed retiring elements of Decision VII/5 regarding work by UNGA on genetic resources of the deep seabed in ABNJ. The CBD ALLIANCE called for no retirement of decisions, especially text on genetic use restriction technologies.

Existing and additional mechanisms: The Secretariat introduced the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/2, 19 and 19/Add.1, and INF/3 and 51).

IPBES: NORWAY suggested adopting a mechanism to define how CBD can make requests to IPBES. MEXICO called for SBSTTA to identify means of communication with IPBES. TIMOR-LESTE called for clear criteria regarding IPBES membership. JAPAN and CHINA cautioned against duplication of work. INDIA suggested that SBSTTA be mandated to make requests to IPBES. JAPAN and CHINA preferred the COP make requests to IPBES. The INDIAN BIODIVERSITY FORUM cautioned that IPBES is unnecessary, as the problem lies not in lack of information but in lack of political will.

New and emerging issues: Delegates discussed three bracketed options in SBSTTA recommendation XII/12: not adding any new and emerging issues to SBSTTA's agenda (option 1), which was supported by AUSTRALIA, CANADA, THAILAND, CHINA, ARGENTINA, NEW ZEALAND and BRAZIL; initiating an information-gathering process for consideration of synthetic biology by SBSTTA before COP 12, on the basis of the precautionary approach (option 2), which was supported by BOLIVIA, GHANA, NORWAY, the PHILIPPINES, ECUADOR, the AFRICAN GROUP and PAKISTAN; and noting that the process for identifying new and emerging issues needs refinement and that SBSTTA 16 was not able to make a decision, and requesting a synthesis report for SBSTTA consideration before COP 12 (option 3), which was supported by SWITZERLAND, the EU, JAPAN and KUWAIT.

CHINA suggested that the issue could be discussed under the Biosafety Protocol. BOLIVIA, the PHILIPPINES, ECUADOR, GABON and several NGOs supported text urging parties to ensure that products of synthetic biology are not released into the environment or approved for commercial use until there is adequate scientific basis for such activities. NORWAY, NEW ZEALAND and BRAZIL favored deletion.

BIODIVERSITY AND DEVELOPMENT: The Secretariat presented the item, including the Dehradun recommendations (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/4, 33/Rev.1, 33/Add.1, and INF/4 and 40). Many welcomed the recommendations and supported continuation of work in an AHTEG. JAPAN and AUSTRALIA preferred "taking note" of the recommendations. JAPAN, opposed by GUATEMALA, said poverty eradication does not fall within the Convention's scope. BOLIVIA, with VENEZUELA and CUBA, opposed the market-based approach in the recommendations, and called for consistency with the Rio+20 outcome.

The EU acknowledged the role of ABS in contributing to poverty eradication, with INDONESIA and TUNISIA highlighting the potential of the Nagoya Protocol. GABON called for mainstreaming the Aichi targets into the post-2015 development agenda. SENEGAL supported inviting stakeholders to provide information on best practices for mainstreaming biodiversity into poverty eradication plans. KENYA called for holistic strategies to address poverty and biodiversity concerns.

BRAZIL called for referencing language from the Rio+20 outcome document stressing the importance of indigenous peoples in the achievement of sustainable development. PAKISTAN called for capacity development of ILCs to help eradicate poverty. The IIFB suggested recognizing the contribution of TK and adding reference to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). The WOMEN'S ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION noted women face unequal access to natural resources, land, technology and credit.

IN THE CORRIDORS

By Thursday, the COP managed to complete a first reading of all its draft decisions. "The pace has picked up ... we even adopted a few decisions today!" commented a surprised seasoned participant. This came at the price, however, of not re-opening text transmitted by the CBD subsidiary bodies even in the face of specific objections from delegations. The well-informed commented that time and money invested in intersessional work in an era of austerity call for avoiding the renegotiation of (preliminary) agreed text. On the other hand, some lawyerly types wondered whether the practice of pushing through agreements with multiple reservations attached would decrease the uptake of the CBD COP decisions at the national level.

Meanwhile, the difficult issues at COP 11 clearly emerged from the packed agenda: in addition to the predictable finance-related items, deliberations on geo-engineering and synthetic biology suggest that the Convention still needs to find its niche when it comes to the implications of cutting-edge technology. An eternal optimist commented, "at least we set aside enough time to deal with them."



CBD COP 11 HIGHLIGHTS FRIDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2012

WG I met in the morning and afternoon to discuss biodiversity and climate change, and ecosystem restoration. In the afternoon, plenary adopted decisions on biofuels and biodiversity, the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC), the GTI and incentive measures, heard reports and addressed organizational matters. Contact groups on resource mobilization and REDD+, as well as the budget group and Friends of the Chair groups on guidance to the financial mechanism and geo-engineering met throughout the day.

WORKING GROUP I

CLIMATE CHANGE: Delegates addressed a revised draft decision on other matters related to biodiversity and climate change (UNEP/ CBD/COP11/WG.1/CRP.1).

On funding to fill biodiversity and ecosystem data gaps, JAPAN, the EU, NORWAY, CANADA and others, opposed by CHINA, suggested that governments and organizations “in a position to do so” further mobilize resources. BRAZIL, ARGENTINA, CHINA, BOLIVIA, MALAYSIA, ETHIOPIA and others requested either bracketing text on endorsing the SBSTTA recommendation on strengthening knowledge and information on the linkages between biodiversity and climate change or adding reference to the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. The EU, CANADA, NEW ZEALAND, JAPAN, AUSTRALIA and NORWAY opposed. On evaluating the impact of climate change on biodiversity and ecosystem services, BRAZIL, opposed by the EU and ISRAEL, objected to reference to “monitoring activities.”

ETHIOPIA suggested, and delegates agreed, that parties “promote,” rather than “consider,” synergies between biodiversity and climate change policies and measures. BELARUS suggested reflecting the role that “restored ecosystems” play in climate change-related activities.

On the strengthening of inventories and monitoring of biodiversity and ecosystem services, the EU, opposed by BRAZIL, suggested including evaluation of the impacts of climate change adaptation and mitigation. BRAZIL, opposed by NORWAY, objected to language on reviewing land-use planning with a view to enhancing ecosystem-based adaptation to climate change, arguing it falls under the UNFCCC mandate.

In the afternoon, delegates agreed on compromise language to: strengthen knowledge and information, including comparable datasets and related research, and monitoring activities on the links between biodiversity, climate change and human well-being in educational programmes, with the EU adding “at all

levels”; strengthen inventories and monitoring of threats and likely impacts of climate change, and both positive and negative impacts of climate mitigation and adaptation measures on biodiversity and ecosystem services; and “consider” reviewing land-use planning with a view to enhancing ecosystem-based adaptation to climate change.

ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION: Delegates considered a revised draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.1/CRP.2). CANADA, supported by INDIA, proposed deleting reference to ecosystem restoration as a “last resort for ameliorating degraded ecosystems.”

On identifying degraded ecosystems for potential restoration that may be used by ILCs, THAILAND proposed promoting best practices and appropriate technology. NORWAY recommended performing social impact assessments to ensure that restoration projects do not negatively affect ILCs that may use the land. The EU preferred to “consider” performing social impact assessments, with AUSTRALIA adding “appropriate to national circumstances.”

On language recognizing that developing countries require financial resources to implement ecosystem restoration and achieve the Aichi targets, PERU, supported by EL SALVADOR but opposed by CANADA, suggested including countries that are centers of origin. The EU, supported by NEW ZEALAND, requested bracketing the text due to its financial implications, pending discussions on resource mobilization. SOMALIA, SUDAN, QATAR, the DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO, TOGO, TURKEY and other developing countries wished to retain the language. JAPAN proposed referring not only to financial, but also to technical and human resources. CHINA, supported by BRAZIL, proposed adding “in accordance with CBD Article 20” (Financial Resources). MEXICO urged delegates not to repeat the experience of COP 10 in Nagoya where several portions of decisions were left bracketed until the conclusion of discussions on resource mobilization. Chair González Posse admonished delegates not to keep the process “hostage” to the resource mobilization discussion.

In the afternoon, delegates agreed not to establish an AHTEG on ecosystem restoration, but to request the Secretariat to undertake the tasks initially allocated to an AHTEG. Pointing to ongoing informal discussions on terminology regarding “indigenous peoples and local communities” versus ILCs, CANADA and the EU requested bracketing these references.

CONTACT GROUP ON RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

Participants addressed a shortened and revised non-paper following discussions held on Thursday evening. Co-Chairs Ines Verleye (Belgium) and Javier Camargo (Colombia) explained

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Kate Louw, Elisa Morgera, Ph.D., Dorothy Wanja Nyingi, Ph.D., Teya Penniman, Eugenia Recio and Elsa Tsioumani. The Digital Editor is Francis Dejon. The Editor is 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), the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), and the Government of Australia. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2012 is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 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). Specific funding for coverage of this meeting has been provided by the Belgium Federal Public Service for Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment, the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, the Indian Ministry of Environment and Forests, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and the Finnish Ministry of the Environment. 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, USA. The ENB Team at CBD COP 11 can be contacted by e-mail at <elsa@iisd.org>.



<http://enb.iisd.mobi/>

the non-paper included language discussed at WGRI as well as parties' additional contributions, grouped under sections on: preamble; reporting framework; baselines; targets; review of goals of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization; high-level panel; enabling conditions; innovative financial mechanisms; and requests to the Secretariat. Debate focused on procedural issues. Developing countries stressed the need to start the discussion from the section on targets, arguing the need for, at least, an interim target. Developed countries preferred discussing the reporting framework and baselines first, noting these sections provide the required background for discussion on targets. Some developing countries also argued that innovative financial mechanisms can be accepted only in combination with a system monitoring their efficacy.

BUDGET GROUP

During the budget contact group, parties discussed the programme budget for the next biennium 2013 – 2014, noting that the COP had prepared three options based on assessed growth, 7.5% growth and zero growth. Delegates addressed the scenarios under each budget option, with parties addressing the implications in terms of staffing, frequency and duration of SBSTTA meetings, post upgrades, as well as the logistics of COP and SBSTTA Bureau meetings. Delegates also discussed the status of unpaid contributions from 2001. They expressed concern that a large number of dues and pledges for 2012 are still unpaid, and agreed to draft a decision requesting the COP President and the Executive Secretary to appeal to parties to pay their contributions as a matter of urgency.

CONTACT GROUP ON REDD+

Delegates discussed a non-paper reflecting parties' views and discussions held during the week. Some said the paper was a good basis for negotiation. Others noted the Chair's non-paper had omitted critical elements contained in SBSTTA recommendation 16/8, including the indicative list of indicators, adding that indicators for biodiversity safeguards are key to fulfill Decision X/33 (Biodiversity and Climate Change). Others argued that adoption of advice on biodiversity safeguards and a list of indicators would contradict UNFCCC decisions. Discussions continued throughout the afternoon, and parties eventually agreed to work on a revised non-paper to be prepared on the basis of: the Chair's non-paper; submissions made by parties in the WG; and paragraphs selected by parties from the SBSTTA recommendation. Parties also agreed to delete references to the abbreviation "REDD+."

PLENARY

Plenary observed a minute of silence in memory of Marie Khan, focal point for gender in the CBD Secretariat.

WG I Chair González Posse reported finalization of draft decisions on: biofuels and biodiversity; the GSPC; the GTI; and incentive measures. She said that most paragraphs on other matters related to biodiversity and climate change have been approved, with the exception of four outstanding issues, and that a Friends of the Chair group will meet on Saturday to address marine and coastal biodiversity.

WG II Chair Bignell reported on deliberations, noting finalization of first reading on all agenda items and that a Friends of the Chair group on the implementation of resource mobilization strategy, including setting targets, will meet on Saturday.

Budget group Chair Conrod Hunte (Antigua and Barbuda) reported on discussions, noting that participants clarified issues following a presentation by the Secretariat. He highlighted concerns, including the high level of unpaid contributions and the need for creative ideas for resource mobilization.

Plenary then adopted without discussion decisions on: biofuels and biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.2); the GSPC (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.3); the GTI (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.4); and incentive measures (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.5). GRULAC requested that their position on incentive measures as expressed during WG I deliberations be recorded in the report of the meeting.

Pending additional nominations from GRULAC and Asia and the Pacific, plenary elected new Bureau members as nominated by regional groups: Ioseb Kartsivadze (Georgia) and Senka Barudanovic (Bosnia and Herzegovina) for CEE; Spencer Thomas (Grenada) for GRULAC; Tone Solhaug (Norway) and Jeremy Eppel (UK) for JUSCANZ; and Boukar Attari (Niger) and Francis Ogwal (Uganda) for the African Group. Delegates then elected Gemedo Dalle Tussie (Ethiopia) to be the next SBSTTA Chair. Plenary took note of the report on credentials and the list of observer organizations in the meeting. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA offered to host CBD COP 12.

IUCN said the Aichi targets underpin its 2012-2016 work plan adopted during the World Conservation Congress held in September 2012, in Jeju, Republic of Korea, and announced plans to develop a partnership focused on Target 12 for threatened species. BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL said a recent study estimated costs to reduce extinction risk to all threatened species at \$4 billion annually until 2020. WIPO provided an overview of developments in the framework of its Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore.

FRIENDS OF THE CHAIR GROUP ON GEO-ENGINEERING

In an evening meeting, the group considered: the context of the proposed decision on geo-engineering; definitions of geo-engineering; the need for a comprehensive science-based, global, transparent and effective regulatory mechanism/framework; the role of customary international law; and socioeconomic issues related to geo-engineering.

IN THE CORRIDORS

Feelings were mixed among participants as the first week of the COP came to a close. The swift adoption by plenary of four decisions, including on the success-story GSPC, left many satisfied with progress achieved in the first half of the COP. That same feeling of accomplishment wasn't shared by the smaller groups working on REDD+ and the Resource Mobilization Strategy. "It took us the whole afternoon to figure out a way to create a non-paper out of a non-paper," said a bleary-eyed REDD negotiator. Procedural debates also haunted the start of the deliberations on implementation of the Resource Mobilization Strategy, including setting of targets – an item carried over from COP 10. As developing countries made clear that the adoption of targets, at least interim ones, is an absolute and urgent priority, developed parties argued that baselines are necessary for target-setting, and thus should be addressed first. No way out of the chicken-or-egg conundrum was identified, with hopes pinned on a Friends of the Chair group to find common ground over the weekend along with a workable strategy for moving forward. Some feared however the issue will hold everybody awake until the wee hours of next Friday.



CBD COP 11 HIGHLIGHTS MONDAY, 15 OCTOBER 2012

WG I addressed draft decisions on marine and coastal, and island biodiversity, inland waters and PAs; and WG II on the status of the Nagoya Protocol and capacity-building related items. The budget group, and contact and Friends of the Chair groups on resource mobilization, guidance to the financial mechanism, new and emerging issues, REDD+, and geo-engineering met throughout the day.

WORKING GROUP I

MARINE AND COASTAL BIODIVERSITY: Delegates considered draft decisions revised by a Friends of the Chair group on Saturday (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.1/CRP.5 and 6).

Other matters: On encouraging measures to minimize adverse impacts of anthropogenic underwater noise, the EU suggested, and parties agreed to, referring to the “full range of” best available technologies and environmental practices.

EIA guidelines: The EU, opposed by ARGENTINA, ECUADOR and JAPAN, suggested taking note “with appreciation” of the guidelines. ARGENTINA noted the guidelines still contain prescriptive language.

EBSAs: To avoid continued debate on whether to “endorse” or “take note of” summary reports of EBSA regional workshops, Chair González Posse proposed that parties request the Secretariat to include the summary reports in the repository and transmit them to UNGA, its Working Group on marine biodiversity in ABNJ and other international bodies. Many supported the compromise proposal. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION, CHINA and ICELAND queried whether this is contrary to the procedure outlined by COP 10, highlighting the need for prior COP endorsement.

The PHILIPPINES and MEXICO called for reference to the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities. The EU cautioned against ILCs’ involvement in regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs) because of lack of clarity about the standard of “full and effective participation” and, with CANADA, because of RFMOs’ procedural rules.

ISLAND BIODIVERSITY: Delegates discussed a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.1/CRP.3). MADAGASCAR proposed reference to interdependence of marine, freshwater and terrestrial resources, and SOUTH AFRICA suggested including estuarine resources. CHINA and ETHIOPIA suggested including reference to mobilizing “additional resources, in accordance with CBD Articles 20 and 21” (Financial Resources and Financial Mechanism). Delegates approved the draft decision as amended.

INLAND WATERS: Delegates approved a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.1/CRP.4), amended to include reference to the findings of the TEEB report on the economics of water and wetlands.

PROTECTED AREAS: Delegates considered a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.1/CRP.7). COLOMBIA recommended emphasizing that PAs are strategic to achieve not only Aichi Target 11 (PAs) but also other Aichi targets, with BRAZIL suggesting references to specific targets.

ETHIOPIA and BENIN, opposed by the EU, AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND and TURKEY, objected to reference on improving marine PAs in all areas within parties’ jurisdiction. ARGENTINA proposed adding reference to CBD Article 4 (Jurisdictional Scope). Chair González Posse proposed reference to “both” marine and terrestrial PAs.

ETHIOPIA suggested, and following informal consultations delegates agreed to, giving due attention to the conservation of wild relatives of cultivated crops and edible plants in PAs and ICCAs in accordance with CBD and national legislation.

The PHILIPPINES called for continuation of assessments on PA governance to improve PA systems management. Following informal consultations, delegates agreed.

The EU reiterated a proposal to encourage parties, when implementing Nagoya Protocol Article 9 (Contribution to Conservation and Sustainable Use), to encourage users and providers to direct benefits from the utilization of genetic resources towards conservation and sustainable use, including establishing and managing PAs, with ETHIOPIA, GABON, BRAZIL and MADAGASCAR also requesting “ensuring fair and equitable benefit-sharing with ILCs.”

On a list of activities for the Secretariat to support implementation of national action plans for the work programme on PAs, SWITZERLAND proposed adding guidance on the definition of area-based conservation measures. The PHILIPPINES suggested contributing to the further development of the global registry of ICCAs. The draft decision was approved with these and other amendments.

WORKING GROUP II

FINANCIAL MECHANISM: The AFRICAN GROUP recommended that the GEF: allocate funds dedicated to ABS and the Nagoya Protocol in a separate window under STAR during GEF-6 to implement the third CBD objective, without setting a precedent with regard to creation of separate windows; and provide financial support to the Secretariat to continue its technical support to parties for the Protocol’s ratification and implementation. The PHILIPPINES proposed: urging the GEF not to undermine the effectiveness of national regulatory activities by funding bioprospecting activities while regulatory activities are ongoing; and inviting countries receiving applications for bioprospecting activities to require that collectors’ countries have effective ABS regulations in place or commit to ratify the Nagoya Protocol.



CHINA, the PHILIPPINES, the ARAB GROUP, CUBA and MEXICO said that delegates in the Friends of the Chair group are not allowed to negotiate text agreed intersessionally. The Secretariat noted that the process followed reflects Rule 35 of the Rules of Procedure regarding proposals and amendments to proposals. CHINA stressed that negotiation is a dynamic process. The PHILIPPINES noted that the COP has the mandate to address the work of subsidiary bodies. WG II Chair Bignell proposed the Friends of the Chair group address tasks initially identified and draft a revised paper, while any outstanding proposals will be addressed by WG II. He requested parties not to reopen text other than that already indicated for amendment.

NAGOYA PROTOCOL: Delegates addressed a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.2/CRP.3). The EU, NAMIBIA and CANADA, opposed by BOLIVIA and VENEZUELA, proposed deleting a request for a study on a global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism, including non-market-based approaches, and text remained in brackets. Regarding a progress report on the ABS clearing-house, delegates debated specific reference to national permits and/or the internationally recognized certificate of compliance. The text remained in brackets. Outstanding issues will be addressed in informal consultations. Delegates agreed to add an exchange of views on the development and use of model contractual clauses, codes of conduct and guidelines, and on the state of implementation of the Nagoya Protocol to the ICNP 3 agenda. They also approved the annexes as forwarded by ICNP 2.

CAPACITY BUILDING: Delegates addressed a draft decision on reviewing progress in providing capacity-building support to parties, promoting communication, education and public awareness (CEPA), strengthening the CHM, and technology transfer and cooperation (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.2/CRP.1). CANADA and the EU, opposed by ZAMBIA, COLOMBIA, the PHILIPPINES and CHINA, supported reference to CBD Article 20 (Financial Resources) and the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, rather than CBD Article 20(4). The text remained bracketed. CHINA proposed emphasizing that studies for capacity needs assessments and identification of baselines should not delay implementation of commitments by developed country parties under CBD Article 20, which was bracketed.

BUDGET GROUP

In the morning, delegates discussed options on the budget of the Secretariat, including operating expenses, members' contributions and the structure and duration of future COP and COP/MOP meetings. Delegates addressed holding a "costless COP/MOP" for the Nagoya Protocol in parallel to the COP, however, they wished to further discuss the modalities of the proposal.

On the use of a budget surplus, delegates questioned whether it could be used for addressing priority meetings should there be a shortfall of funds in the core budget. Discussions continued in the afternoon.

CONTACT GROUP ON REDD+

The group addressed a non-paper, with some developing countries emphasizing the need to ensure coherence with UNFCCC decisions, and avoiding overburdening REDD+ implementing countries. Some delegates suggested deleting references to issues dealing with the application and monitoring of biodiversity-related safeguards in the context of activities referred in paragraph 70 of the UNFCCC Decision 1/CP.16 (REDD+) throughout the text, indicating that risks and safeguards mentioned in the non-paper were already considered in UNFCCC Decision 1/CP.16. Others opposed deletion of some of these references, and many issues remained pending. The group also addressed information gathering by the Secretariat on experiences regarding the potential effects of REDD-related activities on ILCs, through compiling information from parties or "collating," "analyzing" or "summarizing" information from the national safeguards monitoring systems created under UNFCCC.

CONTACT GROUP ON RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

Delegates discussed a non-paper drafted following Saturday's consultations, focusing on a section on target setting. On obligations under CBD Article 20, several developed countries proposed referring to Decision X/3 rather than Rio Principles. Developing countries opposed, and the text remained bracketed. On the preliminary reporting framework, delegates could not agree on adopting, welcoming, or taking note of the framework for reporting and monitoring.

Delegates could not agree on preliminary targets for increased biodiversity funding, reporting of domestic biodiversity expenditures and funding needs, and preparation of national financial plans for biodiversity. Developed countries called for needs assessments and robust baselines before establishing resource flow targets, noting that national financial plans are fundamental preconditions. A number of developing countries expressed "extreme disappointment," underscoring lack of political will. Negotiations were suspended to allow for additional consultations.

CONTACT GROUP ON NEW AND EMERGING ISSUES

Discussions focused on identifying the differences between two of the options in SBSTTA recommendation XII/12 regarding future work on synthetic biology. Delegates noted that both options call for information gathering, with one aiming to follow the criteria on new and emerging issues identified in COP Decision IX/29.

Following debate, delegates agreed to request the Secretariat to: compile and synthesize relevant information, in accordance with paragraph 11 of Decision IX/29, including information provided by governments, organizations and ILCs, on organisms and products from synthetic biology techniques that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and on appropriate measures regarding their treatment, taking into account risks to human health and social, economic and cultural considerations relevant to the CBD objectives; and consider possible gaps and overlaps with the applicable provisions of the Convention and its Protocols. Delegates reserved their right to consult and propose amendments. The group agreed that the information, including application of criteria in paragraph 12 of Decision IX/29 be available for consideration by SBSTTA prior to COP 12, following a peer review. Delegates did not reach agreement on whether SBSTTA would be enabled to recommend if the topic should be placed on its agenda "as a new and emerging issue."

IN THE CORRIDORS

Discussions on targets for resource mobilization took center stage – again – despite reportedly intense consultations over the weekend and the circulation of a revised text. Parties maintained their entrenched positions, leading one developing country delegate to fear "the death of the Aichi targets" and lament "another two years wasted," and others worrying of a potential spill-over effect to other agenda items, on the eve of the opening of the high-level segment.

At the same time, smaller groups proliferated – some even thrived, such as the group on new and emerging issues that managed to have a constructive and well-informed discussion on synthetic engineering. In the REDD+ universe, in turn, discussions focused on adequately capturing the relationship between the CBD and UNFCCC mandates. Some delegates pointed to reiterations and contradictions between the text of the CBD draft decision and the Cancun outcomes on safeguards. Still, others stressed that the CBD can provide the "biodiversity and indigenous lens," which may make the difference when it comes to implementation on the ground.



CBD COP 11 HIGHLIGHTS TUESDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2012

WG I and WG II addressed several draft decisions. Contact and Friends of the Chair groups on biodiversity and development, new and emerging issues, IPBES, geo-engineering and the financial mechanism met throughout the day. In the afternoon, the opening plenary of the high-level segment was held.

WORKING GROUP I

MARINE AND COASTAL BIODIVERSITY: Delegates agreed to “take note” of the EIA guidelines, expressing appreciation for the work that led to their finalization in the preamble to the decision, which was approved in its entirety.

ARTICLE 8(J): Delegates considered a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.1/CRP.8). COLOMBIA and PERU called for inclusion of information held by ILCs regarding the implementation of the Article 8(j) work programme. The EU requested a footnote that the next meeting of the Article 8(j) Working Group is subject to availability of funding, pending budget discussions.

CANADA and the EU offered compromise text urging parties to include in their requests to the GEF and GEF Small Grants Programme support for ILCs to develop community conservation plans. On participatory mechanisms for ILCs in the work of the Convention, many called for ILCs’ full and effective participation in the development of relevant capacity-building mechanisms.

The EU, opposed by BRAZIL and ETHIOPIA, proposed deleting text designating 13 July as the international day for local communities.

Tasks 7, 10 and 12: COLOMBIA, opposed by NEW ZEALAND and CANADA, requested reference to the Tkarhwaïé:ri Code of Ethical Conduct in the operative text of the decision.

Task 15: The PHILIPPINES and PERU recommended reference to facilitating the recovery of cultural property related to TK. The EU opposed, cautioning against going beyond the CBD mandate. Chair González Posse proposed, and the PHILIPPINES agreed to, reflect the point in the meeting report.

COLOMBIA, supported by BRAZIL and PERU, proposed deleting a paragraph on continued use of repatriated knowledge by the repatriating country. As an alternative, BRAZIL proposed to add references to “prior informed consent” and “national legislation,” and PERU to “compliance with the national legal framework of the country that requires repatriation.” Supported by the EU and AUSTRALIA, CANADA proposed seeking the views of other intergovernmental bodies that currently address genetic resources, TK and traditional cultural expressions. Following informal discussions, delegates agreed to delete the paragraph.

Article 10(c): BRAZIL proposed, and delegates agreed to: indicate that the list of indicative tasks is for “future” consideration; and insert a footnote stating that tasks in brackets have not been agreed upon at COP 11 and will be considered by the Working Group on Article 8(j).

UNPFII Recommendations: NORWAY, COLOMBIA, BRAZIL, GUATEMALA, BOLIVIA, PERU, ARGENTINA, the PHILIPPINES and Denmark on behalf of GREENLAND supported using the terminology “indigenous peoples and local communities.” CANADA and INDIA opposed, with CANADA proposing that the Working Group on Article 8(j) and COP 12 further consider the issue. The EU and CHILE suggested bracketing the text.

WORKING GROUP II

CAPACITY BUILDING: Continuing Monday’s discussions, MEXICO opposed encouraging parties to engage in voluntary peer reviews of NBSAP implementation. SWITZERLAND supported the reference, which remained in brackets. PERU and others, opposed by CANADA and the EU, supported references to countries that are centers of origin throughout the text, particularly regarding establishing a network of centers of excellence.

Regarding an invitation to developed country parties and others to support technical and scientific cooperation, CHINA, supported by BRAZIL, ARGENTINA, MALAYSIA and COLOMBIA, proposed reference to technology transfer under fair and most favorable terms. The EU and CANADA preferred inviting “parties, including developed country parties.” CHINA reiterated its proposal that conducting studies for capacity needs’ assessment and identification of baseline data of financial resources should not delay implementation of developed country parties’ commitments under Article 20(4).

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTATION: Delegates considered a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.2/CRP.2/Rev.1). On the indicator framework, ARGENTINA requested, and delegates agreed to, add references to “taking into account national conditions and priorities.” Delegates debated a request to the Secretariat to promote collaboration on monitoring and indicators with forestry, agriculture, fisheries and other sectors. BRAZIL, opposed by CANADA and NORWAY, proposed deleting reference to specific sectors. On an annexed indicative list of indicators, ARGENTINA proposed deleting indicators on ecological footprint and ecological limits under Target 4 (sustainable production and consumption); and on products derived from sustainable sources under Target 7 (sustainable management of agriculture, aquaculture and forestry areas).

BUSINESS AND BIODIVERSITY: Delegates addressed a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.2/CRP.4). GRULAC and CHINA called for the draft decision to be in line with the Rio+20 outcomes. ARGENTINA and BOLIVIA, opposed by the EU, called for deleting references to ecosystem services throughout the document. CANADA and the EU, opposed



by ARGENTINA, called for deleting text on considering the needs and circumstances of small and medium-sized enterprises and businesses based in developing countries. The text remained bracketed, along with text on: considering policies and legislation to halt biodiversity loss and reduce perverse incentives; encouraging best practices for voluntary standards; and encouraging monitoring and reporting frameworks. Delegates also left bracketed text encouraging businesses to: analyze biodiversity-related issues of individual sectors; cover in their annual reports operational impacts on biodiversity; and adopt policies on sustainable consumption and production, and on use of voluntary standards. Deliberations will continue in a Friends of the Chair group.

ENGAGEMENT OF STAKEHOLDERS: Delegates considered a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.2/CRP.6). BRAZIL, supported by others, proposed considering an additional section on workers and trade unions, to be incorporated in a revised decision. The EU said the promotion of South-South and triangular cooperation should be subject to availability of resources.

Sub-national governments: CANADA suggested, and delegates agreed to, encouraging the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership to develop indicators that track the progress of urban settlements on the Aichi targets, and encourage parties to monitor and report on their cities' contribution towards the targets.

GENDER MAINSTREAMING: Delegates discussed a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.2/CRP.5). CANADA proposed that the Secretariat collaborate with relevant organizations to provide guidance on mainstreaming gender in all CBD work programmes; and, with the EU, opposed establishing an expert group on indicators to monitor gender mainstreaming by parties.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS: Delegates discussed a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.2/CRP.7). On the UN Decade on Biodiversity, delegates discussed whether to use the Strategic Plan sub-heading "Living in Harmony with Nature," or to also take into consideration the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Mother Earth, without reaching agreement.

CONTACT GROUP ON NEW AND EMERGING ISSUES

On the compilation and synthesis of information on synthetic biology, delegates debated reference to taking into account social, economic and cultural considerations relevant to the CBD objectives, without reaching agreement.

Delegates then addressed the bracketed paragraph on a moratorium on the release or approval of synthetic genetic parts and organisms. A delegate proposed calling upon parties not to approve the release and commercial use of synthetic genetic parts and organisms until their full scientific assessments are carried out. Most delegates preferred working on the basis of an alternative paragraph recognizing the rapid development of technologies associated with synthetic life and urging parties to apply the precautionary approach to the release of organisms and products from synthetic biology techniques. Many delegates underscored their lack of mandate to accept a moratorium. One also suggested adding an acknowledgement of parties' entitlement to suspend the release of components, organisms and products from synthetic biology in accordance with domestic legislation. Informal consultations will be held on the issue.

CONTACT GROUP ON GEO-ENGINEERING

Delegates discussed inviting parties to ensure that testing of geo-engineering techniques take place in controlled laboratory conditions, within national jurisdiction and in accordance with international law, or within a country's exclusive economic zone (EEZ) and without having negative impacts outside a country's EEZ. One developed country cautioned against prejudging scientific research on geo-engineering.

Delegates addressed language noting customary international law, including States' general obligations with regards to activities within their jurisdiction or control and the requirements regarding EIAs, as well as the application of the precautionary approach. Some developed countries preferred referring to CBD Article 14 (Impact Assessment). Citing the International Court of Justice, a developing country supported "the obligation

to conduct an EIA where there is a risk of such a harm. An observer country representative suggested deleting reference to "including States' general obligations with regard to activities within their jurisdiction or control." Delegates also discussed whether customary international law "is" or "may be" relevant to geo-engineering. Delegates then agreed to "recall," rather than "reaffirm," COP 10 language on ensuring that no geo-engineering takes place, and discussed activities to be excluded from the understanding of geo-engineering under the Convention, including whether to specifically exclude REDD+.

In the evening, delegates made some progress on outstanding issues. Discussions will continue in WG I.

FRIENDS OF THE CHAIR GROUP ON THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM

Delegates agreed on text that takes note of the range of funding needs estimated for GEF-6. Delegates also addressed, but could not agree on, *inter alia*: the contribution of private sector funds to the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund (NPIF); the guiding principles to the four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities 2014-2018; and the GEF making the necessary funds available for ABS activities and the Nagoya Protocol to address the backlog in implementation of the CBD third objective.

HIGH-LEVEL OPENING PLENARY

Participants watched a video on India's mobile biodiversity exhibition train. India's Minister of Environment Jayanthi Natarajan opened the meeting, highlighting the themes of the high-level segment, including: implementation of the Strategic Plan; biodiversity for livelihoods and poverty reduction; coastal and marine biodiversity; and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. UNEP Executive Director Achim Steiner stressed the need for implementing the commitments made in Nagoya, including through mobilizing resources and engaging new players such as the private sector. Hiroyuki Nagahama, Japan's Minister of Environment, said work towards implementation of the Aichi targets is the main expectation from COP 11, emphasizing the need for concrete actions. He stressed Japan's commitment to support implementation in developing countries through the Japan Biodiversity Fund and the NPIF. N. Kiran Kumar Reddy, Chief Minister of the state of Andhra Pradesh, said the meeting will be commemorated by a biodiversity museum and a livestock heritage farm to preserve local livestock breeds of cattle, sheep and poultry as part of achieving Aichi Target 13 (agricultural genetic diversity).

Manmohan Singh, Prime Minister of India, announced India's ratification of the Nagoya Protocol and highlighted India's Traditional Knowledge Digital Library. He announced the "Hyderabad pledge:" US\$50 million during India's two-year COP presidency, focused on enhancing India's human and technical resources to attain CBD's objectives, and for promoting capacity building in developing countries. CBD Executive Secretary Bráulio Ferreira de Souza Dias reiterated his invitation to each party to become regional or global champions for one of the Aichi targets.

IN THE CORRIDORS

Amidst increased security and logistics hoops due to the beginning of the high-level segment, delegates continued their efforts to conclude work on the most intractable issues on the COP 11 agenda. Consultations on financial issues continued throughout the day, with many hoping that the Indian Prime Minister's pledge to fund national capacity-building activities could send positive vibes to the resource mobilization group.

Meanwhile, the contact group on geo-engineering spent long hours trying to grapple with technical and legal issues. As popular press reported alarmingly on ocean fertilization activities in the Pacific Ocean as the "world's biggest geo-engineering experiment violating UN rules," delegates struggled to find common ground on a workable understanding of geo-engineering under the Convention. Some cautioned that the way in which the term was framed by COP 10 could include a wide range of activities, even REDD+. With the REDD+ contact group scheduled on Wednesday, they noted, climate change issues will keep delegates jumping through hoops.



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 throughout the day. 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 Rebeca 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 use of natural capital accounting alongside 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 workshop to be organized in the Mediterranean region to finalize the description of EBSAs in 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 this decision,” with the EU requesting also reference to the “procedure set out in paragraph 42 of decision X/29”; and making future 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 the AFRICAN GROUP wished 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 recommendation XVI/8 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+ contact 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.

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Kate Louw, Elisa Morgera, Ph.D., Dorothy Wanja Nyingi, Ph.D., Teya Penniman, Eugenia Recio and Elsa Tsioumani. The Digital Editor is Francis Dejon. The Editor is 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), the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), and the Government of Australia. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2012 is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 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). Specific funding for coverage of this meeting has been provided by the Belgium Federal Public Service for Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment, the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, the Indian Ministry of Environment and Forests, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and the Finnish Ministry of the Environment. 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, USA. The ENB Team at CBD COP 11 can be contacted by e-mail at <elsa@iisd.org>.



<http://enb.iisd.mobi/>

WORKING GROUP II**COOPERATION WITH INTERNATIONAL**

ORGANIZATIONS: Delegates discussed a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.2/CRP.7). BOLIVIA and VENEZUELA proposed compromise text encouraging parties to promote the UN Decade on Biodiversity in ways appropriate to their national circumstances, for example the protection of “Mother Earth,” to create dialogues and to share experiences.

SWITZERLAND, supported by NEW ZEALAND and NORWAY, proposed new text welcoming collaboration between CBD and UNFF. CHINA requested deleting text inviting parties to collaborate with national health sectors to integrate biodiversity into national health strategies and programmes. On incorporating links between biological and cultural diversity into CBD implementation, delegates agreed, following consultations, to add language on consistency and harmony with the Convention and relevant international obligations.

BRAZIL and ECUADOR suggested inviting the World Tourism Organization and other relevant organizations to cooperate with the CBD on identifying critical tourism and conservation hotspots to support the integration of biodiversity aspects into sustainable tourism development.

On recognizing that international trade is an important factor in biodiversity conservation, BRAZIL proposed adding that parties should promote a supportive and open international economic system and avoid measures that constitute arbitrary discrimination or a disguised restriction on international trade. Following informal consultations, delegates agreed to delete the paragraph.

Following consultations on references to centers of origin or genetic diversity, delegates agreed to remove all such references and insert a chapeau paragraph in the draft decision on monitoring implementation of the Strategic Plan recognizing the crucial importance to humankind of centers of origin and centers of genetic diversity.

BIODIVERSITY AND DEVELOPMENT: Delegates addressed a draft decision, including elements for terms of reference for an expert group on the issue (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.2/CRP.8/Rev.1). ECUADOR proposed, and delegates debated, a preambular reference to “the rights of nature.” After informal consultations, delegates agreed to take note of “the concept of rights of nature.” Delegates did not reach agreement on a preambular reference to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

CONTACT GROUP ON RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

Delegates proceeded with a first reading of the non-paper under discussion, aiming at an exchange of views for the drafting of a revised paper. Delegates discussed whether the target of doubling biodiversity financial resource flows from developed to developing countries by 2015 is meaningful, with developed countries noting that a baseline is necessary to determine the sum that needs to be doubled. Developing countries noted the target stems from the OECD Creditors Reporting System and the Rio markers, which establish a robust baseline.

Some developed countries also noted that their official development assistance (ODA) model does not include issue-specific targets but responds to needs and priorities set by recipient countries, underscoring the need for developing countries to identify biodiversity as a priority for ODA. A suggestion for “aspirational” goals, was rejected by developing countries, who called, in turn, for a concrete proposal to move forward.

Delegates then addressed a target of 75% of parties reporting domestic biodiversity expenditures and funding needs, gaps and priorities by 2014. Many developed countries stressed the importance of this target as a roadmap for improving baselines, while some called for taking into consideration national circumstances and constraints. Developing countries called for the obligation to be qualified on a best-endeavor basis and stressed many countries’ lack of capacities, pointing to interlinkages with the target on financial flows. Developing countries argued that reporting and assessment-related targets should not be a precondition for the target on financial flows.

Delegates also discussed: establishing a target on the removal, reform or phase 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.”



CBD COP 11 HIGHLIGHTS THURSDAY, 18 OCTOBER 2012

WG I and WG II approved several draft decisions. In the afternoon, WG I focused on REDD+ and adopted its report, while contact group discussions on resource mobilization and the budget continued. The high-level segment heard statements from ministers and high-level representatives, and held two panel discussions on marine and coastal biodiversity and the Nagoya Protocol.

WORKING GROUP I

CLIMATE CHANGE: Other matters: CANADA, with JAPAN and ISRAEL, cautioned against reference to the Rio principle on common but differentiated responsibilities in relation to resource mobilization. NEW ZEALAND suggested, and delegates agreed on, a reference to being “aware of the Rio Principles.” The EU accepted “taking note with appreciation” of SBSTTA 16 recommendation on strengthening knowledge and information on linkages between biodiversity and climate change.

Geo-engineering: BRAZIL, supported by CHINA, suggested stating that climate change should “primarily” be addressed by reducing anthropogenic emissions under the UNFCCC principles and provisions. The EU opposed reference to the UNFCCC principles. NORWAY, supported by the EU and QATAR, cautioned against limiting work on geo-engineering under other conventions. Delegates eventually agreed to emphasize that climate change should primarily be addressed through reducing anthropogenic emissions by sources and increasing removals by sinks “under the UNFCCC, noting also the relevance of the CBD and other instruments.”

On geo-engineering definitions, BRAZIL, supported by BOLIVIA, suggested a footnote stating that geo-engineering activities exclude carbon capture and storage (CCS) and REDD+ activities. NEW ZEALAND preferred “afforestation, reforestation and restoration” to “REDD+,” to cover activities carried out by developing and developed countries. Delegates eventually agreed to “excluding CCS at source from fossil fuels when it captures carbon dioxide before it is released into the atmosphere, and also excluding forest-related activities.”

NORWAY requested, and delegates agreed to, stating that a global regulatory and control mechanism may be “most” necessary for geo-engineering activities having potential to cause significant adverse transboundary effects or being deployed in ABNJ and the atmosphere.

NORWAY, JAPAN, AUSTRALIA, CANADA, NEW ZEALAND and the EU requested deleting text inviting parties to ensure that testing of geo-engineering techniques takes place in “controlled laboratory conditions.” ETHIOPIA, INDONESIA, TIMOR LESTE, BOLIVIA and others opposed deletion, with SOUTH AFRICA and the PHILIPPINES preferring to “urge” parties. Supported by PERU and ECUADOR, ARGENTINA

proposed to add “in accordance with international law.” Chair González Posse proposed reference to Decision X/33 (Biodiversity and Climate Change), as it included language on “controlled setting.” ETHIOPIA conceded deleting language on controlled laboratory conditions only if delegates agreed to “reaffirm” COP 10 language on ensuring that no geo-engineering takes place. AUSTRALIA and NEW ZEALAND preferred “recalling,” rather than “reaffirming,” paragraph 8(w) of Decision X/33, with AUSTRALIA explaining that it would only “reaffirm” that paragraph in conjunction with its chapeau which invites parties to consider guidance contained in paragraph 8(w). Delegates eventually agreed to delete text on controlled laboratory conditions and to “reaffirm paragraph 8, including paragraph 8(w) of Decision X/33.”

On text on customary international law, NORWAY preferred relying on language from CBD Article 3 (Principle), expressing concern about a reference to “significant” transboundary harm. ARGENTINA requested adding reference not only to States’ obligation with regard to activities within their jurisdiction or control, but also to “possible consequences of those activities.” NEW ZEALAND stressed the need to refer to the precautionary approach before mention of customary international law, due to certain countries’ disquiet at linking the two. CHINA cautioned against prescriptive language on the content of customary international law. Delegates eventually agreed to note that the application of the precautionary approach, as well as customary international law including States’ general obligation with regard to activities within their jurisdiction or control and with regards to possible consequences of those activities, and EIA requirements, may be relevant for geo-engineering activities but would still form an incomplete basis for global regulation. The US made an objection to this language, to be reflected in the meeting report.

GUATEMALA noted that geo-engineering is not a “high priority” for the CBD, and suggested that the following requests be subject to financial resource availability: compiling parties’ reports on measures taken on geo-engineering; preparing an update on the potential impacts of geo-engineering on biodiversity and on the regulatory framework; and preparing an overview of views on potential impacts on biodiversity and associated socioeconomic and cultural impacts. Delegates agreed, requesting the Secretariat to prepare the update and the overview “at the appropriate time.”

ARTICLE 8(j): On adopting the terminology “indigenous peoples and local communities,” the EU suggested: “noting,” rather than “recalling,” relevant UNPFII recommendations; deleting language on the terminology being “an accurate reflection of the distinct identities developed by those entities since the adoption of the Convention almost 20 years ago”; and requesting the next Article 8(j) Working Group, on the basis of submission by parties, other governments, relevant stakeholders and ILCs, to consider this matter “including any

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Kate Louw, Elisa Morgera, Ph.D., Dorothy Wanja Nyingi, Ph.D., Teya Penniman, Eugenia Recio and Elsa Tsioumani. The Digital Editor is Francis Dejon. The Editor is 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), the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), and the Government of Australia. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2012 is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 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). Specific funding for coverage of this meeting has been provided by the Belgium Federal Public Service for Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment, the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, the Indian Ministry of Environment and Forests, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and the Finnish Ministry of the Environment. 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, USA. The ENB Team at CBD COP 11 can be contacted by e-mail at <elsa@iisd.org>.



<http://enb.iisd.mobi/>

legal implications and within the scope of the CBD.” BRAZIL and ETHIOPIA queried the need for submissions, with NEW ZEALAND suggesting “taking into account” submissions. COLOMBIA, BOLIVIA, ECUADOR and TIMOR LESTE questioned reference to “legal implications,” with the EU clarifying that they could be either international or national, depending on discussions in the Article 8(j) Working Group.

Following informal consultations, delegates agreed to “noting” the relevant UNPFII recommendations and requesting the next Article 8(j) Working Group “taking into account” submissions by governments, stakeholders and ILCs, to consider this matter “and all its implications for the CBD and its parties” for COP 12 consideration.

SUSTAINABLE USE: Delegates agreed to welcome the revised recommendations on bushmeat, and compromise text stating that climate change adaptation and mitigation policies and measures should take into account the importance of wildlife for maintaining healthy ecosystems and ecosystem services.

REDD+: Delegates agreed to compromise language on different outstanding paragraphs. They agreed to retain language noting that the indicative list of indicators to assess progress towards the Strategic Plan’s goals as contained in SBSTTA recommendation XV/1 on the indicator framework for the Strategic Plan could be useful for assessing the contributions of REDD+ activities.

Delegates agreed to invite parties to strengthen efforts to promote the contribution of REDD+ activities to the CBD objectives with particular attention to existing technology transfer and capacity-building processes for the elements referred to in paragraph 71 of UNFCCC Decision 1/CP.16 (Cancun Agreement on long-term cooperative action) to build synergies. They deleted reference to technology transfer and capacity building “for the inclusion of relevant indicators in national forest monitoring systems.”

Delegates agreed to delete two provisions on: supporting developing countries in addressing biodiversity concerns and in achieving multiple benefits in relation to the implementation of REDD+; and inviting parties to strengthen efforts with particular attention to the indicative list of indicators in the annex of the Secretariat document on REDD+ safeguards (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/8). They further agreed to: “take note with appreciation” of the annex to the decision; and request the Secretariat to further develop advice on issues included in Decision X/33, paragraph 9(h), based on further views from parties and to report to SBSTTA prior to COP 13, “taking into full account the relevant UNFCCC decisions.”

In the annex, delegates agreed that clarifying tenure issues remains a challenge, rather than an “urgent challenge,” for aspects of REDD+ activities, including for applying safeguards.

WORKING GROUP II

BIODIVERSITY AND DEVELOPMENT: Delegates approved a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.2/CRP.8/Rev.1), noting agreement reached during informal consultations on a preambular reference recalling the importance of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

OPERATIONS OF THE CONVENTION: Retirement of decisions: Delegates approved a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.2/CRP.10/Rev.1) without amendments. The PHILIPPINES questioned the basis for proposed retirements but agreed to record their concerns in the report of the meeting.

WAYS TO IMPROVE SBSTTA EFFECTIVENESS AND COLLABORATION WITH IPBES: Delegates discussed a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.2/CRP.12), including compromise text from a Friends of the Chair group. MEXICO requested re-insertion of paragraphs regarding facilitation and financial support of side events and round tables at SBSTTA meetings.

STATUS OF THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL: Delegates considered a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.2/CRP.3/Rev.1). Following consultations, delegates agreed to: request ICNP 3 to consider, based on the conclusions of the expert group on the global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism, the need for an additional study on the issue, including on non-market-based approaches; and remove brackets

around a request to the Secretariat to report to ICNP 3 on progress in the implementation of the ABS clearing-house pilot phase, including on registration of information related to national permits or their equivalents and on technical issues concerning the establishment of the internationally recognized certificate of compliance.

CAPACITY BUILDING: Delegates discussed a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.2/CRP.1/Rev.1). The EU, opposed by CHINA, requested deleting text stating that conducting studies for capacity needs assessments and identification of baseline data on financial resources should not delay implementation by developed countries of their financial commitments under the Convention. The text remained bracketed. Following informal consultations, delegates accepted to invite parties to undertake and engage in voluntary peer review of NBSAPs and their implementation and share experiences through the Secretariat and the CHM. On technology transfer, delegates agreed “to promote the full implementation of Article 16 of the Convention.”

ENGAGEMENT WITH STAKEHOLDERS: Delegates approved a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.2/CRP.6/Rev.1), as amended, to reference: promotion of the active involvement of major civil society groups, including workers and trade unions, proposed by the EU; and engagement with initiatives such as the Young Naturalist Network and Go4BioDiv, suggested by BOLIVIA.

NEW AND EMERGING ISSUES: Delegates addressed bracketed text on synthetic biology in a draft decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/WG.2/CRP.11). Delegates agreed to: keep preambular text referencing associated social, economic and cultural considerations regarding potential impacts of synthetic biology techniques; and replace a bracketed reference to SBSTTA recommending whether the topic should be placed on its agenda as a new and emerging issue, with reference to Decision IX/29 paragraph 13 (SBSTTA mandate on new and emerging issues).

BRAZIL and MEXICO supported an option calling for application of the precautionary approach. The PHILIPPINES and BOLIVIA preferred another option amounting to a moratorium on releases. Following informal consultations, GHANA presented compromise text urging parties to take a precautionary approach when addressing threats of significant reduction or loss of biodiversity caused by organisms and products of synthetic biology, in accordance with domestic legislation, recognizing scientific uncertainties on the potential impacts on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity of synthetic life, cells or genomes. ARGENTINA preferred “encouraging” parties. Many delegates opposed, pointing to the delicate balance of the compromise.

IN THE CORRIDORS

With the closure of the meeting only hours away, the “main item” – resource mobilization – seemed to be far from finalization. As delegates engaged in text-based negotiations on the basis of a new Co-Chairs’ text in a packed room, it soon became clear that positions remained entrenched. “Let’s hope the festival of Dasara will live up to its name and remove the “bad fate,” an exasperated participant remarked.

Meanwhile, scant progress was being made on matters of budget. Delegates remained firm in their positions on staffing and key activities to be financed through the core budget. Some movement, however, was noticeable as developing countries offered to make up the shortfall for the meeting of the Article 8(j) Working Group – a move lauded by all. Amidst several frantic calls to capitals to try finalizing other possible pledges and find leeway in positions, one seasoned delegate commented: “We may be reaching an agreement, but it’s held together by the skin of our teeth.”

ENB SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS: The *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* summary and analysis of COP 11 will be available on Monday, 22 October 2012 online at: <http://www.iisd.ca/biodiv/cop11>

SUMMARY OF THE ELEVENTH CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY: 8-19 OCTOBER 2012

The eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 11) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) was held from 8-19 October 2012, in Hyderabad, India, following the sixth Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP/MOP 6). Approximately 6,000 delegates representing parties and other governments, UN agencies, intergovernmental, non-governmental, indigenous and local community organizations, academia and the private sector participated in the meeting.

CBD COP 11 adopted 33 decisions on a range of strategic, substantive, administrative, financial and budgetary issues. Among other issues, the meeting addressed: the status of the Nagoya Protocol on access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing (ABS); implementation of the Strategic Plan 2011-2020 and progress towards the Aichi biodiversity targets; and implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization. Deliberations also focused on: issues related to financial resources and the financial mechanism; cooperation, outreach and the UN Decade on Biodiversity; operations of the Convention; and administrative and budgetary matters. Delegates also addressed: ecosystem restoration; Article 8(j) (traditional knowledge); marine and coastal biodiversity; biodiversity and climate change; biodiversity and development; and several other ecosystem-related and cross-cutting issues.

The COP 11 high-level segment was held from 16-19 October 2012. A number of other meetings were held in parallel to COP 11, including the fair on experiences and best practices in communication, education and public awareness (CEPA), the Rio Conventions Pavilion, and the Cities' Biodiversity Summit.

Following the impressive package adopted at COP 10 in Nagoya, Japan, COP 11 marked the move from policy-making to implementation. The meeting adopted a set of decisions on items ranging from ecosystem restoration and marine and coastal biodiversity to the Nagoya Protocol and customary sustainable use to set the groundwork for intense intersessional

work with a focus on implementation at the national and local level. The meeting, however, will probably be remembered for its intense, down-to-the-wire negotiations on financial issues,

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the CBD	2
COP 11 Report	2
Status of the Nagoya Protocol	3
Implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and Progress towards the Aichi Targets	4
Financial Resources and Financial Mechanism	5
Cooperation, Outreach and the UN Decade on Biodiversity	8
Operation of the Convention	9
Article 8(j)	10
Island Biodiversity	12
Ecosystem Restoration	12
Marine and Coastal Biodiversity	13
Biodiversity and Climate Change	15
Biodiversity and Development	17
Dry and Sub-humid Lands	17
Inland Waters Biodiversity	17
Protected Areas	17
Sustainable Use	18
Global Strategy for Plant Conservation	19
Biofuels and Biodiversity	19
Invasive Alien Species	19
Global Taxonomy Initiative	19
Incentive Measures	20
Administrative and Budgetary Matters	20
High-level Segment	21
Closing Plenary	21
A Brief Analysis of COP 11	22
Upcoming Meetings	24
Glossary	25

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Kate Louw, Elisa Morgera, Ph.D., Dorothy Wanja Nyngi, Ph.D., Teya Penniman, Eugenia Recio and Elsa Tsioumani. The Digital Editor is Francis Dejon. The Editor is 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), the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), and the Government of Australia. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2012 is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 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). Specific funding for coverage of this meeting has been provided by the Belgium Federal Public Service for Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment, the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, the Indian Ministry of Environment and Forests, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and the Finnish Ministry of the Environment. 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, USA.



<http://enb.iisd.mobi/>

including targets for implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, and the budget, with a compromise agreement reached in the early hours of Saturday, 20 October 2012. To tackle unfinished business from Nagoya, the agreement sets an interim target of doubling biodiversity-related international financial resource flows to developing countries by 2015, and at least maintaining this level until 2020. This is coupled with targets aiming to improve the robustness of baseline information as well as a preliminary reporting framework for monitoring resource mobilization. COP 12 will then review progress with a view to adopting the final target for resource mobilization.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CBD

The CBD was adopted on 22 May 1992, and 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.

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 the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (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.

COP 3: At its third meeting (November 1996, Buenos Aires, Argentina), the COP adopted a Memorandum of Understanding with the GEF.

COP 4: At its fourth meeting (May 1998, Bratislava, Slovakia), the COP established a Working Group on Article 8(j) (traditional knowledge) and a panel of experts on ABS, and adopted a work programme on forest biodiversity and the Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI).

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 living modified organisms 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, incentive measures, Article 8(j), and agricultural biodiversity; endorsed the description of, and operational guidance on, the ecosystem approach; and established a Working Group on ABS.

COP 6: At its sixth meeting (April 2002, The Hague, the Netherlands), the COP adopted the Convention's Strategic Plan, 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 invasive alien species (IAS); the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC); and a work programme for the GTI.

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 ABS Working Group to initiate negotiations on an international regime on ABS. The COP also established the Working Group on Review of Implementation (WGRI), and 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 guidelines on biodiversity and tourism development.

COP 8: At its eighth meeting (March 2006, Curitiba, Brazil), the COP adopted a work programme on island biodiversity 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 the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, scientific criteria and guidance for marine areas in need of protection, and a roadmap for the negotiation of the international ABS regime; and established an *ad hoc* technical expert group (AHTEG) on biodiversity and climate change.

COP 10: At its tenth meeting (October 2010, Nagoya, Japan), the CBD COP adopted: the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization, which sets out rules and procedures for implementing the Convention's third objective; the CBD Strategic Plan for the period 2011-2020, including the Aichi biodiversity targets; and a decision on activities and indicators for the implementation of the Resource Mobilization Strategy.

COP 11 REPORT

On Monday, 8 October, Hoshino Kazuaki, on behalf of the Minister of Environment of Japan, opened the meeting, underscoring support to the revision of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) through the Japan Biodiversity Fund. Ryu Matsumoto, former Minister of Environment of Japan and COP 10 President, called for urgency in implementing the COP 10 outcomes, including the Nagoya Protocol on ABS and the Aichi targets. He then handed the COP Presidency to Jayanthi Natarajan, India's Minister of Environment and Forests.

COP 11 President Natarajan called for agreement on a roadmap and means of implementation for the Nagoya outcomes. Noting that COP 10 did not conclude discussions on resource mobilization, she urged agreement on funding targets. She said developing countries need to balance environmental concerns

and poverty eradication. Amina Mohamed, UNEP Deputy Executive Director, said the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) opened potential pathways to sustainable development, including through inclusive green economy, and highlighted the need for more effective and targeted implementation processes.

CBD Executive Secretary Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias called for a pragmatic approach focusing on sharing experiences on implementation, as opposed to negotiation. He stressed the need for: enhancing the links between the Convention and its protocols; an effective and continuous monitoring system of the Aichi targets' implementation; a structured capacity-building process at the regional and local level, through strengthened collaboration with UN entities and stakeholders; and supporting community-based approaches.

Nallari Kiran Kumar Reddy, Chief Minister of the State of Andhra Pradesh, called for allowing each country to implement internationally agreed policies according to domestic circumstances. India's Secretary of Environment and Forests T. Chatterjee stressed the need to reach consensus on: financial issues; the Strategic Plan's implementation; biodiversity and poverty reduction; marine and coastal biodiversity; and the Nagoya Protocol's implementation.

Argentina for the Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries (GRULAC) encouraged COP 11 to reflect on the Rio+20 outcome, common but differentiated responsibilities, poverty eradication and avoidance of trade restrictions. She prioritized financial resource mobilization for implementing the Strategic Plan and Aichi targets, maintenance of COP meetings' periodicity, and a strengthened core budget.

Syria for the Asia-Pacific emphasized the linkages between the Convention's objectives, as well as the need for effective financial resources and capacity building for implementation. Serbia for Central and Eastern Europe underscored the need for resource mobilization to ensure ratification of the Nagoya Protocol. Benin for the African Group recalled that the CBD is one of the rare international legally binding agreements on sustainable development and underscored the need to maintain the COP meetings' periodicity.

The European Union (EU) with Croatia emphasized the need to focus on effective implementation through: policy frameworks and governance structures; a significant increase in financial, human and technical resources; and mobilization of new funding sources, including green economy and innovative financial mechanisms. Kiribati for Small Island Developing States urged addressing the loss of island biodiversity and highlighted the need for capacity building and provision of financial resources in a timely manner.

The CBD Alliance called for: keeping the Convention's implementation under review; adopting indicators on the Aichi targets; allocating financial resources for the forest biodiversity work programme, rather than focusing on non-binding guidelines for reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+); ending subsidies and targets for biofuels; and extending the moratorium on geo-engineering. The Women's Caucus called for integrating the gender dimension in social,

environmental and cultural indicators, and committing to long-term action on gender equality. The International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB) highlighted remaining challenges, including respecting indigenous practices and livelihoods when establishing protected areas, and mainstreaming rights enshrined in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) in national CBD implementation.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Delegates then adopted the agenda and organization of work (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/1 and Add.1/Rev.1); and elected Betty Kauna Schroder (Namibia) as Rapporteur for the meeting, and Valeria González Posse (Argentina) and Andrew Bignell (New Zealand) as Chairs of Working Group I and Working Group II, respectively. A budget group was also established and chaired by Conrod Hunte (Antigua and Barbuda). During the meeting, several contact groups and Friends of the Chair groups met to address: Article 8(j); REDD+; geo-engineering; resource mobilization; the financial mechanism; business and biodiversity; the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES); new and emerging issues; and biodiversity and development.

On Friday, 12 October, the COP elected new Bureau members, as nominated by regional groups: Ioseb Kartsivadze (Georgia) and Senka Barudanovic (Bosnia and Herzegovina) for Central and Eastern Europe; Spencer Thomas (Grenada) for GRULAC; Tone Solhaug (Norway) and Jeremy Eppel (UK) for the Western Europe and Others Group; and Boukar Attari (Niger) and Francis Ogwal (Uganda) for the African Group. Delegates then elected Gemedo Dalle Tussie (Ethiopia) to be the next SBSTTA Chair. Remaining Bureau members were elected on Friday, 19 October, and included: Chaweewan Hutacharearn (Thailand) and Eleni Rova Tokadua (Fiji) for Asia-Pacific; and Valeria González Posse (Argentina) and María Luisa del Río Mispireta (Peru) to share the remaining GRULAC seat.

This report summarizes discussions and outcomes on each agenda item. Decisions on biofuels and biodiversity, the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC), the Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI) and incentive measures were adopted on Friday, 12 October. All remaining decisions were adopted during the closing plenary.

STATUS OF THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL

Working Group (WG) II's discussions on the Nagoya Protocol focused on the recommendations forwarded by the Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol (ICNP) (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/6). All delegates supported reconvening the ICNP for a third meeting, with South Africa and Ghana calling for strict timelines for completing its work. Malaysia, India and Turkey supported holding an expert meeting on the global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism. The EU suggested that COP 11 invite submissions on model clauses, codes of conduct and guidelines.

Namibia recommended the COP monitor implementation of CBD Article 15 (Access to Genetic Resources) by CBD parties that are not parties to the Protocol. Micronesia highlighted its recent ratification of the Nagoya Protocol. Uganda suggested adding text to encourage parties to ratify the Protocol. GRULAC underscored the key role of indigenous and local communities

(ILCs) for implementation and the need for building their capacities and suggested that activities to support implementation and early entry into force be supported by the core budget.

Discussions focused on future work, particularly with regard to the global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism and the ABS clearing-house. The EU, Namibia and Canada, opposed by Bolivia and Venezuela, proposed deleting a request for a study on a global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism, including non-market-based approaches, and text remained in brackets. Regarding a progress report on the ABS clearing-house, delegates debated specific reference to national permits and/or the internationally recognized certificate of compliance, without reaching consensus. Delegates agreed to add to the ICNP 3 agenda an exchange of views on the development and use of model contractual clauses, codes of conduct and guidelines, and on the state of implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. They also approved the annexes as forwarded by ICNP 2.

Following consultations, delegates agreed to: request ICNP 3 to consider, based on the conclusions of the expert group on the global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism, the need for an additional study on the issue, including on non-market-based approaches; and remove brackets around a request to the Secretariat to report to ICNP 3 on progress in the implementation of the ABS clearing-house pilot phase, including on registration of information related to national permits or their equivalents and on technical issues concerning the establishment of the internationally recognized certificate of compliance.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.22), the COP reconvenes the ICNP for a third meeting and calls upon CBD parties to expedite their internal processes leading to ratification. It invites parties and others to submit information on model contractual clauses, codes of conduct, guidelines and best practices and/or standards, to be made available through the ABS clearing-house and compiled for consideration by ICNP 3. It further decides to add to the ICNP 3 agenda: monitoring and reporting; an exchange of views on sectoral and cross-sectoral model contractual clauses, codes of conduct and guidelines; and an exchange of views on the state of implementation of the Protocol.

On the need for and modalities of a global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism, the COP requests the Secretariat to convene an expert group, subject to available funds, to review information provided and identify areas of common understanding and areas for further examination for ICNP 3 consideration of the need for an additional study, including on non-market-based approaches.

On the ABS clearing-house, the COP endorses the indicative work plan and timeline for activities and decides that the informal advisory committee will hold one meeting, subject to available financial resources.

On capacity-building measures, the COP requests the Secretariat to organize an expert meeting to develop a draft strategic framework, subject to available financial resources.

The COP forwards to ICNP 3 the draft procedures on compliance developed by the ICNP during its two previous meetings, for further consideration.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY AND PROGRESS TOWARDS THE AICHI TARGETS

WG II discussions on the item addressed: national targets and NBSAPs; capacity building, CEPA, CHM and technology transfer; and monitoring implementation, including indicators.

NATIONAL TARGETS AND NBSAPs: Delegates addressed a progress report on Strategic Plan implementation and relevant WGRI recommendations (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/12 and 4). Several parties highlighted progress in updating their NBSAPs in line with the Strategic Plan. China highlighted formulating provincial NBSAPs while the EU stressed integrating NBSAPs into relevant sectoral plans. Indonesia stressed involving relevant stakeholders in all aspects of updating NBSAPs to remove barriers to implementation. Argentina called for a strong participatory process when reviewing NBSAPs. The UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) said its national focal points could contribute to designing NBSAPs.

CAPACITY BUILDING, CEPA, CHM AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER: Delegates addressed relevant WGRI recommendations and other documents, including a proposed work programme for the CHM (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/4, 13, 13/Add.1 and 2, 31 and INF/5 and 8). Many requested removing brackets around text urging the provision of financial resources, technology transfer and benefit-sharing. Delegates urged establishing capacity-building networks, while requesting clarification on the classification and criteria for selecting centers of excellence that make up the proposed capacity-building networks. The Philippines urged technology needs assessments be funded and undertaken as a matter of priority. The EU supported enhancing the CHM and developing a consistent approach on technical and scientific cooperation. Norway prioritized biosafety and ABS for development of tools under the CHM. Switzerland proposed the Secretariat facilitate a voluntary peer-review process to enhance information exchange on good practices.

Delegates debated reference to CBD Article 20 (Financial Resources). Canada and the EU, opposed by Zambia, Colombia, the Philippines and China, supported reference to CBD Article 20 (Financial Resources) and the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, rather than CBD Article 20(4). China proposed emphasizing that studies for capacity needs assessments and identification of baselines should not delay implementation of commitments by developed country parties under CBD Article 20, which was bracketed.

During the closing plenary, China, supported by Malaysia and Somalia, made an alternative proposal to emphasize that provision of financial resources in accordance with CBD Article 20 should not be affected by the lack of capacity needs assessments and baseline information on financial resource flows. The EU, supported by Japan, Switzerland, New Zealand and Australia, requested that language remain bracketed until conclusion of ministerial consultations on resource mobilization. The brackets were removed and the decision adopted following conclusion of the consultations on resource mobilization.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.28), the COP urges parties to review, update and revise their NBSAPs in line with the Strategic Plan; and undertake voluntary peer

review of NBSAPs and their implementation. It calls for the provision of support for timely review, revision and updating of NBSAPs, and requests the Secretariat to facilitate the continued exchange of best practices and lessons learned from preparing, updating and revising NBSAPs, as well as continuing to promote and facilitate activities to strengthen implementation of the Strategic Plan and progress towards the Aichi targets at all levels.

The COP agrees to: keep the work programme for the CHM under review; strengthen communication with, and build the capacity of, national focal points for the CHM; and call on parties to share information on, *inter alia*, results from the monitoring of progress towards the Aichi targets. It further decides to extend the mandate of the informal advisory committee and requests SBSTTA to develop guidance on effectively addressing barriers to data access to achieve the Aichi targets. It also requests the Secretariat to, *inter alia*, establish a standard information exchange mechanism for the CHM to interconnect the central and national CHMs, and collaborate with other biodiversity-related conventions to ensure mutual compatibility.

On scientific and technical cooperation and technology transfer, the COP requests the Secretariat to, *inter alia*: develop a coherent, consistent and coordinated approach to technical and scientific cooperation; identify how it can facilitate implementation of the Convention by acting as a convener to build partnerships and capacity; and collaborate with IPBES to engage in a process for establishing a capacity-building network of national and regional centers of excellence in biodiversity to support implementing the Strategic Plan and achieving the Aichi targets in developing countries.

Under other matters, the Secretariat is requested to undertake a review of the impact of disasters and conflicts on biodiversity; and to collaborate with IPBES in developing a work programme that includes the preparation of the next global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services, to be launched in 2018, focusing on status and trends, the impact of biodiversity and ecosystem services on human well-being, and the effectiveness of responses.

MONITORING IMPLEMENTATION, INCLUDING INDICATORS: Delegates addressed relevant SBSTTA recommendations (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/2, 3 and 27). The EU supported developing global indicators. Canada supported reaching consensus on a small set of indicators during COP 11, and further developing the draft list of indicators for discussion at COP 12. While generally welcoming the proposed indicators, delegates urged keeping the proposed indicators as a flexible framework and noted that more work would be needed for their implementation at the national level.

Brazil questioned the inclusion of certain proposed indicators. Bolivia suggested recognizing different visions in achieving the CBD objectives. Kiribati called for including the source data used for establishing the indicators. The IIFB Working Group on Indicators called for support of community monitoring systems, through partnerships between governments and indigenous peoples.

On traditional knowledge (TK) indicators, New Zealand highlighted the value of working with existing forest assessment

processes to help reduce data burdens. Ecuador and Malaysia called for developing indicators specific to indigenous peoples.

Final Decision: On the indicator framework for the Strategic Plan and the Aichi targets (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.25), the COP takes note of the indicative list of indicators contained in the annex and recognizes that they provide a flexible basis for parties and can be adapted to national circumstances.

It also requests the Secretariat to, *inter alia*:

- develop practical information on the indicators;
- further develop the global indicators identified in the annex to ensure that each Aichi target can be monitored by at least one global indicator by 2014;
- propose a limited number of simple, easily applicable and cost-effective indicators;
- promote harmonization of global indicators and their use between the CBD, other conventions, regional agreements and processes and promote further collaboration;
- provide information about the indicator framework to assist the process to establish sustainable development goals;
- further develop and maintain the online database on indicators for the Strategic Plan; and
- develop an explanatory practical toolkit on each of the Aichi targets.

The Secretariat is requested to provide regular progress reports on the development and use of the indicators and associated monitoring systems to each meeting of SBSTTA.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND FINANCIAL MECHANISM IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RESOURCE MOBILIZATION STRATEGY, INCLUDING

ESTABLISHMENT OF TARGETS: WG II discussions focused on establishing targets for implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, and the required baselines for the establishment of such targets (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6/Add.1, UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/6 and 7, UNEP/CBD/COP/11/4/Rev.1/Add.1-3).

GRULAC highlighted the need for new, additional, predictable and adequate financial resources, and suggested that national trust funds complement the Convention's financial provisions by channeling international resources. The African Group called for doubling resources by 2015 and increasing international financial flows to developing countries by 20% annually up to 2020. Norway underscored the need to combine efforts on resource mobilization, track biodiversity funding, and create enabling conditions. Australia opposed setting quantitative targets specific to official development assistance (ODA).

Canada stressed the need to monitor parties' implementation of the Strategy and the importance of national assessments to establish baselines, expressing readiness to discuss targets once parties have completed their data collection process. Peru highlighted the need for capacity building, and Argentina for funding, for countries to undertake national assessments of needs and gaps. Kiribati emphasized the importance of agreeing on funding targets at this meeting, noting that available data is sufficient. India explained that setting targets now, even on an interim basis, would build confidence among parties. Mexico said it would be a "serious mistake" to delay implementation.

The Philippines supported adopting the preliminary reporting framework for resource mobilization. Bolivia affirmed that the framework's indicators should also consider collective action taken by indigenous peoples and local communities. Highlighting the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, China noted the framework should be voluntary for developing countries.

Negotiations continued throughout the meeting. Delegates could not agree on: adopting, welcoming, or taking note of the preliminary reporting framework for reporting and monitoring; preliminary targets for increased biodiversity funding; reporting of domestic biodiversity expenditures and funding needs; and preparation of national financial plans for biodiversity. Developed countries called for needs assessments and robust baselines before establishing resource flow targets, noting that national financial plans are fundamental preconditions. Developing countries stressed that establishment of targets is the main outstanding item since COP 10 and many expressed "extreme disappointment," underscoring a lack of political will. They proposed a target of doubling biodiversity financial resource flows from developed to developing countries by 2015, noting it stems from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Creditors Reporting System and the Rio markers, which establish a robust baseline. They also argued that reporting and assessment-related targets should not be a precondition for the target on 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 addresses 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. 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.

Some developed countries also noted that their ODA model does not include issue-specific targets but responds to needs and priorities set by recipient countries, underscoring the need for developing countries to identify biodiversity as a priority for ODA. Other debated items included: establishing a target on the removal, reform or phase-out of subsidies harmful to biodiversity at COP 12, requesting using language from Decision X/3 (Strategy for Resource Mobilization); and reviewing implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization.

In the early hours of Saturday, the closing plenary was presented with a compromise decision resulting from ministerial-level consultations. Canada highlighted commitment to COP 10 decisions and fulfillment of related obligations, including submission on robust baseline information, noting that absence of such information is inconsistent with Decision X/3; and expressed disagreement with the decision but said they will not block consensus. Switzerland expressed concern that COP 11 set quantified targets for resource mobilization considering that robust baselines have not been identified and highlighted that

the decision is exclusively related to the CBD, further noting difficulty to subscribe to the interim 2015 goal but commitment to reach the 2020 goal.

Australia stressed that the target of doubling resource flows relates exclusively to the CBD and expressed commitment to respond to ODA partners' priorities. Japan highlighted that the interim target was agreed without sufficient discussion and recognized that it relates to CBD parties as a whole, while each party is expected to make efforts within its capabilities and resources.

Final Decision: The decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.34) includes sections on target setting, review of implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, and a roadmap.

The COP urges parties to consider all possible sources and means that can help to meet the level of resources needed, in accordance with Article 20 consistent with Decision X/3. It welcomes and decides to use the preliminary reporting framework and methodological and implementation guidance (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/14/Add.1) as a flexible and preliminary framework to report on and monitor the resources mobilized for biodiversity at the national and global levels, and invites parties to build on this flexible framework at the national level as part of monitoring, including implementation of NBSAPs, as appropriate, and to report prior to WGRI 5. It invites parties to submit their information through the preliminary reporting framework using the average of annual biodiversity funding for the years 2006-2010 as a preliminary baseline.

The COP decides on an overall substantial increase of total biodiversity-related funding for the implementation of the Strategic Plan from a variety of sources, and resolves to achieve the following preliminary targets:

- double total biodiversity-related international financial resource flows to developing countries by 2015 and at least maintaining this level until 2020;
- endeavor for 100% but achieve at least 75% of parties having included biodiversity in their national priorities or development plans by 2015;
- endeavor for 100%, but achieve at least 75% of parties provided with adequate financial resources having reported domestic biodiversity expenditures and funding needs, gaps and priorities by 2015; and
- endeavor for 100%, but achieve at least 75% provided with adequate financial resources, having prepared national financial plans for biodiversity by 2015, and 30% of those parties having assessed biodiversity values.

The COP decides to review implementation of the Strategy at WGRI 5 and include consideration of resource mobilization for the Nagoya Protocol in the implementation of the Strategy; and at COP 12 to: consider modalities and milestones for full operationalization of Aichi Target 3 to mobilize resources for biodiversity; establish a transparent process to encourage and facilitate the efforts of reporting by developing countries for achieving the CBD objectives and Aichi targets; and review progress towards the achievement of Aichi Target 20 with the aim of adopting the final target for resource mobilization.

GUIDANCE TO THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM: WG II delegates reviewed the effectiveness of the GEF's biodiversity-

related activities during GEF-5 and discussed the GEF-6 needs assessment (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/4, 8 and 15/Rev.2).

During discussions on the review of GEF-5, delegates expressed concern regarding the timeliness of disbursements, and suggested language on this. Colombia stressed stable funding for NBSAPs. Numerous delegates called for simpler, streamlined methodologies for allocating funds.

On the needs assessment for GEF-6, many delegates called for “urging” developed countries to increase their contributions, with Colombia proposing text noting that the lowest estimate of necessary funds for implementation is US\$5 billion. Many delegates cautioned against suggesting a figure and target for the GEF-6 replenishment. Japan called for also considering donors’ financial capacity. Brazil said the establishment of priorities for GEF-6 should take into account the Strategic Plan and countries’ needs assessments. India highlighted the need to monitor the impact of GEF-6 projects in reaching the Aichi targets. Following deliberations in the Friends of the Chair group, delegates included two bracketed options on funding needs and increased contributions to GEF-6. Following informal consultations, delegates agreed to “urge the GEF in the process of replenishment for GEF-6 to give due consideration of all aspects of the expert team on the levels of funding for biodiversity.”

Japan and Norway suggested extending the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund (NPIF) until COP 12. Namibia suggested calling on the GEF to “contract directly through recipients rather than with the usual GEF agents,” for disbursements from NPIF. Japan highlighted the importance of establishing an ABS clearing-house, and Switzerland called for additional resources from the core budget. Bangladesh urged establishing a fast-track process within the NPIF. Senegal, Gabon, Namibia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Benin and Peru, opposed by Canada, called for establishing a special window for ABS in the GEF’s System of Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) system.

The African Group recommended that the GEF: allocate funds dedicated to ABS and the Nagoya Protocol in a separate window under STAR during GEF-6 to implement the third CBD objective, without setting a precedent regarding the creation of separate windows; and provide financial support to the Secretariat to continue its technical support to parties for the Protocol’s ratification and implementation. The Philippines proposed: urging the GEF not to undermine the effectiveness of national regulatory activities by funding bioprospecting activities while regulatory activities are ongoing; and inviting countries receiving applications for bioprospecting activities to require that collectors’ countries have effective ABS regulations in place or commit to ratify the Nagoya Protocol.

Delegates also addressed, *inter alia*: the contribution of private sector funds to the NPIF; the guiding principles to the four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities 2014-2018; and making the necessary funds available for ABS activities and the Nagoya Protocol to address the backlog in implementation of the CBD’s third objective.

Final Decision: In the decision on the financial mechanism (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.30), the COP adopts the four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities for the period 2014-2018, which is annexed to the decision, and requests

the GEF to implement it and report back to COP 12 on the GEF-6 strategy and COP 13 on its implementation. It further asks the GEF to:

- expedite the provision of financial support, based on a flexible and national demand-driven approach;
- avoid additional and lengthy processes and use existing NBSAPs as the basis for GEF-6 priorities;
- clarify the concept and application of co-financing for biodiversity projects;
- apply co-financing arrangements in ways that do not create unnecessary barriers and costs for recipient countries; and
- invite developed country parties and others to increase their financial contributions during GEF-6.

It also requests the Secretariat to make the report of the fourth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism available to parties.

On the needs assessment for GEF-6, the COP takes note of the range of estimated funding needs and urges the GEF to consider all aspects of the expert team’s needs assessment report on the levels of funding for biodiversity. It also requests the Secretariat and invites the GEF to identify the Aichi targets benefiting the most from synergies with other GEF focal areas.

The COP urges parties and invites other governments, the financial mechanism, and funding organizations to provide adequate, timely and sustainable support for implementing the GSPC, and training and capacity building and other activities related to ecologically and biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs). It invites the GEF and its implementing agencies to facilitate aligning the development and implementation of PA projects with the actions identified in national action plans for the programme of work with a view to facilitating the systematic monitoring and reporting of the results of those projects as they contribute to achieving Aichi Target 11 (protected areas) and other related targets. The COP also requests the GEF and invites other donors to: provide adequate and timely financial support to developing countries for assisting on IAS; and continue to support projects and activities to improve synergies among relevant multilateral environment agreements.

It recommends that the GEF make funds available for activities to support ABS and the early entry into force and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and further recommends that GEF operational focal points carefully consider the urgent need to finance activities related to ABS and the Nagoya Protocol when consulting national stakeholders on the distribution of the STAR allocation. It further recommends that the GEF continue to finance technical support to parties for the speedy ratification and early entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol, and its implementation at the national level. It requests the GEF to ensure that the NPIF will specifically support activities related to early ratification and capacity building, and be used for access to and utilization of genetic resources only when such activities have been approved by appropriate government authorities and endorsed through the GEF operational focal point.

The COP also calls upon the GEF, donors, parties and others to consider providing technical support and financial resources for work on indicators on TK and customary sustainable use and invites them to provide adequate and timely financial support

for the preparation of the fifth national reports. It reiterates its invitation to the GEF to consider establishing a South-South biodiversity cooperation trust fund and welcomes ongoing discussions on this matter. On biosafety, it transmits the guidance received from the COP/MOP, which is contained in an appendix to the decision.

Appendix I of the decision sets out the guidance to the GEF to support implementing the Nagoya Protocol, which highlights the need for support for capacity building for, *inter alia*: implementing and enforcing legislative, administrative and policy measures on ABS; negotiating agreements; developing parties' research capabilities; and addressing ILCs' needs and priorities. It also provides guidance on the NPIF and other activities to support the entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol. Appendix II sets out guidance to the GEF from the Cartagena Protocol COP/MOP.

COOPERATION, OUTREACH AND THE UN DECADE ON BIODIVERSITY

WG II delegates considered: strengthening cooperation with international organizations, promoting the UN Decade on Biodiversity, integrating biodiversity issues into business policies and operations, and engaging other stakeholders, including progress on gender mainstreaming.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS:

Delegates considered enhancing synergies among biodiversity-related conventions, including links between biological and cultural diversity, agricultural diversity, forest diversity, Arctic diversity, health, and tourism development (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/17 and INF/11, 27, 30, 31, 41, 44, 46, 52/Rev.1). Many called for coordination at the national level, and India said NBSAPs can assist in ensuring policy coherence. Thailand proposed to strengthen and enhance synergies between the CBD and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) on low-carbon cities.

On incorporating links between biological and cultural diversity into CBD implementation, delegates agreed to add language on consistency and harmony with the Convention and relevant international obligations. On the joint work programme with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) on biological and cultural diversity, Australia proposed language on consistency with international obligations, while India called for considering specific national contexts. On agricultural biodiversity, the Philippines urged that implementation of the joint work plan between the CBD, FAO and its Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture takes into account farmers' rights. The FAO highlighted endorsement of the Global Soil Partnership by the FAO Council. On forest biodiversity, the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) presented on projects on tropical forest biodiversity and many delegates supported expanded work. Switzerland, supported by New Zealand and Norway, proposed new text welcoming collaboration between the CBD and UN Forum on Forests (UNFF). On health, China requested deleting text inviting parties to collaborate with national health sectors to integrate biodiversity into national health strategies and programmes.

The EU called for enhanced use of the guidelines on biodiversity and tourism development. Brazil and Ecuador suggested inviting the World Tourism Organization and other relevant organizations to cooperate on identifying critical tourism and conservation hotspots.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.16), the COP, *inter alia*, stresses the need to strengthen synergistic processes among the biodiversity-related conventions, and welcomes specific work, progress and plans. It requests the Secretariat to: propose options for a process to enhance coordination, coherence and national-level synergies; draft suggestions for the COP on improving efficiency and reducing unnecessary overlap and duplication, including through joint workshops with other conventions; and compile, review and update the various recommendations for synergistic activities.

The COP:

- stresses the importance of strengthening collaboration between the CBD and FAO in meeting the Aichi targets, particularly in the context of food security and with respect to the Nagoya Protocol;
- recognizes the contribution of ILCs with regard to agricultural and forest biodiversity;
- welcomes collaboration between the CBD and ITTO, and the CBD and UNFF, including the Secretariat's work as a full partner in the Collaborative Partnership on Forests;
- invites parties and others to raise awareness of links between biodiversity and health and to report on the issue to COP 12;
- encourages parties and others to make use of Strategic Plan indicators that may be relevant to links between biodiversity and health;
- requests the Secretariat to further develop health-related indicators, and to establish a joint work programme with the World Health Organization;
- encourages the working groups of the Arctic Council to advance the work of identifying Arctic areas of high ecological and cultural significance;
- emphasizes that tourism is essential as a livelihood option, particularly for ILC stewards of rich and biodiverse areas; and
- calls on parties and stakeholders to promote dialogue, enhanced cooperation and partnerships on sustainable tourism management.

UN DECADE ON BIODIVERSITY: Delegates considered potential activities to promote the UN Decade on Biodiversity (UNDB) (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/16). Belarus proposed calling on parties to step up activities related to the UN Decade and report on them annually. Delegates discussed whether to use the Strategic Plan sub-heading "Living in Harmony with Nature," or to also take into consideration the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Mother Earth. They also agreed to include a section on the Decade in the decision on review of progress in implementation of NBSAPs and related capacity-building support.

Final Decision: In the decision on implementation of NBSAPs (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.28), the COP invites parties and encourages stakeholders to use the message "Living in Harmony with Nature" in UNDB-related activities; encourages parties to promote the UNDB in ways appropriate to their national circumstances, for example, protection of Mother Earth,

to create dialogues and to share experiences; and requests the Secretariat to provide each COP until 2020 with a summary of related activities.

BUSINESS AND BIODIVERSITY: Delegates considered actions related to integrating biodiversity concerns into business operations (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/18/Add.1). The Arab Group recommended that partnership initiatives focus on national plans and actions, with financing from the private sector. GRULAC said measures must be based on standards elaborated by recognized international institutions. Switzerland encouraged businesses to report on their impacts on biodiversity. The UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) drew attention to its best policy guidance for integrating biodiversity ecosystem services into standards, and the FAO to World Food Day focusing on agricultural cooperatives. Delegates debated, *inter alia*, references related to: ecosystem services; needs and circumstances of small- and medium-sized enterprises based in developing countries; policies and legislation; best practices for voluntary standards; and encouraging monitoring and reporting frameworks.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.21), the COP, *inter alia*:

- invites parties to consider promoting the integration of biodiversity and ecosystem services values into private sector activities, including large and publicly listed companies, and consider policies and legislation that halt biodiversity loss and reduce incentives;
- encourages businesses, including publicly listed and large companies, to encourage their supply chains and other stakeholders to report on progress made in mainstreaming CBD objectives, and to consider covering effects of business operations on biodiversity in annual reports and corporate information platforms; and
- requests the Secretariat to compile information on best practices related to all three CBD objectives and its protocols, and to facilitate the engagement of businesses and others in adopting such practices.

ENGAGEMENT OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS:

Delegates discussed engagement of stakeholders at sub-national and local levels and with specific stakeholder groups (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/18 and INF/57). Mexico called for capacity building to develop local plans to implement the Aichi targets. Singapore called for cities to develop indicators to monitor progress in implementation. Youth called for their participation in decision-making processes at all levels. Brazil and others proposed considering additional text on workers and trade unions. Canada suggested encouraging the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership to develop indicators that track the progress of urban settlements on the Aichi targets, and encourage parties to monitor and report on their cities' contribution towards the targets.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.26), the COP, *inter alia*: invites governments to develop, with local and sub-national governments, guidelines and capacity-building initiatives to ensure implementation of the Strategic Plan and Aichi targets; and encourages governments to include youth

fully in relevant processes, and implement the Multi-Year Plan of Action for South-South Cooperation on Biodiversity for Development.

Gender Mainstreaming: Delegates discussed a progress report on gender mainstreaming (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/32 and INF/43). Cameroon proposed inviting parties' submissions on indicators to monitor gender mainstreaming. Canada proposed that the Secretariat collaborate with relevant organizations to provide guidance on mainstreaming gender in all CBD work programmes; and, with the EU, opposed establishing an expert group on indicators to monitor gender mainstreaming by parties.

Final Decision: In its decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.12), the COP, *inter alia*, requests the Secretariat to: provide guidance, in collaboration with relevant organizations, for mainstreaming gender into all CBD work programmes; and update the Gender Plan of Action to 2020, taking into consideration the Strategic Plan and Aichi targets.

OPERATION OF THE CONVENTION

PERIODICITY OF MEETINGS: WG II delegates considered relevant documentation (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/10 and Add.1). Discussions focused on maintaining momentum for implementation, with the African Group, Brazil, India, the EU and Switzerland supporting the current biennial schedule for COP meetings. Japan called for further discussion at COP 12.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.18), the COP decides to maintain the current periodicity of its meetings until 2020, and that future meetings will take place in 2014, 2016, 2018 and 2020; and requests the Secretariat to prepare a proposal on improving efficiency of structures and processes under the convention and its two protocols for consideration by WGRI 5.

EXISTING AND ADDITIONAL CONVENTION MECHANISMS: WG II discussions focused on new and emerging issues and on SBSTTA effectiveness and collaboration with IPBES (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/2, 19 and 19/Add.1, and INF/3 and 51).

New and Emerging Issues: Delegates discussed three bracketed options in SBSTTA recommendation XII/12: not adding any new and emerging issues to SBSTTA's agenda (option 1), which was supported by Australia, Canada, Thailand, China, Argentina, New Zealand and Brazil; initiating an information-gathering process for consideration of synthetic biology by SBSTTA before COP 12, on the basis of the precautionary approach (option 2), which was supported by Bolivia, Ghana, Norway, the Philippines, Ecuador, the African Group and Pakistan; and noting that the process for identifying new and emerging issues needs refinement and that SBSTTA 16 was not able to make a decision, and requesting a synthesis report for SBSTTA consideration before COP 12 (option 3), which was supported by Switzerland, the EU, Japan and Kuwait.

China suggested that the issue could be discussed under the Biosafety Protocol. Bolivia, the Philippines, Ecuador, Gabon and several NGOs supported text urging parties to ensure that products of synthetic biology are not released into the environment or approved for commercial use until there is adequate scientific basis for such activities. Norway, New Zealand and Brazil favored deletion.

Debate focused on language on information-gathering by the Secretariat on synthetic biology in relation to the process for SBSTTA addressing new and emerging issues; and the bracketed paragraph on a moratorium on the release or approval of synthetic genetic parts and organisms. Many delegates underscored their lack of mandate to accept a moratorium, and most preferred working on the basis of an alternative paragraph recognizing the rapid development of technologies associated with synthetic life and urging parties to apply the precautionary approach to the release of organisms and products from synthetic biology techniques.

Compromise text was developed following informal consultations, urging parties to take a precautionary approach when addressing threats of significant reduction or loss of biodiversity caused by organisms and products of synthetic biology, in accordance with domestic legislation, recognizing scientific uncertainties on the potential impacts on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity of synthetic life, cells or genomes. Argentina preferred “encouraging” parties. Many delegates opposed, pointing to the delicate balance of the compromise. Following informal consultations, Argentina accepted language on “urging” parties, with the additional reference to “accordance with relevant international obligations.”

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.24), the COP notes, based on the precautionary approach, the need to consider the potential positive and negative impacts of components, organisms and products resulting from synthetic biology techniques on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and requests the Secretariat, subject to available resources, to: compile information submitted by parties and others, and consider possible gaps and overlaps with CBD applicable provisions, for SBSTTA consideration. It also urges parties to take a precautionary approach, in accordance with the preamble of the Convention and its Article 14, when addressing threats of significant reduction or loss of biodiversity posed by organisms, components and products resulting from synthetic biology, in accordance with domestic legislation and other relevant international obligations.

SBSTTA Effectiveness and IPBES: Mexico called for SBSTTA to identify means of communication with IPBES. Japan and China cautioned against duplication of work. India suggested that SBSTTA be mandated to make requests to IPBES. Japan and China preferred the COP make requests to IPBES.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.20), the COP notes the role of the peer-review process for SBSTTA documents in mobilizing scientific communities and strengthening their quality, and requests the Secretariat to develop training materials for Convention focal points and continue to explore options for closer collaboration with biodiversity-related conventions. It stresses the need to support the full and effective participation of ILCs in SBSTTA work, and requests IPBES to consider ways in which the activities of the platform could, as appropriate: build on and contribute to the fourth Global Biodiversity Outlook; contribute to assessments of the achievement of the Aichi targets; and provide information on policy options available to deliver the 2050 vision of the Strategic Plan. It decides that: SBSTTA 17 provide additional

explanatory information on such requests; and SBSTTA 18 develop recommendations as to how the Convention and, in particular, SBSTTA should collaborate with IPBES.

RETIREMENT OF DECISIONS: WG II delegates considered a list of elements of COP 7 decisions proposed for retirement (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/20). The EU opposed retiring elements of Decision VII/5 on work by UNGA on genetic resources of the deep seabed in areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ) and it was retained. Brazil suggested review of proposed retirements related to Article 8(j) by the Article 8(j) Working Group. Mexico opposed, saying retirement of decisions are the parties’ prerogative. The Philippines questioned the basis for proposed retirements but agreed to note concerns.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.19), the COP decides to: retire the decisions and elements of decisions adopted at COP 7 listed in the annex; and integrate the retirement exercise into preparation and adoption of new decisions on the same subject.

ARTICLE 8(J)

WG I considered the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/7; UNEP/CBD/WG8J/7/INF/5/Rev.1, 5/Add.1 and 7/Rev.1), focusing on repatriation of TK (task 15 of the work programme), the development of a plan of action on customary sustainable use (Article 10(c)), and whether to change terminology in CBD decisions from ILCs to “indigenous peoples and local communities” on the basis of recommendations of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII).

Progress in Implementation: The EU requested a footnote that the next Article 8(j) Working Group meeting is subject to availability of funding. Canada and the EU offered compromise text urging parties to include in their requests to the GEF and the GEF Small Grants Programme support for ILCs to develop community conservation plans. The EU, opposed by Brazil and Ethiopia, proposed deleting text designating 13 July as the international day for local communities.

Tasks 7, 10 and 12: Colombia, opposed by New Zealand and Canada, requested reference to the Tkarihwaï:ri Code of Ethical Conduct in the operative text of the decision. The reference was kept only in the preambular text.

Task 15: Brazil affirmed that no continued use of repatriated knowledge should be allowed without prior informed consent and mutually agreed terms, and supported the development of best-practice guidance for international repatriation.

The African Group suggested removing brackets concerning interpreting repatriation in light of CBD Articles 8(j) and 17(2) (exchange of information, including TK). The Philippines and Peru recommended reference to facilitating the recovery of cultural property related to TK. The EU opposed, cautioning against going beyond the CBD mandate, and the Philippines agreed to reflect the point in the meeting’s report.

The African Group proposed removing brackets around language on the repatriation of TK not impeding the continued use of such knowledge in the repatriating party. Colombia, supported by Brazil and Peru, proposed deleting the paragraph. As an alternative, Brazil proposed to add references to “prior informed consent” and “national legislation,” and Peru to “compliance with the national legal framework of the country that requires repatriation.” Supported by the EU and Australia,

Canada proposed seeking the views of other intergovernmental bodies that currently address genetic resources, TK and traditional cultural expressions. Following informal discussions, delegates agreed to delete the paragraph.

Sustainable Customary Use: On a list of indicative tasks for a plan of action on sustainable customary use, the African Group, Pacific Islands and Brazil supported a review of national and sub-national policies to ensure protection and encouragement of sustainable customary use. The African Group and Pacific Islands also supported guidelines on developing legislation to respect, protect and promote sustainable customary use and TK, with Brazil suggesting reference to “according to national legislation and circumstances.”

The IIFB preferred “to develop mechanisms to recognize and respect customary laws, community protocols and procedures and traditional institutions and authorities in national and sub-national legislation” and “to review and revise national and sub-national laws and policies taking into consideration customary laws and practices.” Canada proposed, *inter alia*, compiling information on case studies on customary land use and community resource management practices, and providing tools and networks to enable ILCs to map their customary use. Brazil proposed, and delegates agreed to: indicate that the list of indicative tasks is for “future” consideration; and insert a footnote stating that tasks in brackets have not been agreed on at COP 11 and will be considered by the Article 8(j) Working Group.

UNPFII Recommendations: Norway, Colombia, Brazil, Guatemala, Bolivia, Peru, Argentina, the Philippines and Denmark on behalf of Greenland, supported using the terminology “indigenous peoples and local communities.” Canada and India opposed, with Canada proposing that the Article 8(j) Working Group and COP 12 further consider the issue. 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. The EU suggested: “noting,” rather than “recalling,” relevant UNPFII recommendations; deleting language on the terminology being “an accurate reflection of the distinct identities developed by those entities since the adoption of the Convention almost 20 years ago”; and requesting the next Article 8(j) Working Group meeting, on the basis of submission by parties, other governments, relevant stakeholders and ILCs, to consider this matter “including any legal implications and within the scope of the CBD.” Brazil and Ethiopia queried the need for submissions, with New Zealand suggesting “taking into account” submissions. Colombia, Bolivia, Ecuador and Timor Leste questioned reference to “legal implications,” with the EU clarifying that they could be either international or national.

Following informal consultations, delegates agreed to “note” the relevant UNPFII recommendations and request the next Article 8(j) Working Group meeting to “take into account” submissions by governments, stakeholders and ILCs, to consider this matter “and all its implications for the CBD and its parties” for COP 12 consideration.

During the closing plenary, Colombia and Brazil expressed concern that the next meeting of the Article 8(j) Working Group

depends on voluntary funding, hoping that future meetings will be covered by the core budget.

Final Decision: The decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.13) addresses: progress in implementation of Article 8(j) and its integration into the CBD areas of work; participatory mechanisms for ILCs in the Convention’s work; tasks 7, 10 and 12 of the revised multi-year programme of work; consideration and development of terms of reference for task 15 of the work programme; *sui generis* systems for the protection of TK; Article 10, with a focus on Article 10(c), as a major component of the work programme, including a list of indicative tasks for future consideration; and UNPFII 9 and 10 recommendations.

On progress in Article 8(j) implementation in the Convention’s areas of work, the COP requests parties to submit information through their fifth national reports for the Secretariat to compile geographically-balanced good practices, in consultation with parties and ILCs, and make them available in a CBD Technical Series report.

The COP further:

- calls upon parties to integrate Aichi Target 18 (TK) into their revised NBSAPs and other relevant local and regional plans and report progress in their fifth national reports;
- decides to organize one meeting of the Article 8(j) Working Group prior to COP 12 with the in-depth dialogue to be held on: “connecting TK systems and science, such as under the IPBES, including gender dimensions”; and
- urges parties to include in their requests to the GEF and invites other donors to support: development of community plans and protocols by ILCs; documentation, mapping and registry of their indigenous and community conserved areas (ICCAs) by ILCs; and preparation and implementation of their community conservation plans.

On participatory mechanisms for ILCs in the Convention’s work, the decision addresses: capacity building; CEPA; development of communication, mechanisms and tools; participation including through the Voluntary Fund for the Participation of ILC representatives; other initiatives; and local communities.

On capacity building, the COP requests the Secretariat to continue convening regional and subregional capacity-building workshops on the Guidelines on Biodiversity and Tourism Development; and explore facilitation of joint capacity-building workshops with other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) to promote sustainable use of biodiversity.

On local communities, the COP: takes note with appreciation of the report of the Expert Group Meeting of Local Communities Representatives (UNEP/CBD/WG8J/7/8/Add.1) and requests the Secretariat to take practical steps to ensure that local communities’ representatives have equitable access to the Voluntary Fund for the participation of ILC representatives in Convention meetings.

The COP requests the Secretariat to commission three studies on how tasks 7, 10 and 12 could best contribute to work under the Convention and the Nagoya Protocol, to be made available for the next meeting of Article 8(j) Working Group.

The COP adopts terms of reference to advance task 15, emphasizing that task 15 is to be interpreted in accordance with the Convention provisions, in particular Article 8(j) and Article

17(2) (exchange of information), and is intended to build on, and enhance repatriation by governments and other entities, including international organizations, museums, herbaria, botanical and zoological gardens, databases, registers and genebanks.

It requests the Secretariat to: compile the information received by parties and others for consideration by the next meeting of the Article 8(j) Working Group; seek cooperation with UNESCO in analyzing whether and how the different international legal instruments that address cultural property of ILCs contribute to repatriation; and develop draft best-practice guidelines for the repatriation of TK relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, for consideration by the Article 8(j) Working Group and COP 12.

On *sui generis* systems, the COP decides to organize an AHTEG with the participation of ILC experts for the preparation of a report, and acknowledges that the Nagoya Protocol provides a favorable framework for the development of *sui generis* systems and for ABS from the use of TK associated with genetic resources.

On customary sustainable use (Article 10(c)), as a major component of the work programme on Article 8(j), the COP requests the Secretariat to develop a draft plan of action, including a proposal for phased implementation of the plan, for consideration by the next meeting of the Article 8(j) Working Group; and mandates the Working Group to provide views and advice on TK and sustainable use directly to SBSTTA on a regular basis. The COP decides that the initial tasks shall be to: incorporate customary use practices or policy into NBSAPs; promote community-based initiatives contributing to customary sustainable use and collaborate with ILCs in joint activities to achieve enhanced implementation of Article 10(c); and identify best practices. An annex contains a list of indicative tasks for future consideration. A footnote states that tasks indicated in brackets have not been considered or agreed to by parties.

On UNPFII 9 and 10 recommendations, the COP requests the Article 8(j) Working Group to consider the matter of terminology related to “indigenous peoples and local communities” and all its implications for the CBD and its parties, for further consideration by COP 12.

ISLAND BIODIVERSITY

WG I considered the SBSTTA recommendation (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/3) on the in-depth review of the island biodiversity work programme, with many countries supporting it. The EU, with Croatia, emphasized poverty alleviation and ABS, and, with South Africa, biodiversity loss in uninhabited and seasonally habited ecosystems. The African Group called for integration of climate change adaptation and mitigation activities in island biodiversity conservation. Thailand supported assessing islands’ carrying capacities for anthropogenic activities. Trinidad and Tobago called for individual and institutional training, while India suggested considering sustainable tourism practices.

Madagascar proposed reference to interdependence of marine, freshwater and terrestrial resources, and South Africa suggested including estuarine resources. China and Ethiopia suggested including reference to mobilizing “additional resources, in accordance with CBD Articles 20 and 21” (Financial Resources and Financial Mechanism).

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.8), the COP urges parties to strengthen implementation of the programme of work on island biodiversity by, *inter alia*, promoting high-level regional commitments, expanding mechanisms to strengthen local capacity, and maintaining key databases and information portals. It calls for continued focus on: IAS; climate change adaptation and mitigation; marine protected areas (MPAs); capacity-building; ABS; and poverty alleviation. The COP also: calls on parties to accord priority to management of terrestrial PAs; encourages cross-sectoral partnerships; invites parties to engage with the Global Island Partnership; and requests the Secretariat to enable regional and global technical support networks.

ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

WG I considered a SBSTTA recommendation (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/2 and 21). The African Group underscored the need to clarify the understanding of “ecosystem restoration” under the Convention, with South Africa suggesting more focus on ecosystem health and functioning.

The EU stated that ecosystem restoration should be integrated in the CBD work on specific ecosystems and, with the Republic of Korea, that it should be the last resort. Mexico cautioned that restoration should not be seen as an end in itself but rather as a long-term process subject to continuous management. Canada, supported by India, proposed deleting reference to ecosystem restoration as a “last resort for ameliorating degraded ecosystems.” Switzerland proposed that the Secretariat not only identify, but also “use as appropriate” opportunities for collaboration with other conventions. Saint Lucia noted the importance of cooperation among biodiversity-related conventions.

Thailand recommended compiling degraded ecosystem inventories to identify best practices and appropriate technology for restoration. Norway called for: user-friendly guidance to support restoration planning and to avoid negative net effects; consideration of existing land use, including pastoralism and low-impact agriculture; elaboration of safeguards including on land ownership in the identification of land suitable for restoration; and consideration of different financial mechanisms, including those from the private sector.

Canada acknowledged information, capacity and financial limitations, saying it is not an excuse for lack of conservation. India asserted the need to adopt ecologically and socio-economically sound and user-friendly restoration practices, address the causes of degradation and support natural regeneration. FAO and the International Model Forest Network highlighted landscape approaches.

Ghana, Ecuador and Canada supported an *ad hoc* technical expert group (AHTEG) on ecosystem restoration. Peru and Colombia urged compilation of existing information. Delegates agreed not to establish an AHTEG on ecosystem restoration, but to request the Secretariat to undertake the tasks initially allocated to an AHTEG. The Dominican Republic suggested that the mining sector be targeted in further development of practical guidance for restoration.

On identifying degraded ecosystems for potential restoration that may be used by ILCs, Thailand proposed promoting best practices and appropriate technology. Norway recommended

performing social impact assessments to ensure that restoration projects do not negatively affect ILCs that may use the land. The EU preferred to “consider” performing social impact assessments, with Australia adding “appropriate to national circumstances.”

Guatemala, Argentina and El Salvador stressed the need for financial support. On language recognizing that developing countries require financial resources to implement ecosystem restoration and achieve the Aichi targets, Peru, supported by El Salvador but opposed by Canada, suggested including countries that are centers of origin. The EU, supported by New Zealand, requested bracketing the text due to its financial implications, pending discussions on resource mobilization. Somalia, Sudan, Qatar, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Togo, Turkey and other developing countries wished to retain the language. Japan proposed referring not only to financial, but also to technical and human resources. China, supported by Brazil, proposed adding “in accordance with CBD Article 20” (Financial Resources). Mexico urged delegates not to repeat the experience of COP 10 in Nagoya where several portions of decisions were left bracketed until the conclusion of discussions on resource mobilization. WG I Chair González Posse admonished delegates for keeping the process “hostage” to the resource mobilization discussion.

During the closing plenary, Canada suggested compromise text recognizing that developing countries require financial and technical resources in order to implement ecosystem restoration programmes and to achieve the related Aichi targets. WG I Chair González Posse, supported by many, noted the text was bracketed pending agreement on resource mobilization, which had been concluded. Plenary agreed to remove the brackets and adopt the decision without amendment.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.11), the COP urges parties and encourages other governments and relevant organizations to make concerted efforts to achieve Aichi Targets 14 (ecosystems and essential services safeguarded) and 15 (ecosystems restored and resilience enhanced) and to contribute to achievement of other targets through activities that support ecosystem restoration. The COP also recognizes that developing countries require financial and technical resources in order to implement ecosystem restoration programmes and achieve the Aichi Targets, and urges governments and international organizations to provide support for implementation, and provide adequate financial, technical and other support to the Secretariat to facilitate capacity development and implementation initiatives.

The COP further requests the Secretariat: to convene regional and subregional capacity-building and training workshops and expert meetings with participation of ILCs; facilitate a comprehensive web portal on ecosystem restoration; compile all COP decisions and information related to ecosystem restoration; collaborate with other UN partners and related conventions to enhance and harmonize efforts in ecosystem restoration and avoid duplication; and report progress on these matters to SBSTTA prior to COP 12.

MARINE AND COASTAL BIODIVERSITY

ECOLOGICALLY AND BIOLOGICALLY SIGNIFICANT MARINE AREAS: WG I debated how to

take forward the summary reports of regional workshops on the description of areas that meet the criteria for ecologically and biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs), which were adopted by COP 9 in order to describe areas that may require enhanced conservation and management measures through a variety of means, including marine protected areas and impact assessments (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/22). Mexico, Argentina and Japan emphasized that the description of EBSAs is a scientific and technical exercise, and cannot affect states’ rights and obligations under international law or prejudice the work of competent international organizations.

Delegates debated at length the process for including the summary reports in the CBD repository, called for by COP 10. Australia recommended “endorsing” the EBSA workshops’ summary reports and establishing a supplementary process to include them in the repository. Japan, China and Peru preferred “taking note” of the reports. Norway encouraged including the reports in the repository, distributing them to relevant bodies and improving EBSA descriptions when information becomes available. The EU called for endorsing the reports to stimulate further workshops and further EBSA identification, and urged regional groups to identify marine protected areas beyond national jurisdiction under a new implementing agreement under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). Greenpeace urged parties to endorse the summary reports and request UNGA to urgently address EBSAs’ governance. IUCN urged the COP to invite the UNGA Working Group on Marine Biodiversity in ABNJ to encourage states and international organizations to respond to EBSA information and report on action taken based on existing international obligations under UNCLOS.

Chair González Posse proposed that parties request the Secretariat to include the summary reports in the repository and transmit them to the UNGA, its working group and other international bodies. Many supported the compromise proposal. The Russian Federation, China and Iceland queried whether this is contrary to the procedure outlined by COP 10, highlighting the need for prior COP endorsement. 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 this decision,” with the EU requesting also reference to the “procedure set out in paragraph 42 of decision X/29”; and making future 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.” China requested that the meeting report reflect that the COP did not endorse the summary reports.

Decision: The decision on EBSAs (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.29) addresses: description of areas meeting the scientific criteria for EBSAs; the EBSA repository and the information-sharing mechanism; EBSA capacity building; TK for EBSA description and social and cultural criteria; and an annex containing the summary reports of EBSA descriptions, including

description of areas meeting EBSA criteria in the Western South Pacific region and in the Wider Caribbean and Western Mid-Atlantic region, and areas that could meet the EBSA criteria in the Mediterranean region.

In the decision, the COP:

- notes that the application of EBSA criteria is a scientific and technical exercise;
- emphasizes that the identification of EBSAs and selection of conservation and management measures is a matter for states and competent intergovernmental organizations in accordance with international law;
- requests the Secretariat to include the summary reports on the description of areas that meet the EBSA criteria in the repository, as referred in Decision X/29 and the COP 11 decision, and submit them to the UNGA and particularly its Working Group on Marine Biodiversity in ABNJ, and other international bodies;
- affirms that the scientific description of areas meeting the EBSA criteria is an open and evolving process that should be continued to allow ongoing improvement and updating when improved scientific and technical information becomes available in each region;
- requests the Secretariat to further collaborate with governments and relevant international organizations, including ILCs' participation, to facilitate the description of EBSAs through the organization of additional regional or subregional workshops for the remaining regions or subregions where parties wish them to be held, and make the reports available for SBSTTA and COP consideration;
- welcomes the EBSA repository prototype;
- invites governments and international organizations to consider the use of guidance on the integration of TK in the application of EBSA criteria, with the approval and involvement of TK holders, where applicable, in any future description of areas meeting the EBSA criteria and for the development of conservation and management measures; and
- notes that socially and culturally significant areas may require enhanced conservation and management measures and that criteria for the identification of areas in need of such enhanced measures may need to be developed.

EIA GUIDELINES: WG I debated whether to note the revised voluntary guidelines for the consideration of biodiversity in environmental impact assessments (EIAs) and strategic environmental assessments (SEAs) in marine and coastal areas (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/23). Canada welcomed the guidelines. Australia supported “noting” them. Norway underscored the need to refine language on flag state responsibility and the role of international organizations. India, Colombia, China and the Dominican Republic emphasized the voluntary nature of the guidelines, with Mexico stressing that they do not prejudice the competence of UNGA and the International Seabed Authority. The EU supported taking note of the guidelines, making them available as a reference, and encouraging their use and the submission of information following their application. Peru opposed, calling for more consultation under UNGA and regional seas conventions. The US cautioned that the voluntary guidelines use undefined terms and, with Argentina, mandatory language.

Delegates eventually agreed to “take note” of the EIA guidelines, expressing appreciation for the work that led to their finalization in the preamble to the decision.

OTHER MATTERS: Among work on adverse impacts of human activities on marine and coastal biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/3), WG I discussions focused on marine debris and underwater noise. Norway supported guidance on: underwater noise, taking into account limited scientific information; and marine debris, taking into account work in other fora. Australia called for cooperation with the Convention on Migratory Species on marine debris. On underwater noise, the EU suggested, and parties agreed, to refer to the “full range of” best available technologies and environmental practices.

Final Decision: In the decision on other matters related to marine and coastal biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.10), the COP:

- takes note of the voluntary guidelines for the consideration of biodiversity in EIAs and SEAs annotated specifically for biodiversity in marine and coastal areas, including in ABNJ, recognizing that they will be most useful for activities that are currently unregulated and with no procedures for assessing impacts, without prejudice to the ongoing consideration of marine biodiversity in the UNGA processes, in particular its Working Group on marine biodiversity in ABNJ;
- requests the Secretariat to make the guidelines available as a reference to governments and international organizations; and
- encourages governments and organizations to use the guidelines and to adapt and apply them as may be considered necessary in accordance with their national circumstances and priorities.

The guidelines (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/23) address: stages in the EIA process, biodiversity issues in the different EIA stages, special attention to biodiversity in SEAs and decision-making, relevant biodiversity issues for SEAs, and how to address biodiversity in SEAs.

On addressing biodiversity conservation in fisheries management and adverse impacts of human activities on marine and coastal biodiversity, the COP requests the Secretariat to:

- transmit the report of an expert meeting on addressing biodiversity concerns in sustainable fisheries to governments, FAO and regional fisheries management organizations and to collaborate with them to improve how biodiversity concerns are addressed for sustainable fisheries;
- collaborate with governments, international organizations and ILCs to develop proposals to update the specific workplan on coral bleaching to address the need for managers to, *inter alia*, proactively plan for climate risks and formulate adaptation strategies;
- organize an expert workshop to develop practical guidance and toolkits to minimize and mitigate the significant adverse impacts of anthropogenic underwater noise on marine and coastal biodiversity, including marine mammals;
- organize an expert workshop to prepare practical guidance on preventing and mitigating the significant adverse impacts of marine debris; and
- organize an expert workshop to provide consolidated practical guidance and a toolkit for marine spatial planning.

The COP also encourages governments and organizations to take measures, as appropriate, to minimize the significant adverse impacts of anthropogenic underwater noise on marine biodiversity, including the full range of best available technologies and best environmental practices, where appropriate and needed, drawing upon existing guidance.

BIODIVERSITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE

WG I considered this item on the basis of SBSTTA recommendations and relevant documentation (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/3, 24 and 25). Discussions focused on REDD+, geo-engineering and on strengthening knowledge on linkages between biodiversity and climate change.

REDD+: On advice on the application of relevant country-specific biodiversity safeguards contained in an annex to the SBSTTA recommendation, the African Group and Malaysia supported “taking note” and the Republic of Korea preferred “welcoming” it. GRULAC said that countries should develop national safeguard systems according to the UNFCCC COP decisions. The EU supported advice on safeguards, highlighting that the COP should consider means of monitoring and assessing the impacts of REDD+ on biodiversity. Bolivia said there is not a common understanding on what REDD+ is, suggesting to either avoid reference to the abbreviation or add reference to the Bolivian Joint Mitigation and Adaptation Mechanism for the Integral and Sustainable Management of Forests as an alternative non-market based approach. Brazil and India said information on safeguards has to be country-driven, according to UNFCCC decisions. Brazil further cautioned that the issue of forests is not reduced to REDD+. Eventually, parties agreed to “take note with appreciation” of the annex, which relates to biodiversity-related safeguards.

Parties discussed a request to the Secretariat to develop further advice. The EU, with many, supported reporting progress to SBSTTA prior to COP 12. Delegates agreed to “taking into full account the relevant UNFCCC decisions.”

South Africa, Norway and Switzerland supported retaining a reference to an indicative list of indicators contained in a note by the Secretariat (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/8). Brazil suggested deletion, and Colombia said a list of indicators is premature. As a compromise, delegates eventually agreed to delete two provisions on: supporting developing countries in addressing biodiversity concerns and in achieving multiple benefits in relation to the implementation of REDD+; and inviting parties to strengthen efforts with particular attention to the indicative list of indicators in the annex of the Secretariat’s document on REDD+ safeguards. They further agreed to delete reference to technology transfer and capacity building “for the inclusion of relevant indicators in national forest monitoring systems.”

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.27), the COP, recalling guidance and safeguards and the guidance on systems for providing information on how safeguards are addressed and adopted in UNFCCC decisions:

- notes that the safeguards may also enhance benefits for biodiversity and for ILCs;
- takes note with appreciation of the annex; and
- invites parties and others to consider the information in the annex when preparing national reports and other submissions.

The COP requests the Secretariat to: compile information from parties on initiatives and experiences regarding paragraph 67 of UNFCCC Decision 2/CP.17 (Durban outcome on long-term cooperative action) with regard to its contribution to the Convention objectives and submit a progress report prior to COP 12; and develop advice on REDD+ issues, taking into full account the relevant UNFCCC decisions, based on parties’ further views and to report to SBSTTA prior to COP 13.

The decision contains an annex related to biodiversity-related safeguards set out in UNFCCC decision 1/CP.16, Appendix I, paragraph 2.

GEO-ENGINEERING: On definitions, Ghana, supported by Grenada and Bolivia, emphasized the precautionary approach and expressed concern about definitions from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). China affirmed that a geo-engineering definition should be developed on the basis of those used by the IPCC and UNFCCC. Eventually, parties agreed to be “aware” of existing definitions and understandings and ongoing work in other fora, including the IPCC and “note,” without prejudice to future deliberations on the definition of geo-engineering activities, elements that climate-related geo-engineering may include. Brazil, supported by Bolivia, suggested a footnote stating that geo-engineering activities exclude carbon capture and storage (CCS) and REDD+ activities. New Zealand preferred “afforestation, reforestation and restoration” to “REDD+,” to cover activities carried out by developing and developed countries. Delegates eventually agreed to “excluding CCS at source from fossil fuels when it captures carbon dioxide before it is released into the atmosphere, and also excluding forest-related activities.”

GRULAC considered a mechanism for geo-engineering regulation not best placed under the CBD. The Philippines affirmed that the biodiversity aspects of geo-engineering should remain within the competence of the CBD. The Global Forest Coalition and the ETC Group stated that CBD is the appropriate body to oversee the governance of geo-engineering. Ghana, the EU, Argentina, South Africa, the Philippines and Kuwait supported recognizing the lack of, and a need for, a “comprehensive, science-based, global, transparent and effective framework for those geo-engineering concepts that have the potential to cause significant adverse transboundary effects and are deployed in ABNJ and the atmosphere.” Norway favored noting that the need for such a mechanism “may be most necessary” for geo-engineering. Parties eventually agreed to note the lack of science-based, global, transparent and effective control and regulatory mechanisms for climate-related geo-engineering, the need for a precautionary approach, and that such mechanisms may be most necessary for those geo-engineering activities that have a potential to cause significant adverse transboundary effects, and those deployed in ABNJ and the atmosphere, noting that there is no common understanding on where they would be best placed.

Ethiopia, Indonesia, Timor Leste, Bolivia and others supported inviting parties to ensure that testing of geo-engineering techniques takes place in “controlled laboratory conditions,” but Norway, Japan, Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the EU opposed. South Africa and the Philippines preferred to “urge” parties. Supported by Peru and Ecuador, Argentina proposed

to add “in accordance with international law.” Chair González Posse proposed reference to Decision X/33 (Biodiversity and Climate Change), as it included language on “controlled setting.” Ethiopia conceded deleting language on controlled laboratory conditions only if delegates agreed to “reaffirm” COP 10 language on ensuring that no geo-engineering takes place (contained in paragraph 8(w) of Decision X/33). Australia and New Zealand preferred “recalling,” rather than “reaffirming,” paragraph 8(w) of Decision X/33, with Australia explaining that it would only concede to “reaffirm” that paragraph if in conjunction with its chapeau, which “invites” parties to consider guidance contained in paragraph 8(w). Delegates eventually agreed to delete text on controlled laboratory conditions and to “reaffirm paragraph 8, including paragraph 8(w) of Decision X/33.”

Delegates addressed language noting customary international law, including states’ general obligations with regard to activities within their jurisdiction or control and the requirements regarding EIAs, as well as the application of the precautionary approach, which may be relevant for geo-engineering activities but would still form an incomplete basis for global regulation. Citing the International Court of Justice, Argentina supported “the obligation to conduct an EIA” where there is a risk of such a harm and adding reference not only to states’ obligation with regard to activities within their jurisdiction or control, but also to “possible consequences of those activities.” Norway preferred relying on language from CBD Article 3 (Principle), expressing concern about a reference to “significant” transboundary harm. New Zealand stressed the need to refer to the precautionary approach before mention of customary international law, due to certain countries’ disquiet at linking the two. Delegates eventually agreed to note that the application of the precautionary approach, as well as customary international law including states’ general obligation with regard to activities within their jurisdiction or control and with regard to possible consequences of those activities, and EIA requirements, may be relevant for geo-engineering activities but would still form an incomplete basis for global regulation. The US made an objection to this language, to be reflected in the meeting report.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.23), the COP:

- reaffirms paragraph 8, including its subparagraph (w), of Decision X/33;
- notes, aware of existing definitions and understandings and ongoing work in other fora, including the IPCC, that climate-related geo-engineering may include, *inter alia*, deliberate intervention in the planetary environment of a nature and scale intended to counteract anthropogenic climate change and/or its impacts, with a footnote that excludes CCS at source from fossil fuels when it captures carbon dioxide before it is released into the atmosphere, and also forest-related activities;
- notes the lack of science-based, global, transparent and effective control and regulatory mechanisms for climate-related geo-engineering, the need for a precautionary approach, and that such mechanisms may be most necessary for those geo-engineering activities that have a potential to cause significant adverse transboundary effects, and those deployed in ABNJ and the atmosphere, noting that there is no

common understanding on where such mechanisms would be best placed; and

- notes that the application of the precautionary approach, as well as customary international law, including states’ general obligations with regard to activities within their jurisdiction or control and with regard to possible consequences of those activities, and EIA requirements, may be relevant for geo-engineering activities but would still form an incomplete basis for global regulation.

The COP invites parties to report on measures undertaken in accordance with paragraph 8(w) of Decision X/33, requesting the Secretariat to compile this information and make it available through the CHM.

The COP also requests the Secretariat, at the appropriate time, to prepare, provide for peer review and submit for consideration by a future meeting of SBSTTA: an update on the potential impacts of geo-engineering techniques on biodiversity and on the regulatory framework of climate-related geo-engineering relevant to CBD, drawing upon scientific relevant reports such as the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report; and an overview of parties’ and other stakeholders’ views on the potential impacts of geo-engineering on biodiversity and associated social, economic and cultural impacts.

OTHER MATTERS: Brazil, Argentina, China, Bolivia, Malaysia, Ethiopia and others requested either bracketing text on endorsing SBSTTA recommendation XVI/8 on strengthening knowledge and information on the linkages between biodiversity and climate change or adding reference to the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. The EU, Canada, New Zealand, Japan, Australia and Norway opposed. Delegates further debated whether to “endorse” or “take note with appreciation of” the SBSTTA recommendation, with parties eventually agreeing to the latter.

On funding to fill biodiversity and ecosystem data gaps for research studies at larger spatial scales, Japan, the EU, Norway, Canada and others, opposed by China, suggested that governments and organizations “in a position to do so” further mobilize resources. Canada, with Japan and Israel, cautioned against reference to the Rio principle of common but differentiated responsibilities in relation to resource mobilization. New Zealand suggested, and delegates agreed to, a reference to being “aware of the Rio Principles.”

On the strengthening of inventories and monitoring of biodiversity and ecosystem services, the EU, opposed by Brazil, suggested including evaluation of the impacts of climate change adaptation and mitigation. Brazil, opposed by Norway, objected to language on reviewing land-use planning with a view to enhancing ecosystem-based adaptation to climate change, arguing it falls under the UNFCCC mandate.

Eventually, delegates agreed on compromise language to: strengthen knowledge and information, including comparable datasets and related research, and monitoring activities on the links between biodiversity, climate change and human well-being in educational programmes, with the EU adding “at all levels”; strengthen inventories and monitoring of threats and likely impacts of climate change, and both positive and negative impacts of climate mitigation and adaptation measures on

biodiversity and ecosystem services; and “consider” reviewing land-use planning with a view to enhancing ecosystem-based adaptation to climate change.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.6), the COP:

- takes notes with appreciation of recommendation XVI/8, paragraph 1, of SBSTTA on strengthening knowledge and information on linkages between biodiversity and climate change;
- encourages parties and relevant organizations to further mobilize resources, in accordance with CBD Article 20, the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, and the Rio Principles, in order to fill biodiversity and ecosystem services data gaps in the context of climate change, and to undertake research studies at spatial scales from local scales to larger landscapes; and
- encourages governments to: strengthen knowledge and information, including comparable data sets and related research and monitoring activities on the linkages between biodiversity and climate change and human well-being in education programmes at all levels; promote synergies between biodiversity and climate change policies and measures; recognize the significant role that protected areas, restored ecosystems and other conservation measures can play in climate change-related activities; and consider reviewing land-use planning to enhance ecosystem-based adaptation to climate change.

BIODIVERSITY AND DEVELOPMENT

WG II addressed relevant WGRI recommendations, including the Dehradun recommendations (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/4, 33/Rev.1, 33/Add.1, and INF/4 and 40). Many supported continuation of work in an AHTEG. Japan, opposed by Guatemala, said poverty eradication does not fall within the Convention’s scope. Bolivia, with Venezuela and Cuba, opposed the market-based approach in the Dehradun recommendations, and called for consistency with the Rio+20 outcome.

The EU acknowledged the role of ABS in contributing to poverty eradication, with Indonesia and Tunisia highlighting the potential of the Nagoya Protocol. Gabon called for mainstreaming the Aichi targets into the post-2015 development agenda. Brazil called for referencing language from the Rio+20 outcome document stressing the importance of indigenous peoples in the achievement of sustainable development. The IIFB suggested recognizing the contribution of TK and adding reference to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).

Ecuador proposed, and delegates debated, a preambular reference to “the rights of nature.” After informal consultations, delegates agreed to take note of “the concept of rights of nature.” Following consultations, delegates agreed to recall in the preamble the importance of UNDRIP and the Outcome Document of Rio+20.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.14), the COP takes note of the Dehradun recommendations and decides that the expert group on biodiversity for poverty eradication and development will continue its work and submit a report to WGRI 5 for consideration by COP 12. It decides that issues relating to the links between biodiversity and human

well-being, livelihoods, poverty eradication and sustainable development shall be discussed, as appropriate, at future COP meetings for the purpose of recommending specific actions to implement the Strategic Plan. It requests the Secretariat to, among others, ensure effective mainstreaming of poverty eradication and sustainable development concerns into all of the Convention’s programmes of work, and incorporate requests for information on mainstreaming biodiversity for poverty eradication and development into the national reporting process under the Convention. Elements for terms of reference for the expert group on biodiversity for poverty eradication and development are annexed to the decision.

DRY AND SUB-HUMID LANDS

The COP took note of the report contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/11/25.

INLAND WATERS BIODIVERSITY

WG I addressed this item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/17 and 30 and INF/2). Many supported further synergies and cooperation among Secretariats of relevant agreements. The EU called for using common definitions and terms throughout conventions. Norway and New Zealand suggested recognizing the importance of the water cycle to most areas of the Convention and to achieving the Aichi targets. Canada requested the Secretariat develop initiatives for water management prior to COP 12. The Republic of Korea suggested reference to the relevance of water as considered in the Rio+20 outcome. Peru supported including a reference to ecosystems that are shared and part of an area of international relevance. Delegates agreed to include reference to the findings of The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) report on the economics of water and wetlands.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.7), the COP welcomes the work of the expert group on reporting on the ability of biodiversity to support water cycles, notes the findings of the TEEB report on economics of water and wetlands, and recognizes the importance of the water cycle to achieving most of the Aichi targets. The COP invites parties to consider adoption of the term “wetlands,” as defined under the Ramsar Convention in implementing Aichi Target 11. The COP further requests the Secretariat and the Secretary-General of the Ramsar Convention, under the Joint Work Plan between both conventions, to develop partnerships for ecosystem-based solutions to water resources management.

PROTECTED AREAS

WG I addressed this item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/2 and 26). Several developing countries stressed the need for financial support to achieve Aichi Target 11 (PAs). The EU emphasized the need to: start negotiations of a new UNCLOS implementing agreement under the UNGA in relation to MPAs beyond national jurisdiction; and provide capacity building to ILCs. The African Group drew attention to the effectiveness of PA management, livelihood issues, and support for harmonized management of transboundary PAs. Bolivia underscored the need to promote and financially support ILC participation in achieving Aichi Target 11.

The Philippines supported the voluntary use and further development of the global registry of ICCAs managed by UNEP-WCMC. Colombia proposed strengthening the recognition of

and support to community-based approaches to biodiversity conservation, including ICCAs and other community areas classified under the IUCN PA categories.

Switzerland called on the Secretariat and IUCN to provide guidance on qualifiers in Aichi Target 11 such as ecological representativeness and management effectiveness. Thailand proposed inviting parties to assess the current status of ecosystems and prioritize degraded areas within PAs. The IIFB called for the free prior informed consent of indigenous peoples and local communities before PA establishment.

Colombia recommended emphasizing that PAs are strategic to achieve not only Aichi Target 11 but also other Aichi targets, with Brazil suggesting references to specific targets. Ethiopia and Benin, opposed by the EU, Australia New Zealand and Turkey, objected to reference on improving MPAs in all areas within parties' jurisdiction. Argentina proposed adding reference to CBD Article 4 (Jurisdictional Scope). Chair González Posse proposed reference to "both" marine and terrestrial PAs.

The Philippines called for continuation of assessments on PA governance to improve PA systems management. Following informal consultations, delegates agreed. The EU reiterated a proposal to encourage parties, when implementing Nagoya Protocol Article 9 (Contribution to Conservation and Sustainable Use), to encourage users and providers to direct benefits from the utilization of genetic resources towards conservation and sustainable use, including establishing and managing PAs, with Ethiopia, Gabon, Brazil and Madagascar also requesting "ensuring fair and equitable benefit-sharing with ILCs."

On a list of activities for the Secretariat to support implementation of national action plans for the work programme on PAs, Switzerland proposed adding guidance on the definition of area-based conservation measures.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.9), the COP invites parties to, *inter alia*:

- integrate national action plans for the work programme into updated NBSAPs;
- undertake major efforts, with appropriate support to achieve all elements of Aichi Target 11 to improve MPAs in areas within their jurisdiction;
- attain those goals of the programme of work on protected areas that are lagging behind;
- improve inter-agency and intersectoral coordination, especially for mainstreaming protected areas and biodiversity and integrating protected areas into wider land- and seascapes;
- strengthen recognition of and support for community-based approaches to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity;
- give due attention to the conservation of wild relatives of cultivated crops and wild edible plants in protected areas and in ICCAs, in accordance with CBD and national legislation;
- establish subregional and national networks of national focal points for the programme of work to exchange best practices;
- renew efforts to establish multi-sectoral committees that include representation of ILCs; and
- report on the implementation of national action plans.

The COP further invites:

- the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, UNESCO's Biosphere Programme, the World Heritage Convention and others to

- create synergies and partnerships including ILCs to consider aligning activities towards supporting national action plans;
- GEF and its implementing agencies to facilitate the alignment of development and implementation of protected area projects;
- UNEP-WCMC and its partners to continue reporting progress towards achieving Aichi Target 11 and others through the Protected Planet Report; and
- regional and international initiatives, organizations and agencies to coordinate activities to foster regional cooperation and partnerships, and align their initiatives on capacity building to support implementation of national action plans.

SUSTAINABLE USE

WG I addressed the item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/2 and 29). The Russian Federation, Indonesia and others supported strengthening the application of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines. GRULAC, Japan, Nepal and others supported recognizing the usefulness of the Satoyama Initiative as a platform to establish synergies among landscape-level initiatives. Australia preferred retaining reference to its "potential" usefulness.

Colombia stressed the need to include TK in the development of national plans and policies. On engaging others in developing alternatives to unsustainable management, Iceland opposed including reference to the fishery sector.

The Russian Federation underscored that sustainable wildlife use includes both tropical and non-tropical areas. FAO volunteered as the convener of the proposed collaborative partnership on sustainable wildlife management. On the "transfer" of access, rights and the responsibility to sustainably manage wildlife resources to ILCs "whenever possible," the IIFB, supported by Ethiopia, suggested that ILCs who can deliver sustainable solutions "should have access to these resources and be sufficiently empowered." TRAFFIC, with the IIFB, suggested: "adopting," rather than "welcoming," the revised recommendations of the Liaison Group on Bushmeat; integrating them into NBSAPs; and identifying specific national focal points for 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, opposed by Brazil, Bolivia, Ecuador, Sudan, Qatar, Mexico, Colombia, Ethiopia and Argentina, called for reinserting text calling on national REDD+ programmes to take into account the importance of wildlife for healthy ecosystems and ecosystem services. Delegates eventually agreed to welcome the revised recommendations on bushmeat, and compromise text stating that climate change adaptation and mitigation policies and measures should take into account the importance of wildlife for maintaining healthy ecosystems and ecosystem services.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.15), the COP:

- encourages parties to strengthen the application of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines to agriculture and the ecosystem approach in spatial planning and sectoral policies;
- invites the UN Environment Management Group to promote existing and new guidance on sustainable use with respect to implementing the Strategic Plan and each of the Aichi targets;

- recognizes the contribution that the Satoyama Initiative is working to make in creating synergies among the various existing regional and global initiatives on human-influenced natural environments; and
- urges parties to acknowledge the role of ILCs in sustainable use.

The COP further requests the Secretariat to: support capacity building in management of wildlife for customary sustainable use, and establish mechanisms for full and effective participation of ILCs in the process.

The COP welcomes the revised recommendations on bushmeat as a potential complement to the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines; and invites governments and organizations to make use of them, as appropriate, taking into account CBD Article 10(c) and national legislation, and to consider using them to integrate bushmeat into NBSAPs.

GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR PLANT CONSERVATION

WG I addressed this item (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/3).

Thailand suggested encouraging countries and partners to identify holders of specimens and associated information, and assist them in making the information accessible with their consent. Brazil stressed the need to take into account specific national conditions. Ethiopia pointed to the need for taxonomic capacity building and “predictable” financial support for GSPC implementation. The Global Partnership for Plant Conservation expressed willingness to provide technical assistance at national and regional levels. Chair González Posse proposed, and delegates agreed, to record reservations in the meeting report and accept the draft decision as transmitted by SBSTTA.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.3), the COP, *inter alia*: takes note of the report of the fourth meeting of the Liaison Group on GSPC outlining links between the GSPC 2011-2020 targets and the Aichi Targets, and the indicative list of indicators; emphasizes the GSPC should be implemented in accordance with CBD Article 15 (Access to Genetic Resources) and, where applicable, with the Nagoya Protocol; and welcomes the proposed resolution of the CITES Plants Committee relating to cooperation between CITES and the GSPC to be submitted for consideration at CITES COP 16.

On the toolkit for GSPC, the COP:

- invites governments and relevant organizations to make use of the technical rationale for development/updating national plant conservation strategies and to make available examples of national use and application of the technical rationale for possible inclusion into the toolkit; and
- requests the Secretariat to: include into the toolkit, guidance on measures to support implementation of the Strategy and measures to manage and conserve plant species impacted by climate change; and assist parties in establishing linkages between monitoring of national implementation of the GSPC.

BIOFUELS AND BIODIVERSITY

During WG I discussions on biofuels technology and potential actions to promote the positive or avoid negative impacts (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/3), El Salvador, Niger, Switzerland, and South Africa stressed the precautionary approach. Qatar raised concerns about socioeconomic impacts and, with Kuwait, about impacts on food security. Bolivia questioned the potential of

biofuels to mitigate climate change. Ethiopia proposed requesting a compilation of practical examples of positive and negative impacts of biofuels. Delegates with concerns agreed to have them noted in the meeting report.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.2), the COP, *inter alia*:

- acknowledges that biofuel technologies may aggravate drivers of biodiversity loss and also biofuel’s potential positive contribution to mitigating climate change;
- encourages continuing initiatives to develop and apply tools and approaches to promote positive and minimize or avoid negative impacts that affect socioeconomic conditions;
- takes note of gaps in scientific knowledge, relevant tools and approaches, and of uncertainties and difficulties measuring and addressing indirect impacts;
- invites parties to evaluate incentive measures that may drive biofuel expansion in the context of the CBD’s cross-cutting issue on incentive measures;
- urges monitoring the development of the rapidly developing technology, recalling COP Decision IX/2, paragraph 3(c)(i), urging parties to apply the precautionary approach; and
- requests the Secretariat to continue compiling information on gaps in standards and methodologies and compile information on definitions of relevant key terms.

INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES

WG I delegates addressed IAS, including those introduced as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, and as live bait and live food (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/2 and 28). Indonesia supported increasing cooperation among international bodies working on IAS. Many supported renewing the CBD application for observer status in the Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) of the World Trade Organization. India underscored the need to monitor trade agreements that may pose a threat to biosecurity. Brazil emphasized the practical and non-prescriptive nature of a proposed toolkit on IAS. Switzerland proposed focusing on measures to control and eradicate prioritized IAS after minimizing risks in achieving Aichi Target 9 (IAS).

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.17), the COP, *inter alia*:

- encourages governments to address threats from IAS and, as appropriate, make use of and improve existing standards to address associated risks;
- invites consideration of the CBD application for observer status in the SPS Committee; and
- requests the Secretariat to: compile and disseminate methodologies to monitor and control trade and cross-border movement of introduced IAS; develop and disseminate a toolkit on applying existing standards on IAS; and facilitate implementation of the Global Invasive Alien Species Information Partnership.

GLOBAL TAXONOMY INITIATIVE

WG I delegates adopted a decision as recommended by SBSTTA (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/2), along with the GTI capacity-building strategy in an annex.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.4), the COP:

- invites parties to integrate the capacity-building strategy for GTI in updated NBSAPs;
- invites taxonomic and other organizations to make particular efforts to train and increase relevant human resources and to build and maintain publicly available information systems and facilities for biological collections;
- recognizes that taxonomic research may involve movement of genetic resources between countries, and access to traditional knowledge, emphasizing the need for such activities to be undertaken in line with CBD provisions on ABS and, where applicable, the Nagoya Protocol; and
- notes the importance of traditional taxonomic knowledge of ILCs in the context of the GTI.

The COP requests parties to report on effectiveness of capacity-building efforts to support GTI implementation through their fifth and sixth national reports; and requests the Secretariat to report on such progress at corresponding COP meetings. It also requests the Secretariat to organize and facilitate: regional workshops on integrating taxonomy into NBSAPs; workshops on practical tools to improve taxonomic skills and raise awareness on usefulness of taxonomic information in the context of the CBD's objectives, including ABS; and the development of a practical learning kit to promote engagement of relevant sectors.

The annex to the decision comprises the Capacity-Building Strategy for the GTI, with sections on a vision, mission, goals, strategic actions for 2011-2020, and implementation, monitoring, review and evaluation.

INCENTIVE MEASURES

WG I delegates considered a recommendation by SBSTTA (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/3). Discussion dwelt on perverse incentives and on how to use the TEEB work in this context.

The EU emphasized that: incentives can help to deliver the Aichi targets in the most cost-effective way; biodiversity funding needs must also be addressed through green economy and innovative funding mechanisms; the TEEB report should be used to review NBSAPs; and that it is committed to mainstreaming biodiversity in reforming its agricultural and fisheries policies. GRULAC pointed to regionally-uneven distribution of perverse incentives, calling for eliminating developed countries' agricultural and fisheries subsidies; and expressed support for payment for ecosystem services if they result in conservation and sustainable use. Australia, supported by New Zealand, recommended ensuring harmony with relevant international obligations. GRULAC requested that their position on incentive measures be recorded in the report of the meeting.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.5), the COP:

- encourages governments to consider preparation of national studies on the economics of ecosystems and biodiversity, making use of the TEEB study, involving all relevant stakeholders, and to integrate the values of biodiversity into relevant national and local policies; and
- encourages parties to consider, in accordance with the objectives of revised NBSAPs, inclusion of specific criteria on biodiversity in national procurement plans, national strategies for sustainable consumption and production, and similar planning frameworks, as a contribution to implementing Aichi Target 4 (sustainable production and consumption).

The COP, further noting the considerable analytical work already undertaken on harmful incentives by international organizations:

- invites parties to develop and apply tools to identify incentives that are harmful for biodiversity, and methods to monitor progress towards Aichi Target 3 (incentives);
- emphasizes that conducting studies for the identification of incentives, including subsidies, harmful for biodiversity, need not delay immediate policy action in cases where candidates for elimination, phasing out or reform are already known; and
- invites parties to submit information on obstacles in implementing options for reforming incentives that are harmful for biodiversity.

The COP also requests the Secretariat to:

- prepare a synthesis report on obstacles encountered in implementing options identified for eliminating, phasing out or reforming incentives that are harmful for biodiversity for consideration by SBSTTA prior to COP 12; and
- continue holding regional capacity-building workshops to support countries in making use of the TEEB studies and similar work at national or regional levels.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY MATTERS

This matter (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/9-10, 10/Add.1 and INF/36) was addressed in plenary and in an open-ended informal group on the budget, chaired by Amb. Conrod Hunte (Antigua and Barbuda).

During the budget contact group, parties discussed the programme budget for the next biennium 2013-2014, noting that the COP had prepared three options based on assessed growth, 7.5% growth and zero growth. Delegates addressed the scenarios under each budget option, with parties addressing the implications in terms of staffing, frequency and duration of SBSTTA meetings, post upgrades, as well as the logistics of COP and SBSTTA Bureau meetings, including the structure and duration of future COP and COP/MOP meetings. One option highlighted by delegates was for future COP/MOPs of the Nagoya and Cartagena Protocols to be "costless," by being held in parallel to the CBD COPs.

Delegates also discussed the status of unpaid contributions from 2001, with many expressing concern that a large number of dues and pledges for 2012 are still unpaid, and agreed to draft a decision requesting the COP President and the Executive Secretary to appeal to parties to pay their contributions as a matter of urgency. Many noted the need for creative ideas for resource mobilization as well as prioritization of activities undertaken by the Secretariat, given the many resource constraints during the current financial crisis.

Delegates also addressed: the use of a budget surplus for holding priority meetings, should there be a shortfall of funds in the core budget; 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.

Final Decision: In the decision (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.31), the COP decides that the trust funds for the CBD be extended until 31 December 2015. The decision approves a core programme budget of US\$12,994,100 for 2013 and US\$13,580,800 for 2014. It further adopts the scale of

assessments as well as the Secretariat staffing table contained in the decisions, and decides to share the costs of the Secretariat services that are common between the CBD and the Cartagena Protocol. On the working capital reserve, it reaffirms a 5% level of expenditure of the core programme budget.

The COP:

- invites all parties to note that contributions to the core programme budget are due on 1 January of the year the contributions are budgeted for;
- notes with concern that a number of parties have not paid their contributions for the core trust fund 2011 and prior years, urging them to do so without delay;
- decides that parties whose contributions are two years or more in arrears will not be eligible to become members of the Bureau of the COP, noting that this will not apply to least developed countries or small island developing states;
- requests the Executive Secretary and the President of the COP, through a jointly signed letter, to notify parties who are in arrears and invite them to take timely action; and
- invites non-party states as well as other IGOs, NGOs and other sources to make contributions to the appropriate trust funds.

The COP requests the Secretariat to:

- report on the possible implications for the Convention budget resulting from the entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol for submission to ICNP-3, the COP/MOP and COP 12;
- continue reporting on the measurable indicators of achievements and performance for the programme budget and suggest possible improvements to them at COP 12;
- prepare and submit a budget for the biennium 2015-2016 for COP 12, as well as provide five alternatives;
- seek further operational efficiencies in the biennium 2013-2014, in consultation with the UNEP Executive Director;
- undertake an in-depth, functional review of the Secretariat with a view to updating its structure and grading of posts; and
- prepare and submit a report on the administration of the Convention.

The decision also notes with concern and regret that the core programme budget does not contain adequate finance for all five intersessional priority meetings that have been identified by the parties and has resulted in ICNP-3 and Article 8(j) meetings being dependent on voluntary funding.

HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT

Held from 16-19 October 2012, the high-level segment heard statements from ministers and high-level representatives, and held panel discussions on: implementation of the Strategic Plan; biodiversity for livelihoods and poverty reduction; marine and coastal biodiversity; and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS.

Manmohan Singh, Prime Minister of India, announced India's ratification of the Nagoya Protocol and announced the "Hyderabad pledge:" US\$50 million during India's two-year COP presidency, focused on enhancing India's human and technical resources to attain the CBD's objectives, and for promoting capacity building in developing countries.

CLOSING PLENARY

On Friday afternoon, 19 October, COP President Natarajan convened the closing plenary. Delegates heard a report on credentials and adopted the working groups' reports and most decisions, pointing to ongoing consultations on resource mobilization and the budget. Plenary took note of the Chair's conclusions from the high-level segment, and the summary and declaration resulting from the Summit on Cities and Biodiversity.

The Republic of Korea offered to host CBD COP 12 in the second half of 2014, noting they will focus on integrating the concept of biodiversity conservation with development, and plenary adopted a decision to that regard (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.32). The Latin American Women's Network on Biodiversity presented a donation to the CBD museum of nature and culture. Delegates adopted a tribute to the government and people of India (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.33). Plenary was suspended at 5:54 pm to allow for finalization of consultations on resource mobilization and the budget. Plenary reconvened at 1:55 am on Saturday morning, when delegates adopted the decisions on resource mobilization and the budget, as well as the COP's report (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/L.1).

In closing statements, Saudi Arabia called for prompt responses to biodiversity conservation challenges. The EU emphasized: common responsibility to tackle the challenge of global biodiversity protection; decisions on REDD+ safeguards, marine biodiversity and EBSAs, and enhanced cooperation between the Rio Conventions and biodiversity-related conventions; and commitment to double the total biodiversity-related flows globally by 2015. Japan, on behalf of the COP 10 Presidency, congratulated delegates for their continuous efforts to implement the Nagoya outcomes.

China expressed concern about the statements made on the decision on resource mobilization, calling for the implementation of the resource mobilization decision on the basis of the consensus reached at COP 11. Argentina for GRULAC stressed the need to move forward in implementing the Nagoya outcomes, to ensure transparency and new and additional funding in accordance with CBD Article 20, and to respect the Rio principle of common but differentiated responsibilities.

Budget Group Chair Hunte highlighted the achievements accomplished by the budget group, and acknowledged countries that stepped forward to pledge for funding priority meetings that were put in the Voluntary Fund, in particular Japan for guaranteeing the funding for ICNP 3 and a group of countries, including the African Group and India, that pledged to ensure the next meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j).

The African Group highlighted that the discussions provided for achieving some commitment for ensuring the required financial support for implementing the Aichi targets and updating NBSAPs for effective implementation of the Convention, but said the financial resources target should be more ambitious.

The IIFB expressed concern about the resistance of some parties to use the term indigenous peoples; expressed satisfaction with the outcomes on customary sustainable use; called for further work in reviewing policies on ILCs in thematic areas, particularly in PAs and coastal and marine areas; and cautioned against open-air geo-engineering experiments.

Carlos Novella, on behalf of UNEP Executive Director Achim Steiner, offered support to the CBD Secretariat in the programmatic work required to achieve the Aichi targets.

CBD Executive Secretary Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias said that Hyderabad established the foundation for the mobilization of resources to achieve the Aichi targets, highlighting India's Hyderabad pledge and inviting others to join efforts to also become biodiversity champions.

Following the customary exchange of courtesies, COP 11 President Natarajan gavelled the meeting to a close at 3:02 am.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF COP 11

IMPLEMENTATION, IMPLEMENTATION, IMPLEMENTATION

Two years ago, COP 10 in Nagoya generated great expectations by adopting its celebrated “package” of decisions on a new Strategic Plan, the implementation of the Resource Mobilization Strategy and the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-Sharing. Negotiated in the shadow of the failure to reach the 2010 biodiversity target, the package was expected to set the Convention on a renewed path towards enhanced and cohesive implementation. Against this background, COP 11 was not anticipated to bring about any “big-bang” developments comparable to those achieved in Nagoya, but rather lay the necessary groundwork to realize the promises made two years earlier. The new CBD Executive Secretary, Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, clearly took this up by emphasizing that the post-2010 work is about three priorities: “implementation, implementation, implementation.”

What is becoming increasingly apparent, however, is that there can be no implementation without resource mobilization, as the G-77/China and Mexico made clear at the outset. Debates about budget and financial issues dominated the agenda in Hyderabad until the wee hours of Saturday morning, while significant substantive items had already been resolved, such as marine and climate change issues. Eventually, COP 11 produced a long and demanding list of continued and new tasks for the Convention, keeping expectations high even in times of economic crisis. This analysis examines the budget and resource mobilization negotiations as a necessary background to understanding other selected—and more technical—outcomes of COP 11, with a view to illustrating how successful implementation in the post-Nagoya era will depend on streamlining, prioritizing and monitoring.

MONEY, MONEY, MONEY

The difficulties encountered in negotiating the budget in times of economic recession did not take many by surprise. Delegates quickly realized that in a time of shrinking budgets, they will have to prioritize among the 140+ requests to the CBD Secretariat that were being accumulated in parallel substantive discussions at the COP. With proliferation of work under the Convention being a long-standing issue, some participants wondered, “Perhaps the ultimate push to streamlining will come from budget constraints?” Others, however, were concerned about having to sacrifice important activities in the name of economic efficiency. For example, recent activities of the

Secretariat, most notably regional capacity-building workshops, have become greatly appreciated as effective, on-the-ground support for implementation that creates and strengthens much-needed regional expert networks. Nonetheless, due to budget constraints, these activities were included under the voluntary funds of the Convention. Developing countries were therefore keen to stress that COP 12 must find a firm place for regional workshops in the “core” budget to reflect their newly-found status of “core priority” activities of the Secretariat. Many were equally concerned about relying on voluntary funds to hold the next meeting of the Article 8(j) Working Group, but saw an unexpected ray of hope in the unprecedented offer by the African Group and India to contribute to its convening—the first time that developing countries have made such an offer in the history of the CBD!

The protracted negotiations on resource mobilization seemed less linked to global economic contingencies, than archetypal North-South debates as to whether the financial solidarity provisions under the CBD and, more generally, the Rio principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, are more than aspirational words when it comes down to monitoring implementation. In light of the ambitious Aichi targets and heightened attention to measuring actual progress on the ground in reducing biodiversity loss after the failure to meet the 2010 target, developing countries were expecting concrete and firm commitment from developed countries. They demanded that increased monitoring of their own performance under the Strategic Plan be paralleled by systematic tracking of developed countries' financial contributions. Delegates, however, struggled with tackling the “unfinished business” from Nagoya of developing targets to assess financial flows, and even agreeing on an “interim target” and roadmap towards definite targets. Eventually, though, they agreed to double biodiversity-related resource flows by 2015, while at the same time putting forward a preliminary reporting framework to monitor resource mobilization and a roadmap for review of progress and potential adoption of a final target at COP 12. Arguably to avoid a domino effect of target-setting and monitoring of funding obligations in other multilateral environmental agreements, several donors emphasized in their statements the fact that this development is specific to the context of the CBD and of a preliminary nature.

COOPERATION FOR ECOSYSTEMS

Notwithstanding stalemates on finance and on respective responsibilities, COP 11 successfully dealt with an impressive amount of work on ecosystem-related issues, mainly through cooperation and streamlining with other international processes.

Many believed that the outcome on marine biodiversity represents progress. In the next two years the CBD will be particularly busy on several complex fronts, such as marine debris and ocean noise. More prominent in the negotiations, however, was the work on marine protected areas (MPAs). While the term MPAs has become a taboo in the Convention and almost never mentioned, given the ongoing negotiations under the UN General Assembly (UNGA) on this and other issues related to marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ), an impressive amount of scientific work that goes under the guarded label of “description of ecologically and biologically significant marine areas” (EBSAs) has been carried out by

the CBD and partner organizations at the regional level. This exercise has provided a critical scientific information basis for the policy and legal discussion on the establishment of MPAs in other competent fora. Although the final decision is convoluted and the COP did not “endorse” the reports describing areas that met EBSA criteria in two regions (Western South Pacific, and the Wider Caribbean and Western Mid-Atlantic), it nevertheless did “launch” the EBSA repository in which these reports will be officially located and their precious information shared with the UNGA and other competent international organizations. Together with the new guidelines on environmental impact assessments in marine areas, including ABNJ, which were also adopted at COP 11, the CBD is providing the scientific evidence needed to address two urgent topics on the agenda of the UNGA and its Working Group on marine biodiversity in ABNJ. Walking the tight rope of its narrowly-defined mandate—limited to “scientific and, where appropriate, technical” tasks—the CBD may thus bring some momentum to the snail-paced policy process in New York.

With regards to biodiversity and climate change, the COP managed to start carving the CBD “niche” on REDD+ by addressing its biodiversity-related aspects. When addressing voluntary guidance on REDD+ biodiversity-related safeguards, discussions started with distrust as a developing country pointed out that “voluntary” safeguards for REDD+ under the CBD could turn into conditionalities when applied by REDD+ donors on REDD+ host countries. Streamlining and fine-tuning the decision so it is aligned with the latest developments under the UNFCCC also took time. For example, delegates debated at length a proposal to develop indicators to monitor compliance by developing countries with REDD+ safeguards aimed to prevent negative impacts on biodiversity and ILCs. In that context, some developing countries repeated UNFCCC decisions as a mantra, saying that monitoring information systems are “country-driven” and that monitoring REDD+ activities and their impacts against the safeguards will have cost implications for REDD+ host countries that would not necessarily be compensated by the benefits of REDD+ activities. Notwithstanding protracted negotiations among countries with quite entrenched positions, most were relatively satisfied with the outcome. Firstly, it accurately reflects the developments that have arisen in the climate change regime, as was requested by developing countries that are keen to prevent the CBD from impinging on ongoing climate negotiations. Secondly, it outlines a “roadmap” authorizing the next CBD COP to consider a progress report on REDD+ safeguards that can hopefully feed into the subsequent climate COP, as hoped by some developed countries, and allow for further review at CBD COP 13. Indicators to monitor developing countries’ compliance with REDD+ safeguards, however, disappeared from the final outcome—sacrificed to reach compromise.

TECHNOLOGY CONUNDRUMS

Despite continuous squabbles about the procedure to include new and emerging issues on the SBSTTA agenda, the CBD has accrued an impressive record of timely tackling unprecedented technological threats to biodiversity. National delegations and NGOs alike consider the CBD the “only game in town” among MEAs in that respect. The Convention thus raised expectations

as an open and lively forum to discuss practical applications of the contentious precautionary approach. Past COPs had to deal with it in the context of genetic use restriction technologies (GURTS), genetically modified trees and ocean fertilization.

Another textbook-case is geo-engineering. Many heralded the relevant outcome from COP 10 (“paragraph 8(w)”) as a moratorium, which led to placing the item firmly on the CBD agenda, albeit not necessarily in a permanent or exclusive way given certain countries’ concern that the CBD may not be “the best place.” The follow-up discussions in Hyderabad were still quite contentious and marred with divergent views as to the application of precaution due to the fine line between geo-engineering activities and research on the potential of geo-engineering to contribute to climate change mitigation. The COP 11 contact group also dealt, once again, with concerns about complementarity with ongoing work under the climate regime: so delegates agreed that the CBD would further follow-up on this issue “at the appropriate time,” i.e. after the release of the fifth Assessment Report of the IPCC, due in 2015, that is set to address geo-engineering. In addition, discussions were complicated by intricate international law questions, such as the relevance and content of customary international law, revealing anxieties not only of parties but also non-parties. These discussions were held at the same time as the media published alarming reports on ocean fertilization activities in the Pacific Ocean as the “world’s biggest geo-engineering experiment violating UN rules,” and the investor behind the experiment was quoted as saying that any international moratoria is a “myth.” While COP 11 wording on geo-engineering is non-committal on the need for the development of a global regulatory and control mechanism, or on whether the CBD is the most appropriate forum to address this gap, the Convention still provides a forum that will monitor parties’ activities with respect to the “reaffirmed” paragraph 8(w), notwithstanding those countries that objected to calling it a moratorium because of the voluntary language of its chapeau.

Synthetic biology was another case in point. While the alarm bell had already rung at COP 10, NGOs and certain developing countries were hoping to set a moratorium at COP 11. Although they eventually compromised to urge parties to apply the precautionary approach, this came within a more restricted scope limited to the threat of “significant reduction or loss of biodiversity” posed by organisms, components and products resulting from synthetic biology. The compromise also came at the cost of reference to other relevant international norms, which many understood as a hint to the norms of the World Trade Organization (WTO). This raised concerns that WTO law may bring about a more restrictive interpretation of the precautionary approach. Some NGOs commented bitterly: “With geo-engineering, we did not win but at least we did not lose either. With synthetic biology, we lost.” Nevertheless, the issue remains on the agenda, allowing the Convention or potentially its Biosafety Protocol to continue discussions, follow developments and increase scientific understanding and common ground among parties.

EXIT MUSIC: STREAMLINING AND MONITORING

COP 11 was in many respects a transitional COP. It was an opportunity to prove commitment to the ambitious, post-Nagoya

implementation roadmap, which emerged with difficulty due to the critical question of resource mobilization. COP 11 was also a time to take stock and plan. Parties paid particular attention to facilitating international cooperation from within the CBD's "own niche" by providing specialist inputs into international negotiations on marine biodiversity and climate change issues going on in other fora.

Partly due to the current global economic situation and partly due to the need to keep up with the expectations created in Nagoya, a brave new world of agenda streamlining and systematic monitoring will characterize the Convention in the years ahead. Along these lines, COP 12 in South Korea will undertake a mid-term review of progress towards achieving the Aichi targets. In the face of the many demands being placed on the Convention—ranging from new scientific work on marine and coastal biodiversity, to continued work towards the entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol—this review may provide a golden opportunity to ensure that multi-faceted work of CBD leads to more than the mere sum of its parts.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

Capacity-building for Pilot Countries on the Implementation of Synergies among the Rio Conventions:

This meeting is organized by the CBD Secretariat. **dates:** 29 October – 2 November 2012 **location:** Hanoi, Viet Nam **contact:** CBD Secretariat **phone:** +1-514-288-2220 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** secretariat@cbd.int **www:** <http://www.cbd.int/meetings>

Fourth Meeting of ITPGR Committee on SMTA and MLS:

The *Ad Hoc* Technical Advisory Committee on the Standard Material Transfer Agreement (SMTA) and the Multilateral System (MLS) of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGR) advises the Treaty Secretary on implementation questions raised by users. **dates:** 6-7 November 2012 **location:** Rome, Italy **contact:** ITPGR Secretariat **phone:** +39-6-570-53441 **fax:** +39-6-570-56347 **email:** pggrfa-treaty@fao.org **www:** <http://www.planttreaty.org/>

First Meeting of ITPGR Committee on Sustainable

Use of PGRFA: The *Ad Hoc* Technical Advisory Committee on sustainable use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA) will advise the Secretary and Bureau of the ITPGR on a number of issues, including developing a toolbox on sustainable use of PGRFA and cooperating with the CBD, the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA), and other international processes and institutions in the field of sustainable use of PGRFA. **dates:** 8-9 November 2012 **location:** Rome, Italy **contact:** ITPGR Secretariat **phone:** +39-6-570-53441 **fax:** +39-6-570-56347 **email:** pggrfa-treaty@fao.org **www:** <http://www.planttreaty.org/>

43rd Meeting of the GEF Council: Among other issues, the GEF Council will consider the accreditation of additional executing agencies. **dates:** 13-15 November 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/events/gef-43rd-council-meeting>

UNFCCC COP 18 and COP/MOP 8: The 18th session of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC and the 8th session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (COP/MOP) will be held together with the 37th meetings of the SBI and SBSTA and other subsidiary bodies. **dates:** 26 November - 7 December 2012 **location:** Doha, Qatar **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://unfccc.int/>

Forest Day 6: This event will seek to inform UNFCCC's global agenda and forest stakeholders on ways to move forward with REDD+ agreements reached at COP 17 in Durban. **date:** 2 December 2012 **location:** Doha, Qatar **email:** f.selamat@cgiar.org **www:** <http://www.forestclimatechange.org/events/forest-day/forest-day-6/>

IPBES 1: The first plenary session of the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) aims to agree on the remaining rules of procedures for the meetings of the platform, consider other rules of procedure for the platform, elect Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel members, and agree on the next steps by which the IPBES work programme can become operational. **dates:** 21-26 January 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNEP Secretariat **phone:** + 254-20-762-5135 **email:** ipbes.unep@unep.org **www:** <http://ipbes.net/>

Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Forest Genetic Resources: The second session of the Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Forest Genetic Resources of the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture will take place in January. **dates:** 23-25 January 2013 **location:** Rome, Italy **contact:** CGRFA Secretariat **phone:** +39-06-5705-4981 **fax:** +39-06-5705-5246 **email:** cgrfa@fao.org **www:** <http://www.fao.org/nr/cgrfa/cgrfa-home/en/>

WIPO IGC 23: Following renewal of its mandate by the General Assembly of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), the 23rd session of the Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore (IGC) will continue negotiations on an international instrument/instruments, focusing on genetic resources. **date:** 4-8 February 2013 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **telephone:** +44-22-338-8181 **fax:** +44-22-338-8810 **www:** <http://www.wipo.int/tk/en>

GC 27/GMEF: The 27th Session of UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum of the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) is scheduled to convene in February 2013. The Governing Council constitutes the annual ministerial-level global environmental forum in which participants gather to review important and emerging policy issues in the field of the environment. **dates:** 18-22 February 2013 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **contact:** Secretary, UNEP Governing Bodies **phone:** +254-20 762-3431 **fax:** +254-20 762-3929 **email:** sgc.sgb@unep.org **www:** <http://www.unep.org/resources/gov/overview.asp>

CITES COP16: The 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 16) to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) will address proposals to amend the Convention appendices and several administrative, strategic and financial issues. **dates:** 3-14

March 2013 **location:** Bangkok, Thailand **contact:** CITES Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-917-81-39/40 **fax:** +41-22-797-34-17 **email:** info@cites.org **www:** http://www.cites.org/eng/cop/16/prop/index.php

UNFF 10: The tenth session of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF10) will assess the overall progress made on the implementation of the Non-Legally Binding Instrument on All Types of Forests and achievement of its four Global Objectives on Forests. **dates:** 8-19 April 2013 **location:** Istanbul, Turkey **contact:** UNFF Secretariat **phone:** +1-212-963-3401 **fax:** +1-917-367-3186 **email:** unff@un.org **www:** http://www.un.org/esa/forests/

CGRFA 14: The 14th session of the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture will address a range of issues related to plant, animal and forest genetic resources. It will be preceded by a special event on climate change. **dates:** 15-19 April 2013 **location:** Rome, Italy **contact:** CGRFA Secretariat **phone:** +39-06-5705-4981 **fax:** +39-06-5705-5246 **email:** cgrfa@fao.org **www:** http://www.fao.org/nr/cgrfa/cgrfa-home/en/

UNPFII 12: The twelfth session of the UN Permanent Forum for Indigenous Issues will address, among other issues, implementation of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. **dates:** 20-31 May 2013 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** Secretariat of the Permanent Forum **email:** indigenous_un@un.org **www:** http://social.un.org/index/IndigenousPeoples.aspx

International Conference for International Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Land and Sea Managers Network: The conference will explore land and sea management themes such as the blue economy, sustainable livelihoods, women engaged in sustainable development and traditional ecological knowledge. **dates:** 27-31 May 2013 **location:** Darwin, Australia **contact:** Australian Government Land and Coasts **phone:** +1800-552-008 **fax:** +61-02-6272-4526 **email:** communications@nrm.gov.au **www:** http://www.nrm.gov.au/about/key-investments/indigenous-network/index.html#conference

Biosafety Protocol COP/MOP 7: The seventh Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety will be held back to back with CBD COP 12. **dates:** to be confirmed, second half of 2014 **location:** Republic of Korea **contact:** CBD Secretariat **phone:** +1-514-288-2220 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** secretariat@cbd.int **www:** http://www.cbd.int

CBD COP 12: The twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity will engage in a mid-term review of the implementation of the Strategic Plan and the Aichi targets. It is expected to be held concurrently with the first Meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on ABS. **dates:** to be confirmed, second half of 2014 **location:** Republic of Korea **contact:** CBD Secretariat **phone:** +1-514-288-2220 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** secretariat@cbd.int **www:** http://www.cbd.int

GLOSSARY

ABS	Access and benefit-sharing
ABNJ	Areas beyond national jurisdiction
AHTEG	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Technical Expert Group
CHM	Clearing-House Mechanism
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CEPA	Communication, education and public awareness
COP	Conference of the Parties
COP/MOP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties
EBSA	Ecologically and biologically significant area
EIA	Environmental impact assessment
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GSPC	Global Strategy for Plant Conservation
GTI	Global Taxonomy Initiative
GRULAC	Latin American and Caribbean Group
IAS	Invasive Alien Species
ICCA	Indigenous and Community Conserved Area
ICNP	Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol
ILC	Indigenous and local community
IIFB	International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity
IPBES	Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
MEAs	Multilateral environmental agreements
MPA	Marine Protected Area
NBSAP	National biodiversity strategy and action plan
NPIF	Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund
PA	Protected Area
REDD+	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, and forest conservation, sustainable forest management and enhancement of forest carbon stocks
SEA	Strategic environmental assessment
SBSTTA	Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice
TEEB	The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity
TK	Traditional Knowledge
UNCLOS	UN Convention on the Law of the Sea
UNEP	UN Environment Programme
UNESCO	UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNGA	UN General Assembly
UNPFII	UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues
WCMC	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WG	Working Group
WGRI	Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention