

## WGRI 3 HIGHLIGHTS: MONDAY, 24 MAY 2010

The third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation (WGRI 3) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) opened on Monday at UN Environment Programme (UNEP) headquarters in Nairobi, Kenya. Delegates met in plenary to hear opening statements, address organizational matters, and consider issues relating to: progress towards the 2010 biodiversity target, revision of the Strategic Plan for the post-2010 period and the multi-year programme of work (MYPOW) of the Convention for the period 2011-2022.

### PLENARY

On Monday morning, Jochen Flasbarth, representative of the COP 9 Presidency, in his capacity as Chair, opened the meeting by highlighting the tasks of the WGRI, including: revising biodiversity targets and indicators, revising and updating the Strategic Plan and MYPOW; and resource mobilization.

Angela Cropper, UNEP Deputy-Executive Director, highlighted, *inter alia*: strengthening science-policy interfaces; business contribution to the green economy; increasing synergies between biodiversity-related conventions; and that an international regime on access and benefit-sharing (ABS) would recognize and reward good stewardship of biodiversity. Ahmed Djoghlaif, CBD Executive Secretary, recognized ongoing financial participation by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and urged countries to finalize national reports before COP 10.

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS:** Delegates elected Somaly Chan, Cambodia, as rapporteur and adopted the agenda and organization of work (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/1 and Add.1) without amendments.

**PROGRESS TOWARDS THE 2010 BIODIVERSITY TARGET:** Chair Flasbarth introduced the documents on implementation of the Strategic Plan and in-depth review of goals 1 and 4 of the Strategic Plan and further consideration of needs for capacity building (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/2, Adds. 1-3). On capacity building and poverty reduction, NORWAY noted that the secretariat should have a facilitating role. On business and the environment, she highlighted the role of governments in creating an enabling environment. The European Union (EU) noted that questions on integration of biodiversity and poverty reduction and the engagement of business in environmental issues would be dealt with at COP 10 together with other initiatives. JORDAN emphasized that initiatives involving the

private sector should be discussed in the framework of the Strategic Plan. JAPAN underscored assisting parties in the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

CANADA requested further clarification on the establishment of an *ad hoc* technical expert group (AHTEG) on poverty reduction and the environment. The PHILIPPINES highlighted that the AHTEG on biodiversity and poverty reduction should identify the root causes of poverty and how they should be removed.

In response to some concerns expressed, Executive Secretary Djoghlaif clarified that the idea of providing the WGRI with documents on items that will be considered at COP 10, such as on business and biodiversity, was to give the WGRI an opportunity to provide guidance to the secretariat on the further preparation of these documents for COP 10.

BRAZIL highlighted that the third edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO 3) is an important tool to mainstream biodiversity and that technology transfer and cooperation have been very limited under the Convention. Malawi and Niger, on behalf of the AFRICAN GROUP, noted that most African countries have undertaken implementation activities but the lack of resources and poor stakeholders' participation has hampered implementation efforts and mainstreaming. YEMEN cited insufficient financial resources, training programs, and political will as reasons behind the global failure to meet the 2010 biodiversity target. He called for increased regional, subregional and international cooperation to mobilize the financial resources and expertise necessary to achieve the new targets. The Cook Islands, for the ASIA PACIFIC GROUP and TURKMENISTAN, underscored the need for funding to support building capacity in developing countries.

INDIA noted the lack of sufficient progress on goal two on capacity building, and stated that the provisional framework for capacity building should not substitute binding CBD commitments. NEW ZEALAND suggested focusing on CBD core objectives to avoid overlap with the mandates of other conventions. MEXICO noted that financial and human resources must be commensurate to ambitions to implement the Strategic Plan. ARGENTINA called for establishing an AHTEG on capacity building and technology transfer and engaging the private sector in biodiversity initiatives. IRAN stressed the importance of linking biodiversity with poverty reduction and economic development. SWITZERLAND noted the importance of the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB)

study in generating awareness about the economic value of biodiversity. TANZANIA called for programs to explore the links between gender and biodiversity.

The INTERNATIONAL INDIGENOUS FORUM ON BIODIVERSITY (IIFB) highlighted the need to strengthen participation of civil society and noted that customary sustainable use can contribute to achieving the Millennium Development Goals and the post-2010 biodiversity targets. ECONEXUS, on behalf of ECOROPA, emphasized that biodiversity protection does not require a balance in approaches, but rather the right approaches, including those that are cultural and socioeconomic.

**REVISION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE POST-2010 PERIOD:** Chair Flasbarth introduced relevant documentation (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/3, Add.1-2, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 14). Highlighting the importance of this agenda item, he proposed a quick reading allowing for informal discussions to take place during the week.

Recalling pre-2010 history, SOUTH AFRICA emphasized benefit-sharing and capacity-building. NORWAY preferred a stronger emphasis on ecosystem services and benefit-sharing and, for communication, a concise slogan and clear links to the bigger picture. The EU underscored the importance of ecosystem services for humankind and that the mission and message of the Strategic Plan has to be clear. SWITZERLAND said the vision and mission should promote the public engagement and be time bound. Underscoring his commitment to send a strong message from COP 10, JAPAN drew attention to a circulated draft decision inviting the UN General Assembly to consider declaring 2011-2020 the decade of biodiversity. INDIA stressed the involvement of all stakeholders in implementation and awareness-raising, and proposed deletion of a reference to eliminating subsidies that are harmful to biodiversity by 2020. BRAZIL remarked on the scarcity of financial, human, technical, and technological resources in developing countries, and stated that CBD implementation must adapt to diverse national circumstances. He also noted the CBD's role in broadcasting and mainstreaming biodiversity through sharing "success stories."

KENYA, supported by MALAWI, highlighted the need for clear financial strategies to help developing countries meet targets. INDONESIA stated that some targets require "enormous" financial resources, and therefore should be moderated to levels more realistic for developing countries. BOSNIA called for "harmonizing baselines" to assess whether targets have been met in different countries. NEW ZEALAND noted that the loss of biodiversity is occurring, *inter alia*, because of limited baseline data and methodologies for measuring success. ETHIOPIA called for targets that reflect the need to restore and reclaim degraded landscapes. CANADA recommended measurable, achievable and realistic targets, stressing the engagement of specific sectors and sub-national governments. With AUSTRALIA, she expressed reservations regarding additional mechanisms and instruments for implementation and compliance. JORDAN stressed implementing support mechanisms and the importance of developing human resources.

IRAN highlighted focusing on the resilience of biodiversity and ecosystem services and requested to drop the collaboration between biodiversity related-conventions from the text.

CHINA stated that the Strategic Plan needs to: integrate biodiversity into sectoral and cross-sectoral policymaking; remove existing obstacles to reaching targets; support capacity building; and be flexible. CUBA highlighted the importance of national plans and strategies. ARGENTINA stated that the Strategic Plan should serve as a flexible framework accounting for local, regional and national conditions.

IIFB requested the inclusion of participatory mechanisms in the Strategic Plan that facilitate local and indigenous community involvement, and recognize and protect traditional knowledge and practices. IUCN reiterated the need to resist the pressure to reduce the level of ambition for the 2020 target, if objectives are to be met. The UN Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) highlighted the role of the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA) in addressing the targets and indicators through its global plan of action.

Chair Flasbarth concluded the agenda item by reminding that a contact group would be formed, co-chaired by Ashgar Fazel, Iran, and Finn Katerås, Norway, to assist the Chair in preparing a text for consideration by the plenary based on: document UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/3, parties' interventions, and contributions by the CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) in document UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/3 Add. 2.

**MYPOW 2011-2022, NATIONAL REPORTING AND PERIODICITY OF MEETINGS:** Chair Flasbarth introduced documents on MYPOW 2011-2022 (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/5), national reporting (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/6, Add.1-2) and the periodicity of COP meetings (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/11). JAPAN highlighted the relation between the MYPOW and Strategic Plan and argued for consistent revisions to both. UGANDA proposed focusing on ecosystem restoration. NEW ZEALAND argued against the need for additional mechanisms to enable parties to meet their implementation commitments and, with IRAN and CHINA, noted it was premature to make specific references to the establishment of an IPBES. Echoing NEW ZEALAND, ARGENTINA reiterated that an implementation mechanism is not necessary, highlighting that work needs to be done under National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs). CANADA prioritized a joint work programme between the Rio Conventions, with CHINA and IRAN expressing reservations.

Pointing to an increasingly complex agenda, BRAZIL suggested convening a COP every three years, with MEXICO stressing the importance of adding new and emerging issues. SWITZERLAND highlighted the need to address processes and activities likely to have significant adverse impacts and expressed preference for a three-year COP cycle complemented by a yearly working group meeting back-to-back with SBSTTA. Concerned about losing momentum, INDIA, supported by MEXICO, preferred to retain biennial COPs with two intersessional SBSTTA meetings. GRENADA proposed not to change the periodicity of meetings. Chair Flasbarth encouraged an informal discussion on the periodicity of meetings and invited the secretariat to prepare a draft recommendation on this matter.

LIBERIA drew attention to recent GEF projects assisting national reporting by least developed countries and small island developing states. The EU welcomed the draft guidelines on the format of national reports, noting these guidelines will benefit from inputs from the parties prior to COP 10.

### IN THE BREEZEWAYS

A warm and sunny day greeted delegates as they returned to Gigiri to tackle yet another heavy agenda. Thanks to the efficient leadership of the Chair, optimism infused the conference room as delegates sailed through the first round of discussions on the post-2010 biodiversity target agenda items. But with several contact groups and timetables on standby, some delegates warned about possible late nights ahead. Beyond the official discussions, delegates wondered whether the WGRI would succeed in leading a "scientific debate" on biodiversity targets or succumb to a more "political discussion". With international ABS regime negotiations looming over the meeting like the ash cloud over Europe, North-South communication appears threatened in more ways than one.

## WGRI 3 HIGHLIGHTS: TUESDAY, 25 MAY 2010

On Tuesday morning, in plenary, WGRI 3 participants tackled the implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization. In the afternoon, and into the evening, discussions continued in two contact groups: one on revision of the Strategic Plan and the other on resource mobilization.

### PLENARY

**IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGY FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION:** On Tuesday morning, Chair Flasbarth introduced documents on: concrete activities and initiatives including measurable targets and/or indicators to achieve the strategic goals contained in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization and on indicators to monitor the implementation of the Strategy (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/7 and Inf. 4); policy options concerning innovative financial mechanisms (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/8, Inf. 5 and Inf. 12); and review of the guidance to the financial mechanism (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/9).

**Targets and Indicators:** Calling on parties to prioritize, NORWAY stressed the need for simplifying indicators. BRAZIL highlighted the need to meet the full incremental costs of implementing the Convention in developing countries. NEW ZEALAND suggested that indicators be short, sharp and focused, and questioned, with the EU, the utility of quantitative targets.

**Policy Options Concerning Innovative Financial Mechanisms:** The EU and NORWAY expressed reservations regarding additional Convention bodies on financing. SENEGAL proposed that a potential financial and economic panel under the CBD elaborate a new and less cumbersome financial mechanism, while cautioning against imposing funding priorities on parties. CUBA highlighted restructuring existing financial mechanisms to facilitate access to financial resources and to increase the effectiveness of such mechanisms. INDIA, supported by CHINA and ARGENTINA, stated that innovative mechanisms should supplement and not substitute existing ones. KENYA emphasized procedural difficulties in accessing the available funds. BOTSWANA asked that the WGRI commit to a flexible financial mechanism.

IRAN expressed concern that some proposed options for innovative financial mechanisms exceed the scope and mandate of the CBD. Along with South Africa, on behalf of the AFRICAN GROUP, he noted that many proposed options neglect the distinction between developed and developing

countries regarding their disparate political, social and economic circumstances. SWITZERLAND expressed reservations that establishing a new executive financial body would burden the CBD with more bureaucracy, and noted that the mandate, scope, and function of the proposed body remains unclear. Voicing similar concerns, NEW ZEALAND, CUBA, CHINA, Ukraine for the CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES (CEE), ARGENTINA, CANADA, HAITI and ECOROPA, on behalf of a group of NGOs, did not support its establishment. JAPAN suggested making better use of existing mechanisms and instruments to serve the purpose of the CBD.

**Guidance to the financial mechanism:** The GEF noted that certain COP priorities, including requests of funds for work on invasive alien species, are under-utilized. SWITZERLAND expressed support for strengthening the GEF, highlighting that the COP should refrain from providing prescriptive guidance to the GEF. CANADA highlighted that while guidance is important, a country-driven approach should be the priority. The PHILIPPINES and the EU cautioned that the retirement of decisions does not impact the implementation of GEF projects. She also objected to setting indicators for GEF.

**OTHER MATTERS:** Chair Flasbarth established a contact group, co-chaired by Damaso Luna, Mexico, and Maria Schultz, Sweden, to discuss draft recommendations on resource mobilization. He also reported on progress made in the “friends of the chair” group on integration of biodiversity into poverty reduction and development. BRAZIL read out a declaration on behalf of the Like-Minded Megadiverse Countries (LMMC), reiterating their commitment to work towards a COP 10 protocol on ABS.

### CONTACT GROUP ON THE REVISION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

On Tuesday afternoon and into the evening, the contact group on the revision of the Strategic Plan, co-chaired by Ashgar Fazel, Iran, and Finn Katerås, Norway, met to discuss the goals, in light of contributions from SBSTTA and interventions made in plenary on Monday. On target two, on integrating biodiversity values into national systems, some parties suggested deleting the reference to the ecosystem approach, noting that when communicating to a broader audience, many may not understand this concept. Another party suggested the use of the “sustainable development” approach instead. One party underscored it would be difficult for her country to integrate the values of biodiversity by 2020. Keeping in mind the importance of communication, many underscored having short and precise targets. On target

three, on subsidies and harmful incentives, one party proposed adding reference to “positive” incentives, including for ABS, but another noted that ABS is already reflected in target 17 on access to genetic resources. Some countries argued against having a reference to “positive” incentives, for example, for conservation, highlighting their mostly negative connotation in the context of this target. On target four, on sustainable use, parties debated over referring to “ecological limits” versus “sustainable limits.”

On target five, addressing natural habitat loss, degradation and fragmentation, parties debated the appropriate level of ambition for targeted reduction rates. Some stated that halving the rate was realistic, others advocated for bringing the rate of loss “close to zero,” and still others noted that measuring any reduction in loss rates requires baselines. On target six, concerning the elimination of overfishing and destructive fishing practices, parties debated whether the target should specifically mention marine, coastal, and inland waters, or generally encompass all fished waters. On target eight, on pollution from excess nutrients, one party suggested a formulation that underscores the need to reduce such pollution to a point where it is not detrimental to “ecosystem function and biodiversity.” Another wondered if this target would capture pollution from “heavy metals” as well. On target nine on invasive alien species, one party highlighted the possible positive aspects of the utilization of invasive alien species “where feasible.” Another party highlighted that the utilization of invasive alien species has never resulted in a “positive” outcome. On target ten, the only one dealing with climate change, some wondered whether referring to just coral reefs and marine ecosystems was too limiting and whether its scope should thus be broadened to other ecosystems.

#### **CONTACT GROUP ON THE STRATEGY FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION**

On Tuesday afternoon and into the evening, the Contact Group on resource mobilization, co-chaired by Damaso Luna, Mexico, and Maria Schultz, Sweden, met to discuss the documents on the Strategy for Resource Mobilization. Co-Chair Luna opened the floor for a paragraph-by-paragraph reading of the draft recommendation on concrete activities to achieve the strategic goals contained in the relevant document.

A developing country questioned the value added by a resource mobilization focal point, with a group of developed countries proposing and delegates agreeing to invite rather than urge their designation. On designing and disseminating country-specific resource mobilization strategies, a group of developing countries, supported by a regional group, proposed inserting language from COP Decision IX/11 to the effect that this be done with the involvement of all key stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities. Supported by one developed country, two large developing countries preferred a general reference to “key stakeholders.”

On requesting the Executive Secretary and the GEF to organize regional and sub-regional workshops on resource mobilization, a regional group: recognized their usefulness; expressed concerns for their financial implications; proposed an amendment, which indicates the intention to agree to workshops if they are integrated into the process of updating NBSAPs; and proposed deletion of the reference to the GEF. Several developing countries and a regional group opposed the amendment, including omitting the reference to the GEF and linking workshops with updating NBSAPs. The amendment’s proponent noted that the COP normally adopts the so-called *omnibus* decision, which comprises all recommendations that are directed to the GEF.

The GEF clarified that its Biodiversity Strategy includes an allocation process, whereby a portion of biodiversity-related

financial resources (US\$500,000) can be devoted to country-specific activities, such as updating NBSAPs, provided such activities can generate global environmental benefits. On global monitoring reports, a regional group supported by some developing countries enquired about their nature, noting that the Biodiversity Strategy calls on the Executive Secretary to prepare these, rather than parties.

Discussions then focused on a paragraph concerning the adoption of indicators and associated targets. One regional group said they were “not in a position to think about targets,” with one developing country calling for parties to “flexibilize” their positions. Regarding a list of indicators, a regional group objected to most indicators and a reference to benefit-sharing funds in particular, while proposing to add “percentage of biodiversity-related funding in national budgets per annum.” Another regional group preferred references to biodiversity, rather than environmental, funds.

On using targets and associated indicators in global monitoring reports, a regional group proposed deleting the reference to associated targets. On concrete activities and initiatives to achieve the strategic goals of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, a regional group supported continuation of the Development and Biodiversity Initiative. He did not support: a financial and economic panel on biodiversity and associated ecosystem services; regional networks on national environmental funds; and the establishment and implementation of an ABS fund. The regional group also left the decisions on all other activities in stand-by, pending the introduction of specific qualifiers. A developing country proposed linking regional networks with the plan of priority action on new and innovative financial mechanisms.

Based on the reaction from the floor, the Co-Chairs announced that they will be producing a consolidated working document containing the revised draft recommendation. The contact group, then, continued discussions on the draft recommendations on policy options concerning innovative financial mechanisms and on the review of the guidance to the financial mechanism late into the evening.

#### **IN THE BREEZEWAYS**

Today’s plenary discussion focused on resource mobilization: the proposed innovative financial mechanisms, including the establishment of a new “executive body” with assessment capacity, were met with considerable friction from a number of countries. Innovative financial mechanisms are sensitive in this context as they go beyond biodiversity-related official development assistance. While some delegates claimed that such mechanisms may violate the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, others argued that the problem is the lack of understanding of such mechanisms, since they may simply transfer resources from less environmental-friendly economic sectors to other sectors of the national economy, which generate more sustainable development outcomes. A delegate in support of both ideas said he didn’t expect them to be met with wholehearted approval, but thought it was important to spark discussions in today’s contact group to point a way forward.

Meanwhile, the Contact Group on revising the Strategic Plan debated the nuances and weight of each word in articulating goals and targets. Parties engaged in the exercise of matching the “scientific and technical guidance” from SBSTTA with political agendas. Delegates scanned the room looking in vain for scientists to clarify the meaning of “inland waters” versus “freshwaters,” and to magically provide “baselines” to measure new targets, but most scientists appeared to have left after SBSTTA.

## WGRI 3 HIGHLIGHTS: WEDNESDAY, 26 MAY 2010

On Wednesday morning Chair Flasbarth proposed a short morning plenary session to allow the two Contact Groups, on revision of the Strategic Plan and resource mobilization, to continue and finish their work before night. In plenary, WGRI 3 participants considered the proposed Biodiversity Technology Initiative (BTI) and the establishment of an IPBES. In the late morning, they split into Contact Groups and continued working into the evening.

### PLENARY

#### FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSED BIODIVERSITY TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE:

On Wednesday morning, Chair Flasbarth introduced the document on the proposed BTI (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/10).

The EU welcomed the possible establishment of a voluntary BTI to support the implementation of CBD Articles 16 to 19 and the programme of work on technology transfer. She stressed that the BTI should be a voluntary initiative independent from the CBD and proposed to carry out a gap analysis. Serbia, on behalf of the CEE, supported the BTI as a voluntary initiative. NEW ZEALAND proposed to omit a reference to the international ABS regime in the draft recommendation.

SWITZERLAND highlighted that the BTI should not duplicate existing activities. CANADA argued that the establishment of a BTI is premature and that the Climate Technology Initiative is not the most appropriate model to follow. JORDAN welcomed the initiative, emphasizing the importance of capacity building. MALAWI supported the establishment of the BTI under the CBD, supported by CHINA, and emphasized the full participation of all parties and indigenous and local communities. SENEGAL, supported by KENYA, GUINEA and TANZANIA, insisted on the importance of technology transfer and that it be accompanied by capacity building.

The PHILIPPINES requested addressing the removal of barriers to technology transfer posed by intellectual property rights, and with BRAZIL and ARGENTINA, stressed the need to further clarify governance structures and operational mechanisms

of the initiative. ARGENTINA also objected to referencing the Copenhagen Accord. INDIA proposed including language from Article 15.6 of the CBD, on carrying out research based on genetic resources with the full participation of, and where possible in, the parties providing them.

**IPBES:** On the request that WGRI 3 consider the outcome of the intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meetings on the establishment of an IPBES, Chair Flasbarth proposed that WGRI add in the recommendation that COP 10 instead considers this outcome.

#### CONTACT GROUP ON THE REVISION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

On Monday morning, the Contact Group reconvened to discuss the elements of the revised Strategic Plan and the proposed recommendations and review the progress of the small group established to discuss target 11 on protected areas. One party highlighted the importance of referring to the protocol on ABS, while a regional group underscored the lack of gender mainstreaming in the Strategic Plan, goals and targets. On the rationale for the Strategic Plan, another party discussed ways of better reflecting governments' commitments and creating a broader political support base; another party asked that the "lack of scientific information for policy and decision-making" be reflected as an obstacle in reaching the 2010 biodiversity target.

Regarding the mission statement, countries deliberated over wording that could convey ambition, inspire urgent and significant action, and establish realistic timeframes, all in a simple and memorable sentence. One country highlighted that the feasibility of a mission statement depended on both political will and also the response of species and ecosystems to the measures taken. Some countries suggested bracketing this text for resolution at COP 10, while others wanted to refine the mission statement at this meeting.

Parties then addressed the draft recommendations. On national targets, one party proposed making use of the flexible framework of indicators developed for the Strategic Plan. Another party proposed an additional recommendation, highlighting the role of TEEB study in motivating investment in biodiversity and ecosystem services. Another party proposed bracketing part of the sentence on motivating investment. On recalling the

Strategy for Resource Mobilization, one party proposed deleting the reference to making resources available to developing countries and economies in transition for the implementation of the Strategy, with many objecting to the deletion. Another party proposed taking “prompt actions” to implement the Strategy in support of CBD’s three objectives. On preparing an analysis of targets, parties debated over the inclusion of “national and regional” targets and their contribution towards the global targets. One group proposed adding a recommendation to convene an AHTEG on indicators for the Strategic Plan, but given that such recommendation is already reflected in a SBSTTA decision, the proposal was dismissed.

Discussions continued into the evening.

### **CONTACT GROUP ON THE STRATEGY FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION**

#### **GUIDANCE TO THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM:**

Co-Chair Luna invited comments on the draft recommendation (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/9). On a consolidated list of guidance to GEF, a regional group preferred to work on the basis of the existing COP decisions, eliminating outdated and redundant guidance from there. Noting that this would require further work, he floated the idea of having the guidance adopted at COP 11 rather than compromising the quality of the consolidation. One developed country stressed the need to consult with the GEF on the type of information that would be most useful. Delegates agreed that further work was needed, with a regional group insisting that such work take place prior to COP 10.

A regional group proposed that the COP should decide that the guidance to the financial mechanism, for a specific replenishment period, shall consist of a consolidated list of programme priorities that define how to finance an outcome-oriented framework. He also requested deletion of the reference to indicators and associated targets throughout the text, opposed by several developing countries. The same regional group argued that setting targets and indicators for the GEF is not in accordance with the COP mandate and would interfere with the operational aspects of the GEF. A developed country proposed to add that the programme priorities that define what to finance shall be based on the Strategic Plan. He further supported, with several developing countries, a paragraph inviting parties to submit information and proposals on potential indicators and associated targets that may be used in the further development of programme priorities concerning the utilization of GEF resources for biodiversity. A civil society organization proposed to invite not only parties, but all other stakeholders including indigenous and local communities to submit such information and proposals. A regional group proposed deletion of the entire paragraph.

While one party was ready to be flexible and delete the reference to targets and associated indicators, a regional group and various other developing countries preferred retaining it, noting that even though the GEF Council may be an appropriate forum to discuss such targets and indicators, unless a party is a contributor, its voice is not heard there.

On a paragraph deciding on the guidance to the GEF, many developing countries highlighted the need to link ambitious new targets in the Strategic Plan to adequate and predictable funding.

They preferred retaining references to “indicators and targets” in connection with an outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities. A developed country proposed, and previous speakers accepted, “taking into account the Strategic Plan, including the associated indicators and targets.” Another regional group proposed “its” associated indicators and targets, explaining his understanding that they referred to the Strategic Plan and were not meant to be prescriptive to the GEF. This was opposed by a regional group of developing countries and retained as an option in brackets. A proposal by a large developing country to delete references to indicators and targets and address them only in the following paragraphs was supported by a developed country and opposed by another large developing country and others.

On a paragraph inviting parties to submit information and proposals on potential indicators and associated targets that may be used for the further development of programme priorities, a regional group proposed deletion. He also suggested maintaining another paragraph requesting WGRI 4 to review the implementation of the current outcome-oriented programme priorities prior to COP 11, noting the review will bring new elements and experiences to improve the next guidance to the GEF replenishment.

After prolonged discussions on whether the paragraphs under consideration should refer to or omit a reference to “indicators and associated targets,” several parties tabled a compromise text. One developing country explained that the text requests the Executive Secretary to compile information and views submitted by parties on proposals to further improve indicators and associated targets on the Strategic Plan and on the performance of the financial mechanism. While some parties felt that such text would help the GEF to plan its programme activities, and allow the vision and mission of the Strategic Plan to be implemented with predictable and adequate funding, a regional group still expressed several concerns, including the fear of losing the idea of a review of the outcome-oriented framework. Discussions continued late into the evening.

### **IN THE BREEZEWAYS**

In the morning, Chair Flasbarth revealed to plenary that he suffers from a “severe allergy to brackets.” Recalling yesterday’s contact group sessions, he lamented a dearth of constructive debate and insufficient efforts to “find a bridge instead of a wall.” As the contact group on resource mobilization breached the ban on brackets, there was increased risk of triggering an anaphylactic shock in Chair Flasbarth. One delegate bemoaned a regional group’s inflexibility to proceed with indicators and targets on guidance to GEF, with another wondering whether technical expertise is always the best guide for a negotiator, given that proximity to the affected processes may magnify the perceived costs of changes suggested. One seasoned observer predicted that while references to targets and indicators may be controversial today, reservations will likely dissipate in years to come.

As the clock runs down on WGRI 3, the pressure to make substantive progress is increasing, and the presence or absence of an allergic reaction in Chair Flasbarth will reveal the measure of that progress.

## WGRI 3 HIGHLIGHTS: THURSDAY, 27 MAY 2010

On Thursday morning in plenary, WGRI 3 participants considered: progress towards the 2010 biodiversity target, MYPOW 2011-2020 and BTI. Contact Groups met during the lunch break. Participants gathered in plenary in the afternoon to discuss the draft new Strategic Plan, strategic goals and 2020 headline targets. After an intermission during which delegates split into Contact Groups again, the plenary reconvened for a late evening session.

### PLENARY

On Thursday morning, Chair Flasbarth noted that progress had been good, but more so in the Contact Group on revising the Strategic Plan. Cautioning against “kicking it to Nagoya,” he proposed to briefly reconvene the Contact Group on resource mobilization, with BRAZIL requesting to reconvene the other Contact Group as well.

**PROGRESS TOWARDS THE 2010 BIODIVERSITY TARGET:** On Thursday morning, Chair Flasbarth introduced the draft recommendation on business engagement (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.1). INDONESIA, supported by the EU, requested references to the Jakarta Charter, with CANADA and CUBA expressing reservations. The EU, opposed by ARGENTINA, requested stronger language on noting TEEB reports. MALAWI preferred to note rather than recognize work on corporate social responsibility and the greening of supply chains.

On government measures, the PHILIPPINES proposed clear criteria for participation in business partnerships, creating conditions for reporting and independent assessments. CANADA and JAPAN objected, requesting, with NEW ZEALAND, to delete language on work toward global corporate performance standards/criteria. BRAZIL added reference to certification schemes, with NEW ZEALAND and ARGENTINA preferring “voluntary.” On facilitating mainstreaming by business, NORWAY requested reference to “regulations,” with NEW ZEALAND adding “as appropriate” and stressing that incentive measures be “economically and socially sound.” BRAZIL proposed inviting parties to adopt sustainability criteria for government purchases, with JAPAN and NEW ZEALAND expressing reservations. ARGENTINA, supported by EU and opposed by JAPAN, requested dialogue with business in relation to all three Convention objectives.

On encouraging private sector activities to achieve the Convention objectives, JAPAN, opposed by MALAWI and MEXICO, suggested deletion of “clear and concrete”

commitments and “clear and measurable” indicators. On requesting activities from the Executive Secretary, SOUTH AFRICA queried about the qualifier “subject to the availability of resources.” Opposed by SWITZERLAND and JAPAN, the EU proposed deleting a request to develop programmes, such as logos, to enable recognition and support by consumers of business activities. IIFB requested taking into account the Akwe:kon Guidelines and the Tkarihwaierri Code of Ethical Conduct, with NEW ZEALAND inserting “as appropriate” and opposing to reference the latter.

**MYPOW 2011-2020:** Chair Flasbarth introduced the draft recommendation on the MYPOW 2011-2020 (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP. 2). ETHIOPIA requested adding “indicators” after “targets” in the paragraph on reviewing targets and updating NBSAPs. On cooperation among international biodiversity-related organizations and agreements, GRENADA, CHINA, and IRAN suggested deleting “agreements” as well as the provision on preparing a joint work programme for the Rio Conventions, noting it is unclear how cooperation among agreements might work. The EU, SOUTH AFRICA, and BOTSWANA requested to keep the provision, with the latter noting that cooperation among the Rio conventions is especially relevant to the developing world.

KENYA, SOUTH AFRICA, UGANDA, TANZANIA, and SENEGAL requested the paragraph on the need for and development of additional mechanisms to enable parties to meet their commitments under the Convention, noting they would rather improve existing mechanisms than create new ones. The EU, MEXICO and GRANADA requested retaining the entire paragraph. ARGENTINA, supported by IRAN, NEW ZEALAND and ETHIOPIA proposed deleting at least the word “compliance”, if the paragraph is retained.

ARGENTINA requested that “targets and indicators” be added to the paragraph on resource mobilization. JAPAN suggested giving the Strategic Plan a specific name, and the Chair responded that this would be decided at COP 10. Many countries requested the WGRI be formally recognized as a subsidiary body, and that “capacity development” be replaced by “capacity building” throughout the draft.

**Periodicity of meetings:** On periodicity of meetings, after multiple interventions over the year proposed for COP 12, the Chair suggested keeping the date open.

Haiti, for the GROUP OF LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES (GRULAC) called, *inter alia*, for one intersessional meeting of WGRI held back to back with SBSTTA. On whether to now determine in the recommendation

when COP 13 and COP 14 will be held, or rather have the COP “keep under review” the periodicity of meetings beyond 2015, the EU, BURKINA FASO and MEXICO preferred the latter.

**BTI:** Chair Flasbarth introduced the draft recommendation on the BTI (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/CRP.6). The PHILIPPINES, supported by ETHIOPIA and NEW ZEALAND, proposed to insert a new paragraph providing that the BTI needs to create an enabling environment aiming to remove technical, legislative and administrative barriers to technology transfer and technology adaptation, inconsistent with international law. NEW ZEALAND proposed “in harmony and consistent with international obligations.”

ETHIOPIA proposed deleting a reference to biotechnologies and adding capacity building for technology assessments. NORWAY proposed introducing a specific focus on technology regulation and assessment. MALAWI, opposed by the EU, proposed deletion of “voluntary” with reference to the nature of the BTI. BURKINA FASO, supported by HAITI, proposed requesting the Executive Secretary to disseminate relevant information not only through the Clearing House Mechanism, but also through “other communication mechanisms.” TANZANIA highlighted the importance of best practices. The EU opposed that the BTI be hosted by the CBD Secretariat. KENYA proposed to take into account the approval and participation of women.

**REVISION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN:** Chair Flasbarth introduced the draft recommendation on revising the Strategic Plan (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.10) and opened the discussion on the draft of the new Strategic Plan annexed to the recommendation. On the mission of the Strategic Plan, the Secretariat presented three bracketed options: halting biodiversity loss by 2020 by taking immediate action provided a 50-fold increase in funding is made available in accordance with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities; taking urgent action by 2020 to halt biodiversity loss; and a list including the prevention of extinction, reduction of pressures on biodiversity and equitably sharing the benefits of biodiversity.

On goals and targets, delegates struggled to make progress, with CANADA asking for more consultation on the target on biodiversity awareness. NEW ZEALAND proposed, and parties agreed to, replace “ecological limits” with “sustainable limits,” emphasizing that the loss of biodiversity becomes irreversible when it reaches ecological limits. Delegates could not find agreement on the timeline, with BRAZIL proposing that governments take steps to achieve sustainable production by 2015 and at the latest by 2020. MEXICO, agreeing with BRAZIL on this target, suggested that for some targets, parties should have the flexibility on achieving them by either 2015 and 2020.

On a target to reduce the rate of loss, degradation and fragmentation of natural habitats, NORWAY, JAPAN and the EU requested emphasis on forests, with CHINA and MALAYSIA opposing it. PERU, opposed by CHINA, recommended bringing the rate close to zero by 2020. On a target to minimize pressures on coral reefs, MEXICO with NEW ZEALAND noted that the draft strategic plan only addresses the impacts of climate change in the context of marine and coastal ecosystems.

On access to genetic resources, there was consensus that there needs to be a target on ABS but that the final formulation of the target is pending the agreement on the ABS regime. UGANDA expressed concern that the EU, late in the evening, asked bracketing sharing benefits “consistent with national legislation,” which BRAZIL opposed since at no point during the Contact Group meeting such intention had emerged.

**NATIONAL REPORTING:** The draft recommendation on national reporting (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.3) was agreed with minor amendments, including references to developing countries,

least developed countries and small island developing states throughout the text.

**PROGRESS TOWARDS THE 2010 BIODIVERSITY TARGET:** A draft recommendation on the implementation of the Convention and Strategic Plan (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.4) was introduced. The EU proposed utilizing an explicit reference to the GEF instead of “institutional structure operating the financial mechanism of the Convention.” He also proposed to request the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with “parties, other governments and relevant international organizations,” to facilitate capacity building and to delete a paragraph on preparing an in-depth analysis of the reasons why the 2010 biodiversity target has not been met. GRENADA, CHINA, MALAWI, IRAN and others opposed deletion. The alternative language proposed by the EU for such a paragraph was eventually agreed.

In the preamble, IRAN, supported by CUBA and others, proposed expressing concern for the “financial, technical and human limitations in capacity.” The document was agreed with amendments.

**UN DECADE ON BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020:** Chair Flasbarth introduced a draft recommendation on the proposal by Japan to invite a UN decade on biodiversity. Noting the lack of agreement, the chair established a small contact group to resolve the issue.

**IPBES:** A draft recommendation on considering the outcome of the third intergovernmental meeting on establishing an IPBES (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.5) was introduced. IIFB, on behalf of several civil society groups, and supported by the PHILIPPINES, proposed adding an invitation to environmental and social science organizations and civil society to contribute to the preparation of the third meeting to establish an IPBES. The EU proposed noting the ministerial commitment to negotiating and reaching agreement on whether or not to establish an IPBES. The draft recommendation was agreed with amendments.

**INTEGRATION OF BIODIVERSITY INTO POVERTY ERADICATION AND DEVELOPMENT:** On the draft recommendation on integration of biodiversity into poverty eradication and development (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/CRP.7), UGANDA asked that “capacity development” be changed to “capacity building” throughout the text. NORWAY, supported by the EU, added a paragraph on welcoming ongoing initiatives linking biodiversity, development and poverty eradication. On the proposed expert group on biodiversity for poverty eradication and development, the PHILIPPINES requested language to identify and remove the root causes of poverty.

### IN THE BREEZEWAYS

As the Chair relentlessly pushed plenary through stacks of CRP readings, a delegate wandering the breezeways in search of the right document remarked that “the Chair drives a BMW today.” The need for speed was only curbed by a desire for balance, as issues on the Strategic Plan were re-opened to push for further progress on finance. As one delegate put it, what SMART and realistic targets are depends, to a large extent, on the means available for implementation. Recalling the basic rule of UN “traffic” regulation, that “nothing is agreed until all is agreed,” and supported by a “six country”-cylindrical engine running in the background, plenary steered clear of procedural obstructions on the road and managed to roar on towards more ambitious targets. The Chair was well-advised, however, to take some prophylactic medication to ease his hives from overexposure to brackets.

**ENB SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:** The *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* summary and analysis of WGRI 3 will be available on Monday, 31 May 2010 online at: <http://www.iisd.ca/biodiv/wgri3/>



**SUMMARY OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE  
AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP  
ON REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE  
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY:  
24-28 MAY 2010**

The third meeting of the *ad hoc* Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation (WGRI 3) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) convened at the headquarters of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in Gigiri, Nairobi, Kenya, from 24-28 May 2010. More than 700 participants attended the meeting, representing governments, UN agencies, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, indigenous and local community groups, public sector research, academia and business.

WGRI 3 adopted 12 recommendations that will be submitted to the tenth meeting of the Conference of Parties (COP) to the CBD, to be held from 18-29 October 2010, in Nagoya, Japan. The recommendations address, *inter alia*: implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan; the multi-year programme of work of the Convention for the period 2011-2020 (MYPOW 2011-2020) and periodicity of meetings and organization of work of the COP; updating and revising of the Strategic Plan for the post-2010 period; concrete activities and initiatives including measurable targets and/or indicators to achieve the strategic goals contained in the strategy for resource mobilization and on indicators to monitor the implementation of the strategy; review of guidance to the financial mechanism; and policy options concerning innovative financial mechanisms.

**A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CONVENTION**

The CBD, which entered into force on 29 December 1993, 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. There are currently 193 parties. The COP is the governing body of the Convention. It is assisted by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA), which is mandated, under CBD Article 25, to provide the COP with advice relating to the Convention's implementation.

**COPs 1-3:** At its first three meetings (November-December 1994, Nassau, the Bahamas; November 1995, Jakarta, Indonesia; and November 1996, Buenos Aires, Argentina), the COP adopted decisions on, *inter alia*: the establishment of the Clearing-House Mechanism and SBSTTA; the designation of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) as the interim financial mechanism; the designation of Montreal, Canada, as the permanent location for the Secretariat; and cooperation with other biodiversity-related conventions. The COP also considered CBD Article 8, and emphasized regional and international cooperation and the importance of disseminating relevant experience.

**COP 4:** At its fourth meeting (May 1998, Bratislava, Slovakia), the COP adopted thematic programmes of work on inland waters ecosystems and marine and coastal biodiversity, and decided to consider protected areas as one of the three main themes at COP 7. It also encouraged the CBD Executive Secretary to develop relationships with other processes to foster good management practices related to protected areas, and established an *Ad Hoc* Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on marine and coastal protected areas.

**IN THIS ISSUE**

A Brief History of the Convention .....	1
WGRI 3 Report .....	2
Revision of the Strategic Plan for the Post-2010 Period .....	2
Progress towards the 2010 Biodiversity Target .....	3
MYPOW 2011-2020, National Reporting and Periodicity of Meetings .....	4
Strategy for Resource Mobilization .....	5
Other Matters .....	6
Closing Plenary .....	7
A Brief Analysis of WGRI 3 .....	7
Upcoming Meetings .....	9
Glossary .....	10

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Claudio Chiarolla, Ph.D., Johannes Gnann, Kate Harris, and Tanya Rosen. The Digital Editor is Tallash Kantai. 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 United Kingdom (through the Department for International Development – DFID), 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), the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the European Commission (DG-ENV), and the Italian Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2010 is provided by the Government of Australia, the Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, the Ministry of Environment of Sweden, the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, SWAN International, 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), the Government of Iceland, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the World Bank. 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). Funding for translation of the *Bulletin* into Spanish has been provided by the Spanish Ministry of the Environment and Rural and Marine Affairs. 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., 11A, New York, New York 10022, USA.

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

**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; the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation; a work programme for the Global Taxonomy Initiative; and decisions on incentive measures and Article 8(j).

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

**WGRI 1:** At its first meeting (September 2005, Montreal, Canada), the WGRI adopted recommendations on: implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan; the 2010 target; impacts and effectiveness of Convention processes and bodies; cooperation with other conventions, organizations and initiatives; stakeholder engagement; and monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes.

**COP 8:** At its eighth meeting (March 2006, Curitiba, Brazil), the COP adopted a work programme on island biodiversity and decisions on a range of issues including Article 8(j), cooperation with other conventions and private sector engagement, protected areas, including high seas protected areas, incentive measures, biodiversity and climate change, and forest, marine and coastal, and agricultural biodiversity. COP 8 reaffirmed the COP 5 ban on the field-testing of genetic use restriction technologies, and instructed the ABS Working Group to complete its work with regard to an international ABS regime at the earliest possible time before COP 10, to be held in 2010.

**WGRI 2:** At its second meeting (July 2007, Paris, France), the WGRI adopted recommendations on: the implementation of goals 2 and 3 of the Strategic Plan, namely national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), capacity building and access to and transfer of technology and technology cooperation; options and a draft strategy for resource mobilization; opportunities for streamlining guidance provided to the GEF; preparation of the third edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO 3); and operations of the Convention.

**COP 9:** At its ninth meeting (May 2008, Bonn, Germany), the COP adopted: a roadmap for the negotiation of the international ABS regime before the 2010 deadline; scientific criteria and guidance for marine areas in need of protection; and the Resource Mobilization Strategy for the Convention. It established an AHTEG on biodiversity and climate change, and further adopted decisions concerning a wide range of issues, including biofuels, genetically modified trees, protected areas and ocean fertilization.

### WGRI 3 REPORT

On Monday, 24 May, Jochen Flasbarth, representative of the COP 9 Presidency, in his capacity as WGRI 3 Chair, opened the meeting by highlighting the tasks of the WGRI, including: revising biodiversity targets and indicators, revising and updating the Strategic Plan and MYPOW; and resource mobilization.

Angela Cropper, UNEP Deputy-Executive Director, highlighted, *inter alia*: strengthening science-policy interfaces; business contribution to the green economy; increasing synergies between biodiversity-related conventions; and that an international regime on access and benefit-sharing would recognize and reward good stewardship of biodiversity. CBD Executive Secretary Ahmed Djoghlafl recognized ongoing financial participation by the GEF and urged countries to finalize national reports before COP 10.

Delegates then adopted the meeting's agenda and organization of work (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/1 and Add.1) without amendment, agreeing to work in plenary and two contact groups throughout the week. One contact group, co-chaired by Ashgar Fazel (Iran) and Finn Katerås (Norway), addressed revisions to the Strategic Plan. The other contact group, co-chaired by Damaso Luna (Mexico) and Maria Schultz (Sweden), addressed the strategy on resource mobilization. Somaly Chan (Cambodia) was elected as Rapporteur.

This report summarizes discussions and recommendations on each agenda item.

### REVISION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE POST-2010 PERIOD

Delegates discussed the Revision of the Strategic Plan for the post-2010 period (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/3, Adds.1-2, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 14) in plenary, on Monday, and in a contact group from Tuesday through Thursday. They considered, in plenary, a draft recommendation with a draft new Strategic Plan annexed thereto (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.10) on Thursday and Friday. The draft recommendation was adopted in plenary on Friday. Discussions focused on the mission and rationale of the new Strategic Plan and new goals and targets.

**DRAFT RECOMMENDATION:** On recalling the strategy for resource mobilization, one party proposed deleting the reference to making resources available to developing countries and economies in transition for the implementation of the strategy, with many objecting to the deletion. On Friday, Canada agreed to remove brackets on making available the necessary resources for the implementation of the Strategic Plan, especially by developing countries, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing states among them, and countries with economies in transition.

**DRAFT NEW STRATEGIC PLAN: Mission:** Countries deliberated over wording that could convey ambition, inspire urgent and significant action, and establish realistic timeframes, all in a simple and memorable sentence. The Secretariat presented three bracketed options for the mission of the new Strategic Plan: halting biodiversity loss by 2020 by taking immediate action, provided a 50-fold increase in funding is made available in accordance with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities; taking urgent action by 2020 to halt biodiversity loss; and a list including the prevention of extinction, reduction of pressures on biodiversity and equitably sharing the benefits of biodiversity.

On Friday, Brazil, Malaysia, Argentina and others expressed preference for the first option. The European Union (EU), Norway and Switzerland expressed preference for the third option. Japan suggested deleting the second option. Brazil and others expressed willingness to accept the Chair's proposal to keep all the three options in brackets and present them to COP 10.

**Strategic Goals and 2020 Headline Targets:** Kenya, supported by Malawi, highlighted the need for clear financial strategies to help developing countries meet the targets. Indonesia stated that some targets require "enormous" financial resources, and therefore targets should be moderated to levels more realistic for developing countries. Bosnia called for "harmonizing baselines" to assess whether targets have been met in different countries. New Zealand noted that the loss of biodiversity is occurring, *inter alia*, because of limited baseline data and methodologies for measuring success. Canada recommended measurable, achievable and realistic targets, stressing the engagement of specific sectors and sub-national governments.

Keeping in mind the importance of communication, many underscored having short and precise targets. On sustainable use, New Zealand proposed, and parties agreed to, replace "ecological limits" with "sustainable limits," emphasizing that the loss of biodiversity becomes irreversible when it reaches ecological limits. On addressing natural habitat loss, degradation and fragmentation, parties debated the appropriate level of ambition for targeted reduction rates. The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) reiterated the need to resist pressure to reduce the level of ambition for the 2020 target if objectives are to be met.

On access to genetic resources, there was consensus on the need for a target on ABS but that the final formulation of the target is pending agreement on the ABS regime. Uganda expressed concern that the EU, on Thursday, late in the evening, asked for the first time to bracket sharing benefits "consistent with national legislation." Brazil opposed the brackets, noting that it should have done so during Contact Group discussions. On Friday morning, the EU clarified that such a request was made in the Contact Group but was not captured in the text.

Brazil, supported by the African Group and China, proposed bracketing the entire Strategic Plan, citing the unresolved financial issues related to resource mobilization and the pending negotiations on an ABS regime as a cause for concern. Echoing such concerns, the Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC) highlighted the lack of financial and human

resources to contribute to international efforts to protect biodiversity and emphasized the importance of adopting an ABS protocol.

**Final Recommendation:** The WGRI recommends (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/L.9) that the COP, *inter alia*:

- urges parties and other governments to implement the Strategic Plan, *inter alia*, to foster the full and effective contribution of women and indigenous and local communities;
- urges regional organizations to consider the development or updating of regional biodiversity strategies, including agreement on regional targets;
- requests the Global Environment Facility to provide support to eligible parties;
- on resource mobilization, invites parties and relevant organizations to make available the necessary resources for the implementation of the Strategic Plan; and
- requests the Executive Secretary to, *inter alia*, support countries in making use of the findings of The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) study and in integrating the values of biodiversity into relevant national and local policies, programmes and planning processes, including through capacity-building workshops.

The annex with the draft new Strategic Plan was entirely bracketed, pending the resolution of financial issues and the negotiation of an ABS regime. The purpose of the new Strategic Plan is to promote effective implementation of the Convention: it includes a shared vision, mission and strategic goals and targets. It provides a framework for the establishment of national and regional targets and for achieving a more coherent implementation of the Convention and COP decisions, including its programmes of work, the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation and the ABS regime. It also represents the basis for developing communication tools to facilitate the mainstreaming of biodiversity into broader national and global agendas. The bracketed targets include:

- By 2020 at the latest, the values of biodiversity are integrated into national accounts, national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes. The word "national accounts" remains in double brackets.
- By 2020, the rate of loss and degradation, and fragmentation, of natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved/ brought close to zero. The words "forests," and "at least halved/brought close to zero" remain in double brackets; and
- By 2020, access to genetic resources is promoted/facilitated/enhanced, and benefits are shared consistent with national legislation and the international regime/protocol on access and benefit sharing. The words "promoted, facilitates, enhanced," and "consistent with national legislation and the international regime/protocol" remain in double brackets.

#### **PROGRESS TOWARDS THE 2010 BIODIVERSITY TARGET**

Delegates considered the documents on the implementation of the Strategic Plan and in-depth review of goals 1 and 4 (on the Convention fulfilling its leadership role in international biodiversity issues; and on better understanding of the importance of biodiversity and the Convention, and how that has led to a broader engagement across society in implementation) of the Strategic Plan and further consideration of needs for capacity building (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/2, Add. 1-3), in

plenary on Monday. On Thursday in plenary, they discussed a draft recommendation on the implementation of the Convention and Strategic Plan (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.4), a draft recommendation on business engagement (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.1) and a draft recommendation on the integration of biodiversity into poverty eradication and development (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.7). The recommendations were adopted on Friday in closing plenary. Discussions focused on implementation activities, capacity building, mainstreaming of biodiversity in national strategies and business engagement.

#### **IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

Malawi and Niger, on behalf of the African Group, noted that most African countries have undertaken implementation activities but the lack of resources and poor stakeholder participation has hampered implementation efforts and mainstreaming. Yemen called for increased regional, subregional and international cooperation to mobilize the financial resources and expertise necessary to achieve the new targets. The Cook Islands, for the Asia Pacific Group, and Turkmenistan underscored the need for funding to support building capacity in developing countries.

Mexico noted that financial and human resources must be commensurate to ambitions to implement the Strategic Plan. Switzerland noted the importance of the TEEB study in generating awareness about the economic value of biodiversity. Tanzania called for programmes to explore the links between gender and biodiversity.

**Final Recommendation:** The WGRI recommends (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/L.6) that the COP, *inter alia*:

- invites parties to establish participatory mechanisms at all levels to foster the full and effective contributions of indigenous and local communities, civil-society organizations and all stakeholders;
- requests the GEF to provide adequate and timely financial support for the updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and related enabling activities; and to ensure that procedures are in place to expedite the disbursement of funds; and
- requests the Executive Secretary to continue facilitating the provision of support to countries for capacity-building activities, including through regional and/or subregional workshops on updating and revising NBSAPs, the mainstreaming of biodiversity and the enhancement of the clearing-house mechanism.

**BUSINESS ENGAGEMENT:** Discussions focused on incorporating biodiversity into business practices. Brazil added reference to certification schemes, with New Zealand and Argentina preferring “voluntary” schemes. The International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity requested taking into account the Akwe:kon Guidelines and the Tkarihwaier:ri Code of Ethical Conduct, with New Zealand inserting “as appropriate” and opposing to the reference to the latter.

**Final Recommendation:** The WGRI recommends (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/L.3) that the COP, *inter alia*:

- invites parties to develop principles for incorporating biodiversity into business practices, taking into account the projects developed by organizations, such as the Business and Biodiversity Offsets Programme, IUCN and others; and
- encourages businesses and the private sector to take into

account, as appropriate, the Akwé: Kon Voluntary Guidelines and participate in voluntary certification schemes.

**INTEGRATION OF BIODIVERSITY INTO POVERTY ERADICATION AND DEVELOPMENT:** Discussions focused on the establishment of an AHTEG on biodiversity and poverty reduction and its terms of reference. The Philippines highlighted that the AHTEG should identify the root causes of poverty and how they can be eliminated. Argentina reiterated the need to strengthen capacity building and technology transfer and called for clarifying the terms of reference of the proposed AHTEG. The EU proposed to narrow down the mandate to address the linkages between the root causes of poverty and the loss of biodiversity.

**Final Recommendation:** The recommendation and its two annexes (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/L.8) on integration of biodiversity into poverty eradication and development contain no brackets.

The WGRI recommends that the COP establish an AHTEG on biodiversity for poverty eradication and development, with a footnote stating that its establishment has financial implications and is thus subject to a decision by the COP. The Executive Secretary is requested to prepare an analysis of existing mechanisms, processes and initiatives for mainstreaming biodiversity and ecosystem services into poverty eradication and development. The first annex contains the terms of reference for the AHTEG. Experts shall provide guidance to all relevant actors and address remaining gaps in the Convention’s provisional framework on capacity building for mainstreaming biodiversity and ecosystem services for sustainable development and poverty reduction. Annex II contains a draft of the provisional framework on capacity building.

#### **MYPOW 2011-2020, NATIONAL REPORTING AND PERIODICITY OF MEETINGS**

The relevant documents on MYPOW 2011-2020 (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/5), national reporting (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/6, Add.1-2) and periodicity of COP meetings (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/11) were introduced on Monday. Japan highlighted the relation between the MYPOW and the Strategic Plan and argued for revisions consistent to both. Draft recommendations on MYPOW 2011-2020, including periodicity of meetings (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP. 2) and national reporting (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP. 3) were discussed on Thursday and adopted with some amendments on Friday. Discussions on the MYPOW focused on implementation mechanisms and cooperation among international biodiversity-related conventions.

**MYPOW 2011-2020:** New Zealand argued against the need for additional mechanisms to enable parties to meet their implementation commitments and, with Iran and China, noted it was premature to make specific references to the establishment of an Intergovernmental Science-policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). Argentina reiterated that an implementation mechanism is not necessary, highlighting that work needs to be done under NBSAPs. Canada prioritized a joint work programme between the Rio conventions, with China and Iran expressing reservations.

On cooperation among international biodiversity-related organizations and agreements, Grenada and others suggested deleting the provision on preparing a joint work programme

for the Rio conventions. The EU, South Africa and Botswana requested to keep the provision, with the latter noting that cooperation among the Rio conventions is especially relevant to the developing world. Kenya, South Africa, Uganda, Tanzania and Senegal requested the paragraph on the need for and development of additional mechanisms to enable parties to meet their commitments under the Convention, noting they would rather improve existing mechanisms than create new ones. The EU, Mexico and Grenada requested retaining the paragraph.

Argentina requested that “targets and indicators” be added to the paragraph on resource mobilization. Japan suggested giving the Strategic Plan a specific name and the Chair responded that this would be decided at COP 10. Many countries requested that the WGRI be formally recognized as a subsidiary body, and that “capacity development” be replaced by “capacity building” throughout the draft.

On Friday, China, supported by Iran, proposed putting in brackets “taking into account, *inter alia*, proposals for: a UN Decade on Biodiversity; possible options for cooperation amongst the Rio conventions, including the preparation of a possible joint work programme; and the convening of a joint high-level segment or joint extraordinary COP of the three Rio conventions.” The EU proposed lifting brackets around “possible options for cooperation amongst the Rio conventions.” The WGRI adopted the recommendation with China’s proposal, as amended by the EU. Iran finally proposed to bracket throughout the text the references to the joint work programme.

**Periodicity of meetings:** Brazil suggested convening a COP every three years, with Mexico stressing the importance of adding new and emerging issues to the agenda. Switzerland expressed preference for a three-year COP cycle complemented by a yearly WGRI meeting back-to-back with SBSTTA. India, supported by Mexico, preferred to retain biennial COPs with two intersessional SBSTTA meetings. Grenada proposed not to change the periodicity of meetings.

Haiti, on behalf of GRULAC called for, *inter alia*, one intersessional meeting of the WGRI held back-to-back with SBSTTA. On whether to determine in the recommendation when COP 13 and COP 14 will be held, or instead to “keep under review” the periodicity of COP meetings beyond 2014, the EU, Burkina Faso and Mexico preferred the latter.

**Final Recommendation:** The WGRI recommends (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/L.7) that the COP adopts the following MYPOW:

- COP 11 will take place in 2012 and address, *inter alia*: a review of progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan; a review of progress in providing support to parties for its implementation; the development of tools and guidance to monitor implementation; a review of implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization; cooperation among biodiversity-related organizations; and the in-depth review of the programme of work on island biodiversity.
- COP 12 could address, *inter alia*: a review of the updated NBSAPs; a mid-term review of the Strategic Plan; a review of progress in providing support to assist parties; a review of implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization; consideration of how the Convention has contributed to the achievement of the MDGs; and an update of the MYPOW to 2020.

- The COP will keep under review the periodicity of its meeting beyond 2014 and will decide the periodicity of meetings until 2020 either at COP 11 or at COP 12.

**NATIONAL REPORTING:** Discussions on national reporting focused on the GEF’s financial support and guidelines. Liberia drew attention to recent GEF projects assisting national reporting by least developed countries and small island developing states. The EU welcomed the draft guidelines on the format of national reports, noting these guidelines will benefit from inputs from the parties prior to COP 10.

**Final Recommendation:** In the recommendation (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/L.5), the WGRI recommends, *inter alia*, that the COP:

- decides that all parties should submit their fifth national report by 31 March 2014;
- decides that the fifth national report focus on, *inter alia*, implementation of the Strategic Plan, and the 2020 strategic targets; and
- requests the GEF to provide financial support and invites other donors, governments and agencies to provide financial and technical support to developing countries for the preparation of the fifth national reports.

#### STRATEGY FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

On Tuesday, Chair Flasbarth established a contact group to address the three agenda items on the strategy for resource mobilization: indicators and targets; innovative financial mechanisms; and guidance to the financial mechanism. The contact group met from Tuesday-Thursday. A Friends of the Chair group on Article 20 on financial resources and Article 21 on financial mechanisms of the Convention, including South Africa, Brazil, India, Switzerland, the EU and Canada, met on Thursday. Chair Flasbarth consulted informally with South Africa, Brazil, the EU and Canada on Friday.

**INDICATORS AND TARGETS:** Plenary considered targets and indicators for the resource mobilization strategy (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/7 and Inf.4) on Tuesday, with the contact group engaging in a first reading in the afternoon. A consolidated working document was circulated on Wednesday, with the contact group negotiating a draft recommendation (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.8) on Thursday. Plenary discussed a revised draft recommendation on Friday (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.8/Rev.1) and adopted it without amendments. Discussions focused on whether and how to proceed with targets and indicators, and, if so, with which.

Brazil repeatedly highlighted the need for predictable and adequate funding to meet the full incremental costs of implementing the Convention in developing countries. New Zealand suggested that indicators be short, sharp and focused, and questioned, with the EU, the utility of quantitative targets.

In the contact group, delegates considered a list of potential indicators and targets, with a regional group and a developing country preferring not to define quantitative targets. A large developing country floated the idea of establishing an AHTEG on targets and indicators.

Regarding concrete activities and initiatives to achieve the goals of the strategy for resource mobilization, a regional group did not support: a financial and economic panel on biodiversity and associated ecosystem services; regional networks on national

environmental funds; and the establishment and implementation of an ABS fund. A regional group proposed that the development of country-specific resource mobilization strategies take place as part of updating NBSAPs, with several developing countries and a regional group opposing this amendment.

**Final Recommendation:** The WGRI recommends (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/L.11) that the COP requests the Executive Secretary to organize regional and subregional workshops to assist with the development of country-specific resource mobilization strategies, as part of updating NBSAPs.

The WGRI recommends that COP decides to undertake concrete activities and initiatives to achieve the goals of the resource mobilization strategy, which could include periodic global monitoring reports on the implementation of the strategy.

Bracketed paragraphs include the recommendations that the COP: either “adopts” or “invites consideration” of a list of indicators for monitoring implementation and “considers” a list of corresponding targets. These include: percentage of biodiversity-related funding in official development assistance per annum, percentage of biodiversity-related funding in national budgets per annum and amount of funding through the GEF, with no targets defined.

**INNOVATIVE FINANCIAL MECHANISMS:** Plenary considered policy options concerning innovative financial mechanisms (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/8, Inf.5 and Inf.12) on Tuesday, with the contact group engaging in a first reading in the evening. A consolidated working document was circulated on Wednesday, with the contact group negotiating a draft recommendation (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.12) on Thursday. Plenary discussed a revised draft recommendation (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.12/Rev.1) on Friday and later adopted it without amendments. Discussions focused on the need for innovative financial mechanisms and a new Convention body.

Iran expressed concern that some proposed policy options for innovative financial mechanisms developed in the International Workshop on Innovative Financial Mechanisms and based on the findings of TEEB exceed the scope and mandate of the CBD. Along with South Africa, on behalf of the African Group, he noted that many proposed options neglect the distinction between developed and developing countries in terms of their disparate political, social and economic circumstances. India, supported by China and Argentina, stated that innovative mechanisms should supplement and not substitute existing ones. Japan suggested making better use of existing mechanisms and instruments.

Senegal proposed that a potential financial and economic panel under the CBD elaborate a new and less cumbersome financial mechanism, while cautioning against imposing funding priorities on parties. Many delegations, including civil society, opposed the establishment of an additional body.

**Final Recommendation:** The WGRI recommends (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/L.13) that the COP requests a compilation of parties’ views on the proposed policy options for further consideration at WGRI 4. It encourages parties to engage in a global discussion on the need for and possible modalities of innovative systems for payment for ecosystem services, and requests the Executive Secretary to initiate and facilitate these discussions. Parties are further encouraged to undertake concrete activities for developing, promoting and adopting innovative

financial mechanisms. References to a green development mechanism and safeguards for the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities remain in brackets.

#### **GUIDANCE TO THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM:**

Plenary considered a review of the guidance to the financial mechanism (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/9) on Tuesday. The contact group engaged in a first reading on Wednesday. Plenary discussed a revised draft recommendation on Friday (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.12/Rev.1) and later adopted it without amendments. Discussions focused on the urgency with which to consolidate the guidance, and on whether or not to set indicators and targets for GEF replenishment periods.

On the consolidation of guidance, the Philippines and the EU cautioned that the retirement of COP decisions should not impact the implementation of GEF projects. Instead of discussing a summary elaborated by the Secretariat, a regional group preferred to work on the basis of the existing COP decisions, eliminating outdated and redundant guidance. Noting this would require further work, the group floated the idea of having the guidance adopted at COP 11 rather than compromising the quality of the consolidation. Delegates agreed that further work was needed, with a regional group insisting that such work take place prior to COP 10. A developing country emphasized party involvement and the Secretariat proposed to conduct intersessional work through an interactive webpage.

During the contact group, a regional group, opposed by several developing countries, requested deleting the references to indicators and associated targets throughout the text, arguing that setting targets and indicators for the GEF is not within the mandate of the COP and would interfere with the operational aspects of the GEF. Opponents argued that even though the GEF Council may be an appropriate forum to discuss such targets and indicators, unless a party is a contributor, its voice is not heard. A developed country proposed to add that the programme priorities that define what to finance shall be based on the Strategic Plan.

**Final Recommendation:** The WGRI recommends (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/L.12) that the COP adopts the consolidated guidance to the GEF, agreeing to retire previous decisions related to the financial mechanism. In preparing a draft decision with a consolidated list, the WGRI requests the Executive Secretary to undertake electronic consultation with parties. The COP is called upon to decide that the guidance to the financial mechanism consists of a consolidated list of programme priorities that defines what needs to be financed, and a four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities related to utilization of the GEF resources for biodiversity. WGRI 4 is asked to review the implementation of the four-year outcome-oriented framework.

#### **OTHER MATTERS**

**FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSED BIODIVERSITY TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE:** Plenary addressed the document on the proposed biodiversity technology initiative (BTI) (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/10) on Wednesday, considered a draft recommendation on the BTI (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.6) on Thursday and adopted it on Friday. Discussions concerned the legal nature and institutional aspects of a possible BTI, as well as the role of intellectual property rights in technology transfer.

Most parties welcomed the establishment of a BTI, with Canada arguing that it was premature and Switzerland cautioning against duplicating existing activities. Opposed by Malawi, the EU and the Central and Eastern European Group preferred that the initiative be of a voluntary nature. China, Jordan and many African countries emphasized the importance of capacity building. Regarding institutional aspects, Malawi supported and the EU opposed that the CBD host the proposed BTI. The Philippines, Brazil and Argentina stressed the need to further clarify the governance structure and operational mechanisms of the initiative. Jordan emphasized the full participation of all parties and indigenous and local communities.

The Philippines drew attention to intellectual property rights as barriers for technology transfer. Supported by Ethiopia, he inserted a new paragraph providing that the BTI needs to create an enabling environment aiming to remove technical, legislative and administrative barriers to technology transfer and technology adaptation, inconsistent with international law.

**Final Recommendation:** The WGRI recommends (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/L.4) that the COP invites parties to consider supporting the establishment of the BTI, with the phrase “to be hosted by the Secretariat of the Convention” in brackets. WGRI recommends the COP emphasize that the BTI needs to:

- be voluntary, which remains bracketed;
- be driven through the active and balanced participation of developed countries and developing countries; and
- create an enabling environment that aims to remove technical, legislative and administrative barriers to technology transfer and technology adaptation, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations.

**IPBES:** Delegates discussed the document on an IPBES (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/4) in plenary on Wednesday and a draft recommendation (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.5) on Thursday. The revised draft recommendation was agreed with minor amendments in plenary on Friday. Several countries requested inviting environmental and social science organizations and civil society to contribute to the preparation for the third *ad hoc* intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting to establish an IPBES, to be held in the Republic of Korea in June. The EU requested acknowledgement of the ministerial commitment to negotiating whether or not to establish an IPBES.

**Final Recommendation:** The WGRI recommends (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/L.10) that the COP considers the outcome of the third and final *ad hoc* intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meetings on an IPBES, as well as the work of SBSTTA 14, with regard to implications for the implementation and organization of work of the Convention.

**UN DECADE ON BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020:** Delegates considered a draft recommendation proposed by Japan on behalf of the Bureau (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/CRP.11) on Thursday. Noting lack of agreement, the Chair established a small contact group to resolve the issue. The draft recommendation was adopted on Friday.

On Friday, in plenary, Malawi and EU congratulated Japan on the initiative.

**Final Recommendation:** The WGRI recommends (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/L.2) that the COP, *inter alia*, invites the UN General Assembly to consider declaring 2011-2020 the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity.

### CLOSING PLENARY

On Friday, 28 May, in the closing plenary, delegates adopted the report of the meeting (UNEP/CBD/WGRI/3/L.1) with minor amendments. UNEP Executive Director Achim Steiner highlighted the potential for synergies between multilateral environmental agreements, and stressed the need to communicate a more sophisticated story about the 2010 target than merely “failure.” In the context of increasing developing countries’ participation in CBD meetings, he signaled a possible waiving of the 13 percent overhead on support for delegates’ travel costs, pending consideration of budgetary implications for the CBD Secretariat. After delegates made some concluding remarks, Chair Flasbarth thanked participants and the Secretariat for their hard work and heralded the “tremendous” progress made on a significant number of challenging issues. He gavelled the meeting to a close at 5:12 pm.

### A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF WGRI 3

If the planet Earth gave report cards, the human species recently earned a glaring F for failing to meet the 2010 biodiversity target of reducing global biodiversity loss, according to evidence presented in the third Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO 3). The Outlook, which reviewed progress on implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), blamed the failure on the insufficient scale of action taken on biodiversity issues, as reflected in their low priority and inadequate integration in policies, strategies and programmes. This dire verdict instilled an atmosphere of urgency and responsibility at the third meeting of the *ad hoc* open-ended Working Group on the Review of Implementation of the Convention (WGRI 3). UNEP Executive Director Achim Steiner optimistically noted that despite failing to achieve the 2010 biodiversity target, “people everywhere, every day, are working hard” to reverse biodiversity loss. Within this context, WGRI 3 was charged with the task of assessing how such hard work can better translate into effective CBD implementation.

This analysis focuses on WGRI’s contribution to the Strategic Plan, in tandem with implementing the strategy for resource mobilization under the CBD. In particular, it considers the Working Group’s discussions on the delicate balance between the need to set specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, timely (SMART) and ambitious targets, on the one hand, and to match such ambitions with the required funding for developing countries on the other. The conclusion assesses the Working Group’s contribution to the package deal that must be adopted in Nagoya to move the biodiversity regime forward and earn a better grade on the next biodiversity report card. Failure in 2020 is simply not an option.

### SMART YET AMBITIOUS: SETTING THE STRATEGIC PLAN’S GOALS AND TARGETS

One of the main tasks of WGRI 3 was to revise and update the Strategic Plan by refining the goals, targets, and mission statement in brief yet detailed, precise yet flexible, ambitious yet

realistic, and robust yet memorable terms. This challenging set of demands saw a contact group wrestling with the draft provisions, testing the lefthand and nuance of every word, while striving to articulate a Strategic Plan capable of inspiring urgent action to slow the devastating rate of global biodiversity loss.

With WGRI 3 immediately following SBSTTA 14, the latter's scientific and technical recommendations were meant in theory to inform and facilitate the process of setting new targets. In practice, WGRI's deliberations on the Strategic Plan frequently strayed beyond the realms of politics and implementation into the technical territory of science. Delegates initially appeared to lack trust that the SBSTTA outcomes were drafted in the most scientifically and technically accurate language possible, perhaps reflecting past criticisms that SBSTTA has been too political and not scientific enough. After the Chair explicitly requested delegates to focus debate at the level of politics and implementation, deliberations proceeded more smoothly.

But even when SBSTTA recommendations were considered and reflected in the work of the WGRI, the dearth of scientific baselines on biodiversity in different countries complicated the task of setting targets. In addition, as some delegates argued, the feasibility of targets and goals for the CBD is a function of political will, financial support and, most fundamentally, the response of ecosystems and species to the measures employed. Some despaired that the CBD would "set itself up for failure" by stating ambitions to halt biodiversity loss by 2020, arguing that 2050 was a more realistic timeline. Others pushed for aggressive targets and timelines, noting the necessity of urgent action and the severe ecological and economic consequences of complacency. The revised Strategic Plan included a bracketed reference to a 50-fold increase in funding in order to fulfill the mission of the proposed 2020 biodiversity targets. Controversy over this and other details could not be resolved and, at the last minute, the entire Strategic Plan was bracketed for submission to COP 10.

#### ***RISING TO THE CHALLENGE: ENSURING ADEQUATE AND PREDICTABLE FINANCING FOR BIODIVERSITY***

The major disagreements over the Strategic Plan might be swiftly resolved once there is consensus on how to finance its implementation. For this reason, the outcomes of the working group on the strategy for resource mobilization are crucial to the upcoming CBD negotiations in Nagoya. While there was agreement on "concrete activities and initiatives," consensus was lacking with regard to the indicators and targets to achieve the strategic goals contained in this strategy and monitor its implementation. One of the most controversial indicators was a proposal to at least double by 2020 annual international financial flows to developing countries, which made it into the bracketed text and thus remains on the table. While most developed countries were not prepared to commit to specific figures in these indicators, developing countries attached symbolic importance to having concrete numbers.

Another sensitive issue was the use of new and innovative financial mechanisms, such as the taxation of activities harmful to biodiversity, which would extend beyond official development assistance and mobilize resources from the private sector. An international mechanism based on such innovative sources could enhance levels of biodiversity funding from the private sector

and officially recognize developing countries' contributions to biodiversity financing. However, innovative mechanisms could potentially create some financing commitments or implementation costs in developing countries too, for example, through the adoption of measures implementing the "polluter pays" principle (e.g., biodiversity offsetting) or the "beneficiary pays" principle (e.g., payments for ecosystem services).

Given the novelty of these proposed policy options and the cautious approach of most developing countries, WGRI 3 succeeded in overcoming resistance to starting a "global discussion" on such options that will continue to occupy the CBD's future agenda. With delegates agreeing that innovative mechanisms, if established, shall be supplementary to the financial mechanism of the Convention, the comfort in exploring options may actually have increased.

With the allocation of US\$1.2 billion for biodiversity under the fifth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund (2010-2014), the review of guidance to the financial mechanism was regarded as a major issue for the resource mobilization strategy. The most controversial aspect was whether WGRI should recommend that COP 10 develop a set of targets and indicators for measuring the implementation of the guidance to the financial mechanism, namely the GEF. The European Union argued that the COP has no mandate to set such targets and indicators for the GEF, but should only provide guidance on programme priorities based on the Strategic Plan. Parties therefore decided not to recommend that COP 10 elaborate such specific targets and indicators. However, the agreed recommendation provides that WGRI 4 will review the guidance to the GEF, and that COP 11 will decide on the outcome of such review. This timetable and associated activities will provide parties with an opportunity to reassess the need for developing targets and indicators to measure the performance of GEF biodiversity funding for the period 2015-2018.

#### ***NORTH-SOUTH POLITICS AT A CROSSROAD: A PACKAGE DEAL FOR COP 10***

The work of WGRI 3 is critical given the need to move beyond the failure to meet the 2010 biodiversity target and reform the international biodiversity governance framework under the CBD in order to halt biodiversity loss. A crucial piece of such a framework is the revised Strategic Plan for the period 2011-2010. Even though financing remains a major challenge, the overwhelming majority of delegates believed that WGRI 3's message was not one of failure. Parties have reached consensus on most substantive aspects of the Strategic Plan and the resource mobilization strategy. Now the challenge is to agree on the means to achieve the goals and targets, and on the required magnitude of human, technical, technological and financial resources.

Looking ahead, Nagoya will provide an opportunity to give the multidimensional challenge of biodiversity governance the political answer it needs. Such an answer appears within reach, but still rests on shaky ground. The African Group described the Strategic Plan as an "ivory tower," and with others, questioned the dearth of resources available for its implementation.

In his concluding remarks, Chair Flasbarth highlighted that such brackets serve the purpose of reminding delegates at COP 10 that they must continue negotiations on the linkages



between the level of ambition required of the Strategic Plan's goals and targets and the other key elements of the post-2010 global biodiversity governance framework. As the overwhelming majority of developing countries made blatantly clear, the adoption of an ABS protocol, the Strategic Plan for the post-2010 period and the Convention's resource mobilization strategy are the essential elements of a "package deal" for COP 10.

## UPCOMING MEETINGS

### 2010 GREEN WEEK: BIODIVERSITY – OUR

**LIFELINE:** This conference will be held from 1-4 June 2010 in Brussels, Belgium. It will address the state of biodiversity and nature in Europe and the world, the benefits they bring, present-day pressures on them, and possible solutions to the current rates of loss. For more information, contact: Isabelle Michiels, European Commission; tel: +32-02-299-6873; fax: +32-02-298-6327; e-mail: env-gw2009@ec.europa.eu; internet: <http://ec.europa.eu/greenweek>

### FOURTH INTERNATIONAL INDIGENOUS CONFERENCE ON TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE:

This Conference will be held from 6-9 June 2010, in Auckland, New Zealand. It is organized by New Zealand's Maori Centre of Research Excellence. For more information, contact: tel: +64-9-373-7599 ext. 84220; fax: +64-9-373-7928; e-mail: [enquiries@traditionalknowledge2010.ac.nz](mailto:enquiries@traditionalknowledge2010.ac.nz); internet: <http://www.traditionalknowledge2010.ac.nz/>

**IPBES III:** The third *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental and Multistakeholder meeting on an Intergovernmental Science-policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES III) will be held from 7-11 June 2010 in Busan, Republic of Korea. It will finalize consideration of whether to establish a science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services. For more information, contact: UNEP IPBES Office; tel: +254-20-762-5135; fax: +254-20-762-3926; e-mail: [ipbes.unep@unep.org](mailto:ipbes.unep@unep.org); internet: <http://ipbes.net/>

**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON BIOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY:** This conference will be held from 8-10 June 2010 in Montreal, Canada. It is co-organized by the CBD Secretariat and UNESCO, in collaboration with UNEP and Université de Montréal. For more information, contact: CBD Secretariat; tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; e-mail: [secretariat@cbd.int](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int); internet: <http://www.cbd.int/meetings/icbcd/>

**FOURTH GLOBAL BOTANIC GARDENS CONGRESS:** This congress will be held from 13-18 June 2010 in Dublin, Ireland. It is organized by Botanic Gardens Conservation International and its partner network organizations representing botanic gardens throughout the world. For more information, contact: the Secretariat; tel: +44-20-8332-5953; fax: +44-20-8332-5956; e-mail: [info@bgci.org](mailto:info@bgci.org); internet: <http://www.4gbgc.com/>

**THIRD MEETING OF THE GROUP OF FRIENDS OF THE CO-CHAIRS ON LIABILITY AND REDRESS:** The third meeting of the Group of Friends of the Co-Chairs will meet from 15-19 June 2010 in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. The meeting, organized by the CBD Secretariat in the framework of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, will aim to finalize negotiations on a supplementary protocol on liability and redress under the Biosafety Protocol. For more information, contact:

CBD Secretariat; tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; e-mail: [secretariat@cbd.int](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int); internet: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=BSGFLR-03>

**BERN CONVENTION GROUP OF EXPERTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE:** This meeting will be held from 21-23 June 2010 in Reykjavik, Iceland. It is organized by the Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention). For more information, contact: Secretary of the Bern Convention; tel: +33-3-9021-5151; e-mail: [ivana.dalessandro@coe.int](mailto:ivana.dalessandro@coe.int); internet: <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/nature/Bern/News/Iceland2010x.asp>

**IWC 62:** This year's meeting of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) will convene from 21-25 June 2010 in Agadir, Morocco. For more information, contact: IWC Secretariat; tel: +44-1223-233-971; fax: +44-1223-232-876; e-mail: [secretariat@iwcoffice.org](mailto:secretariat@iwcoffice.org); internet: <http://iwcoffice.org/meetings/meeting2010.htm>

**CMS SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL 16:** The 16th meeting of the Scientific Council to the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) will be held from 28-30 June 2010 in Bonn, Germany. For more information, contact: CMS Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-2426; fax: +49-228-815-2449; e-mail: [secretariat@cms.int](mailto:secretariat@cms.int); internet: [http://www.cms.int/bodies/ScC/16th\\_ScC\\_documents\\_overview.htm](http://www.cms.int/bodies/ScC/16th_ScC_documents_overview.htm)

**GEF COUNCIL MEETING:** This meeting, to be held from 29 June - 1 July 2010 in Washington, DC, will develop, adopt and evaluate GEF programmes. For more information, contact: GEF Secretariat; tel: +1-202-473-0508; fax: +1-202-522-3240/3245; e-mail: [secretariat@thegef.org](mailto:secretariat@thegef.org); internet: [http://www.thegef.org/gef/council\\_meetings/1](http://www.thegef.org/gef/council_meetings/1)

**SECOND MEETING OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE FUTURE SHAPE OF THE CMS:** This meeting will be held from 1-2 July 2010 in Bonn, Germany. For more information, contact: CMS Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-2426; fax: +49-228-815-2449; e-mail: [secretariat@cms.int](mailto:secretariat@cms.int); internet: [http://www.cms.int/bodies/future\\_shape/future\\_shape\\_mainpag](http://www.cms.int/bodies/future_shape/future_shape_mainpag)

**RESUMED ABS 9:** The resumed session of the ninth meeting of the CBD *Ad Hoc* Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing will be held in Montreal, Canada, from 10-16 July 2010. It aims to finalize work on an international ABS regime, on the basis of a draft protocol proposed by the Co-Chairs, to be submitted to CBD COP 10 for consideration and adoption. For more information, contact: CBD Secretariat; tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; e-mail: [secretariat@cbd.int](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int); internet: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=ABSWG-09-2ND>

**EXPERT MECHANISM ON THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES:** The third session of the UN Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples will be held from 12-16 July 2010, in Geneva, Switzerland. For more information, contact: Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights; tel: +41-22-928-9676; fax: +41-22-928-9066; e-mail: [expertmechanism@ohchr.org](mailto:expertmechanism@ohchr.org); internet: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/indigenous/ExpertMechanism/index.htm>

**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION IN TRANSBOUNDARY TROPICAL FORESTS:** This conference, co-organized by ITTO, CBD,

IUCN and the Government of Ecuador, will be held in Quito, Ecuador, from 21-24 July 2010. Its objective is to review the status and ways ahead for the conservation, management and financing of biodiversity in tropical transboundary conservation areas. Its results, conclusions and recommendations will feed into CBD COP 10. For more information, contact: Hwan Ok Ma; tel: +81-45-223-1110; fax: +81-45-223-1111; e-mail: rfm@itto.int; internet: [http://www.itto.int/en/workshop\\_detail/id=2245](http://www.itto.int/en/workshop_detail/id=2245)

**ECOHEALTH 2010:** The Third Biennial Conference of the International Association for Ecology and Health will take place in London, UK, from 18-20 August 2010. It will bring together academic institutions, government bodies and civil society groups to discuss jointly the major challenges facing people, wildlife and ecosystems internationally in 2010 and the future. For more information, contact: e-mail: [Ecohealth2010@profileproductions.co.uk](mailto:Ecohealth2010@profileproductions.co.uk); internet: <http://www.ecohealth2010.org/>

**WORKSHOP ON FOREST GOVERNANCE, DECENTRALISATION AND REDD+ IN LATIN**

**AMERICA:** This workshop, to be held in Oaxaca, Mexico, from 31 August - 3 September 2010, is organized by the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) and the UN Forum on Forests (UNFF), with a number of government collaborators. The results are expected to feed into UNFF 9. For more information, contact: CIFOR; tel: +62-251-8622-622; fax: +62-251-8622-100; e-mail: [cifor@cgiar.org](mailto:cifor@cgiar.org); internet: <http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/Events/CIFOR/decentralisation-redd.htm>

**UNFF AD HOC EXPERT GROUP ON FOREST**

**FINANCING:** This group will meet from 13-17 September 2010 in Nairobi, Kenya. It will be the first open-ended intergovernmental *ad hoc* expert group on financing for sustainable forest management, as part of the UNFF's strategic plan on forest financing. For more information, contact: UNFF Secretariat; tel: +1-212-963-3401; fax: +1-917-367-3186; e-mail: [unff@un.org](mailto:unff@un.org); internet: <http://www.un.org/esa/forests/>

**HIGH-LEVEL EVENT ON BIODIVERSITY:** On 22 September 2010, on the eve of opening the general debate of the sixty-fifth session of the UN General Assembly, a high-level event is scheduled to mark the International Year of Biodiversity. In parallel to that event, the General Assembly has decided to convene, from 20-22 September 2010 a high-level plenary meeting on accelerating progress to achieve all the Millennium Development Goals by 2015. For more information, see: <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/calendar.shtml>; <http://www.cbd.int/doc/press/2010/pr-2010-04-16-unga-en.pdf>

**COFO 20:** The twentieth session of the FAO Committee on Forestry (COFO) will meet from 4-8 October 2010 at the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) headquarters in, Rome, Italy. For more information, contact: FAO Forestry Department; tel: +39-06-5705-3925; fax: +39-06-5705-3152; e-mail: [COFO2010@fao.org](mailto:COFO2010@fao.org); internet: <http://www.fao.org/forestry/57758/en/>

**BIOSAFETY COP/MOP 5:** The fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety will be held from 11-15 October 2010 in Nagoya, Japan. The meeting is expected to adopt rules and procedures on liability and redress in the context of Article 27 of the Protocol. For more information, contact: CBD Secretariat; tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; e-mail: [secretariat@cbd.int](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int); internet: <http://www.cbd.int/mop5/>

**CBD COP 10:** The tenth Conference of the Parties to the CBD will be held from 18-29 October 2010, in Nagoya, Japan. COP 10 is expected to: assess achievement of the 2010 target to reduce significantly the rate of biodiversity loss; adopt a protocol on ABS and a revised strategic plan for the Convention; and celebrate the International Year of Biodiversity 2010. For more information, contact: CBD Secretariat; tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; e-mail: [secretariat@cbd.int](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int); internet: <http://www.cbd.int/cop10/>

**GLOSSARY**

ABS	Access and benefit-sharing
AHTEG	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Technical Expert Group
BTI	Biodiversity Technology Initiative
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
GBO	Global Biodiversity Outlook
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IPBES	Intergovernmental Science-policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
MYPOW	Multi-year programme of work
NBSAPs	National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans
SBSTTA	Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice
TEEB	The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
WGRI	<i>Ad hoc</i> Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention