



CBD COP-7 HIGHLIGHTS: TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2004

COP-7 delegates met in two Working Groups (WGs). WG-I considered mountain biodiversity and protected areas (PAs). WG-II discussed technology transfer and cooperation. Delegates convened in an afternoon Plenary to hear progress reports on WG-I and WG-II's work and statements by organizations, and to address draft decisions on invasive alien species (IAS).

WORKING GROUP I

MOUNTAIN BIODIVERSITY: WG-I Chair Hans

Hoogeveen (the Netherlands) opened WG-I. The Secretariat introduced documents on mountain biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/7/1/Add.2, and 7/14 and INF/6) and relevant SBSTTA recommendations, noting remaining brackets in the proposed work programme.

Many delegates expressed support for the work programme and its integration into the CBD Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPOW) and thematic work programmes. Iran, for the ASIA AND THE PACIFIC GROUP, encouraged Parties to submit relevant information to the CBD Clearing-house Mechanism (CHM), and supported South-South cooperation and a watershed approach. CHINA noted the importance of North-South cooperation.

Ireland, for the EU and Acceding Countries, Bulgaria and Romania, supported a targeted work programme. Several delegates and the FAO emphasized the importance of transboundary cooperation and coordination with other initiatives. UGANDA called for integrating mountain ecosystem conservation into poverty alleviation programmes.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION, INDONESIA, CHINA and BRAZIL stressed the need for new and additional financial resources to implement the work programme. JAPAN opposed references to national budgets. BRAZIL underlined that national policies should not hamper other countries' conservation efforts and trade.

Liberia, for the AFRICAN GROUP, suggested empowering local communities, building capacity and enhancing regional cooperation. MALAYSIA emphasized the importance of implementing the work programme in accordance with national capacities and priorities. INDIA stressed the need to register grassroots level innovations and develop local networks to disseminate technologies.

TURKMENISTAN supported action to maintain ecologically viable corridors, rather than establish ecological corridors. CANADA and the INTERNATIONAL INDIGENOUS FORUM ON BIODIVERSITY (IIFB) proposed adding references to indigenous communities. ALBANIA stressed the importance of pastures and pastoralism. INDONESIA called for a clear definition of mountain ecosystems. CHILE questioned the need for recommending the development of new legislation.

GHANA stressed the importance of mountain biodiversity conservation for watershed management. KENYA identified mountains as a critical source of social, cultural and economic goods and services. COLOMBIA highlighted the need for technology transfer and access and benefit-sharing (ABS). LEBANON outlined the benefits of its mountain agro-biodiversity programmes to local communities.

Peru, on behalf of the ANDEAN COMMUNITY, recommended that the work programme focus on, *inter alia*, sustainable development and good agricultural practices.

ARGENTINA and BOLIVIA called for references to countries of origin. INDIA and the IIFB expressed concern regarding reference to "inappropriate" land use practices, and the IIFB recommended a precautionary approach.

WWF noted its concern regarding the significance of mountains as headwaters of rivers.

PROTECTED AREAS: The Secretariat presented the documents on PAs, including the proposed work programme (UNEP/CBD/COP/7/1/Add.2, and 7/4 and 15). Outlining the outcomes of the Vth IUCN World Parks Congress held in September 2003, IUCN highlighted the need for national-level gap analyses and management objectives, and for PAs to benefit local people.

Several delegates supported an outcome-oriented work programme with specific targets and harmonized with other relevant activities. AUSTRALIA stressed the need for realistic targets. IUCN, the EU and SWITZERLAND supported creating an open-ended working group on PAs. ICELAND said the contact group on the budget should decide whether to establish a technical expert group or an open-ended working group.

The WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION stressed the need for synergies between national-level programmes. The EU called for a bottom-up approach and integrating PAs into the wider land- and seascapes. SWITZERLAND supported assessing implementation of the work programme at each COP until 2010, and proposed references to areas within and beyond national jurisdiction. The NETHERLANDS called for balancing ecological and social interests, and for including marine PAs (MPAs). ICELAND called for cooperation relating to PAs beyond national jurisdiction, particularly MPAs. CHILE stressed the need for financial support to establish PAs, and supported further expert work regarding MPAs.

WORKING GROUP II

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER: The Secretariat introduced a background note and relevant SBSTTA and MYPOW recommendations, including draft elements for a work programme (UNEP/CBD/COP/7/1/Add.2, and 7/4, 5, 7 and 16). Most delegates supported the draft work programme.

China, on behalf of the ASIA AND THE PACIFIC GROUP, stressed the need for political will, identification of, and access to, environmentally sound technologies, and funding for South-South



cooperation. COLOMBIA emphasized the importance of North-South transfers. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION stressed indigenous peoples' rights and, with CAMEROON, called for global technology transfer without geographical boundaries.

Kiribati, for the PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES (SIDS), expressed concern over the lack of progress in technology transfer and, with the BAHAMAS, called for prioritizing actions to address the vulnerabilities of SIDS. THAILAND stressed the need to identify user and provider stakeholder groups, and proposed coordination mechanisms at various levels. ARGENTINA and SOUTH AFRICA urged developed countries to provide financing, build capacity and create incentives for technology transfer.

Egypt, for the AFRICAN GROUP, stressed that intellectual property rights (IPRs) should not hinder technology transfer, with KENYA adding that traditional knowledge should be considered. The GAMBIA and UGANDA said technology should be socially and environmentally friendly and culturally relevant, and backed by effective capacity-building programmes. TANZANIA stressed the need to acknowledge and compensate communities' contribution to technology development and, with INDONESIA, to provide clear guidance to the CBD's financial mechanism.

Colombia, on behalf of GRULAC, underscored the need for an integrated implementation of CBD articles on technology transfer, technical and scientific cooperation and handling of biotechnology.

The EU and Acceding Countries, Bulgaria and Romania stressed the role of the CHM as a gateway to databases of relevant organizations. He called for improved access of developing countries to patent information, and expressed regret that traditional knowledge is not addressed in the work programme. The AFRICAN GROUP, with Tunisia on behalf of the ARAB GROUP, suggested referencing traditional knowledge as part of technology transfer. CANADA called for references to Article 8(j) (traditional knowledge). BRAZIL and MALAYSIA objected to including traditional knowledge in the work programme, noting lack of a protection system. BOLIVIA said technologies derived from traditional knowledge should remain within community control, and suggested transfer between communities. Mexico, on behalf of the LIKE-MINDED MEGADIVERSE COUNTRIES, added that a *sui generis* system should be developed for traditional knowledge protection.

SWITZERLAND said the work programme should focus on facilitation mechanisms and avoid duplication, and, with INDONESIA and NORWAY, highlighted the importance of collaboration with other processes. NEW ZEALAND and AUSTRALIA called for emphasis on scientific and technical cooperation, addressing impediments to such cooperation and clarifying the role of the CHM.

The PHILIPPINES called for an analysis of the role of IPRs in technology transfer and highlighted the need for links to the work of the Article 8(j) Working Group. NIGER, supported by many, said pilot projects and technology transfer should be based on developing countries' needs. NORWAY stressed the importance of hard and soft technologies, and opportunities for technology transfer through distance learning. COSTA RICA stressed the importance of involving civil society and, with BURKINA FASO, of involving the private sector. The ARAB GROUP emphasized the need to ensure support by donor institutions and to strengthen the CHM at the regional level. BURKINA FASO highlighted the need for cooperative research and academic cooperation. CAMEROON supported establishing an expert group to facilitate implementation of the work programme. SWITZERLAND, CANADA, AUSTRALIA and EL SALVADOR expressed concern regarding the establishment of an expert group, with CANADA prioritizing work through the CHM.

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) outlined relevant activities, including its data specification for databases pertaining to genetic resources and disclosed traditional knowledge.

PLENARY

WG-I Chair Hooegeven and WG-II Chair Desh Deepak Verma (India) reported on progress in their WGs.

STATEMENTS: IUCN called on Parties to develop a work programme on PAs that addresses MPAs, financial resources and improvement of management practices. WIPO introduced its technical study on patent disclosure requirements relating to genetic resources and traditional knowledge, prepared in response to a COP-6 request. The INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS (UPOV) cautioned that ABS regulations could impede access to plant genetic resources.

The UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES reported on its work on the use of IPRs, traditional knowledge, ABS and bioprospecting in Antarctica. The INTERNATIONAL TROPICAL TIMBER ORGANIZATION outlined its work on conservation and sustainable management of tropical forests. The UN FORUM ON FORESTS welcomed the involvement of the CBD Secretariat in the Collaborative Partnership on Forests, especially regarding its work on traditional forest-related knowledge and on forest biodiversity. GREENPEACE KIDS FOR FORESTS described its initiatives encouraging youth to take action for the protection of forests.

INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES: COP-6 President Hooegeven introduced documents relating to decision VI/23 on IAS, including a draft decision and amended guiding principles on the precautionary principle and intentional introduction (UNEP/CBD/COP/7/L.1 to L.3). He said the documents represent a compromise arising from informal consultations, and asked delegates to adopt them as a package in order to avoid reopening negotiations. Many delegations requested additional time to consider the documents, with several noting that these had been submitted in English only.

IN THE CORRIDORS

As working groups proceeded with business-as-usual, the positive spirit of the meetings in the communal and "Kampung" areas resonated in discussions on the heavy and potentially sensitive work programmes on protected areas and technology transfer. At times, the call for a bottom-up approach and indigenous participation could be heard in Working Group II, located directly above the "Kampung" area.

In other parts of the Putra World Trade Centre, invasive alien species were still attracting much attention. One delegate noted that finding a compromise on the substantive issues would not solve the procedural problems at the center of this debate. Despite requests by most regional groups to continue consulting informally on the compromise proposal, many delegates' optimism regarding the prompt resolution of this issue was not altered.

THINGS TO LOOK FOR TODAY

WORKING GROUP I: WG-I will meet at 10:00 am in the Dewan Merdeka Hall to continue discussing PAs.

WORKING GROUP II: WG-II will meet at 10:00 am in Room TR4 to consider the follow-up to the WSSD, MYPOW, the Strategic Plan and operations of the Convention. Look for a Chair's text on technology transfer and cooperation to be circulated in the afternoon.

PLENARY: Participants will reconvene in Plenary at 5:30 pm to review progress.