



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
LIMITED

UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/L.1
11 May 2012

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

Fourth meeting
Montreal, 7-11 May 2012
Agenda item 11

DRAFT REPORT OF THE AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION ON THE WORK OF ITS FOURTH MEETING

Rapporteur: Ms. Snežana Prokić (Serbia)

INTRODUCTION

1. The fourth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention was held at the headquarters of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), from 7 to 11 May 2012.
2. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following Parties and other Governments: *[to be completed]*
3. Observers from the following United Nations bodies, specialized agencies, convention secretariats and other bodies also attended: *[to be completed]*
4. The following organizations were also represented by observers: *[to be completed]*

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

5. The meeting was opened at 10.15 a.m. on 7 May 2012, by Mr. Kazuaki Hoshino, Adviser to the Minister of Environment of Japan, representing the President of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. He welcomed the delegates and also delivered a message from the Minister of the Environment of Japan, Mr. Goshi Hosono, which began by reminding the Working Group that the year 2012 marked the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of the Convention. The UN Conference on Environment and Development during which it had been adopted would be commemorated by the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) in June 2012, in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Discussions at that conference would centre on sustainable development, and the transition to a green economy in the context of poverty eradication and sustainable development. Rich biodiversity and ecosystem services were cornerstones for the realization of those goals. However, biodiversity had been lost at an unprecedented rate over the previous twenty years and the possibility of handing over a beautiful planet to future generations would depend on efforts made over the coming decade.

/...

In order to minimize the environmental impacts of the Secretariat's processes, and to contribute to the Secretary-General's initiative for a C-Neutral UN, this document is printed in limited numbers. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

6. Advocating the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as universal goals, he called for urgent action towards their achievement and particularly the development of national targets and their integration into national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), which would leverage the engagement of relevant sectors and mainstream biodiversity in society.

7. A project had been launched in 2011 to support the updating and revision of NBSAPs in developing countries using the Japan Biodiversity Fund. Since then, capacity-building workshops had been successfully organized in 16 regions around the world, with participation by over 160 countries. As the Presidency of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, Japan had contributed 5 billion yen to the Fund for the continuation of that work up to the mid-term review of the Aichi Targets in 2015.

8. At the national level, Japan was working on the fourth revision of its national biodiversity strategy, due for completion by the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties, in Hyderabad, India, to provide a roadmap towards the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

9. He concluded by affirming that the fourth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention would be particularly significant in the run-up to that meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and expressed the hope that discussions would be fruitful on key issues, such as the review of progress towards achieving the Aichi Targets, the Strategy for Resource Mobilization and the message to Rio+20.

10. Mr. Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, said that Parties had to revise their national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) to fully engage all stakeholder groups and promote the mainstreaming of biodiversity in all sectors. Thanks to funding by the Government of Japan and other donors, a series of regional and sub-regional capacity-building workshops had been organized that had assisted 156 Parties to draw-up national targets within the framework of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. With the continuing support of the Government of Japan and others, capacity-building initiatives would enable Parties to enforce the elements they had identified within their revised NBSAPs. Finance was essential if the Aichi Biodiversity Targets were to be achieved, and the Secretariat had prepared an indicative road map to facilitate the Working Group's discussion of the issues of resource mobilization and the financial mechanism. The Working Group would also need to consider a draft message for the Rio+20 meeting.

11. The Convention had an ambitious global biodiversity agenda, but biodiversity still continued to be lost. New approaches were therefore needed on several fronts for better implementation of the Convention. It was important to reduce the burden on the Parties by reorganizing the work of the Conference of the Parties, and its preparatory work, and by streamlining the negotiation of new decisions and redirecting the time and resources saved to discuss and review how best to support the implementation of existing decisions. The integration of the work programmes and the cross-cutting initiatives also had to be promoted in order to fully explore synergies among all concerned, and biodiversity had to be mainstreamed into the development agenda, something that the revised NBSAPs should promote.

12. Another need was resource mobilization: to move beyond needs identification to prioritizing approaches and mechanisms, to leverage resources from existing sources through mainstreaming, incorporating sustainability criteria in government procurements, to review economic instruments and to further engage with the business sector. It was also important to put into place a monitoring system for the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. That would require the enhanced commitment and participation of all Parties in order to collect reliable and standardized information, and to that end the Parties might consider a more streamlined and frequent reporting system. However, enhanced support to Parties, in particular to the least developed countries and the small island developing States, was also needed to increase their capacity to implement the Convention's goals, programmes and targets.

13. Other needs had to be addressed as well, such as promoting more effective scientific, technical and technological cooperation among Parties, pursuant to Article 18 of the Convention and in the work programme on technology transfers, to promote more effective cooperation and the exchange of experiences among Parties. Promoting stronger recognition of, and support to, community-based approaches for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use would increase the protected areas effort and promote human well-being, food security and poverty alleviation; expanding the engagement of the business sector could be achieved by enhancing the enabling environment through government policies and procurement rules, and by outreach and guidance to small- and medium-sized enterprises; pushing for the early ratification of both the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization, and the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety would promote better use of genetic resources with equity.

14. In closing he said that consideration of some of those needs could enhance national capacities while reducing the negotiation of an increasing number of decisions which, at times, sapped the capacity for implementation of the decisions of the Conference of the Parties.

15. Mr. Carlos Martin Novella, Division of Environmental Law and Conventions, speaking on behalf of Mr. Achim Steiner, Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), congratulated Mr. Dias on his appointment as Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity. He also wished the participants fruitful deliberations, which would be important for the success of the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties, in Hyderabad, India.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

2.1. Officers

16. In keeping with established practice, the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties served as the Bureau of the Working Group. Accordingly, the meeting was chaired by the representative of the President of the Conference of the Parties. It was agreed that Ms. Snežana Prokić (Serbia) would act as Rapporteur.

2.2. Adoption of the agenda

17. The provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/1) was adopted as follows:

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
 - 2.1. Officers;
 - 2.2. Adoption of the agenda;
 - 2.3. Organization of work.
3. Implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets:
 - 3.1. Review of progress in implementation, including the establishment of national targets and the updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans;
 - 3.2. Review of progress in providing capacity-building support to Parties, promoting communication, education and public awareness and strengthening of the clearing-house mechanism and technical and scientific cooperation.

/...

4. Message to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20).
5. Integration of biodiversity into poverty eradication and development.
6. Resource mobilization: implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization and progress in assessing financing needs and gaps.
7. Financial mechanism: review of GEF-5 and needs for GEF-6.
8. Cooperation with other conventions and international organizations and initiatives, and engagement of stakeholders:
 - 8.1. Cooperation with other conventions;
 - 8.2. Engagement with business.
9. Multi-Year Plan of Action for South-South Cooperation on Biodiversity for Development.
10. Other matters.
11. Adoption of the report.
12. Closure of the meeting.

2.3. Organization of work

18. The Working Group decided to work in plenary, with the establishment of informal groups as necessary to facilitate its work.
19. At the 2nd session of the meeting, on 7 May 2012, it was decided to establish two contact groups:
 20. Contact Group I would be co-chaired by Mr. Spencer Thomas (Grenada) and Mr. Andrew Bignell (New Zealand) and would continue discussions on agenda item 3. At the 3rd session of the meeting, on 8 May 2012, the contact group was also requested to consider agenda items 4 and 5.
 21. Contact Group II would be co-chaired by Ms. Ines Verleye (Belgium) and Mr. M.F. Farooqui (India) and would continue discussions under agenda item 6 and 7.
22. At the 5th session of the meeting, on 10 May 2012, the Working Group heard progress reports from the Co-Chairs of both contact groups.

ITEM 3. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020 AND PROGRESS TOWARDS THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

- 3.1. Review of progress in implementation, including the establishment of national targets and the updating of biodiversity national strategies and action plans***
- 3.2. Review of progress in providing capacity-building support to Parties, promoting communication, education and public awareness and strengthening of the clearing-house mechanism and technical and scientific cooperation***

23. The Working Group took up agenda items 3.1 and 3.2 together at the 1st and 2nd sessions of the meeting, on 7 May 2012. In considering item 3.1, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the review of progress in implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including the establishment of national targets and the updating of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/2). It also had before it, as information documents, a review of progress in the establishment of national targets since the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/1), a review of progress in implementation including the updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/2), a review of barriers to the sharing of biodiversity data and information, with recommendations for eliminating them (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/13), as well as an updated note by the Executive Secretary on the provisional technical rationale, possible indicators and suggested milestones for the final version of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/27/Add.1). In considering item 3.2, the Working Group had before it notes by the Executive Secretary on the review of progress in providing support to Parties in the context of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/3), the proposed work programme for the clearing-house mechanism in support of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/3/Add.1), and on the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity 2011-2020 (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/3/Add.2). It also had before it, as information documents, a review of contributions to the Japan Biodiversity Fund (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/3), a summary report of the capacity-building workshops on National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/4), a review of progress in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 and capacity-building initiatives under the programme of work on protected areas (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/5), the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020: How the partnership can contribute to delivery of SBSTTA 15 recommendations with respect to global, regional and national indicator development and use (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/6), a report on activities held during the International Year of Biodiversity - 2010 (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/7), additional information on the proposed work programme for the clearing-house mechanism (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/12), and the report of the Global Workshop on National Experiences in implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/14).

24. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, China, Cuba, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, the European Union (and on behalf of its member States), Georgia (on behalf of the Central and Eastern European countries), Guatemala, Guinea, India, Japan, Jordan, the Republic of Korea, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia (on behalf of the African Group), Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea (on behalf of the Pacific small island developing States: the Cook Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Palau and Samoa), Peru, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, South Africa, Sudan, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Uganda, Ukraine, Uruguay, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

25. Statements were also made by representatives of the Indigenous Information Network (IIN), the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB) and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), and one speaker on behalf of Conservation International, Envirocare Tanzania and WWF.

26. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that Contact Group I would continue discussions under agenda item 3 and a revised version of the draft recommendation contained in documents UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/2 and UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/3 would be prepared, reflecting the views expressed by participants and written submissions to the Secretariat, for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

27. At the 5th session of the meeting, on 10 May 2012, Co-Chair Bignell reported that the contact group had revised the draft recommendations contained in the two documents and that these were now combined in one document, which the Working Group then proceeded to discuss.

28. Statements were made by representatives of Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, China, Colombia, Ecuador, the European Union (and on behalf of its member States), Guatemala, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, South Africa, Uganda and Zambia.
29. Following the exchange of views, the draft recommendation, as orally amended, was approved for formal adoption by the Working Group as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/L.3.
30. On the proposal of the Chair, it was decided to establish an open-ended group of the Friends of the Chair to continue deliberations on the revised draft recommendation, in which the representatives of Canada, the European Union, Japan, Somalia, South Africa and Yemen were particularly invited to participate, with the aim of reaching consensus on one of the outstanding issues.
31. The Chair asked the representatives of Brazil, the European Union and Zambia to engage in informal consultations to resolve the other outstanding issue.

ITEM 4. MESSAGE TO THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (RIO+20)

32. The Working Group took up agenda item 4 at the 3rd session of the meeting, on 8 May 2012. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it notes by the Executive Secretary on the draft message to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/4) and on cooperation with other conventions: the biodiversity-related conventions and the Rio conventions (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/8).
33. At the invitation of the Chair, the Executive Secretary reported that the negotiations on the Rio+20 outcomes in New York were moving slowly owing to the quantity of text under consideration. Though many countries were sympathetic to highlighting the relevance of biodiversity to sustainable development, it was not yet clear how best to incorporate it into those outcomes. The Working Group should therefore maintain reasonable expectations as to how much new text could be inserted into the process, keeping its message short and focused.
34. He reminded the Working Group that there would be ample opportunity at Rio+20 to discuss further issues relating to biodiversity, as well as climate change and desertification, through the Rio Conventions Pavilion and in various side events. The twentieth anniversary of the Convention would also be marked outside of the conference.
35. On the basis of the Executive Secretary's remarks, the Chair said that the Working Group needed to be strategic if it was to communicate its message successfully to Rio+20. Document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/4 now contained two draft messages – one technical and one political – rather than the planned single message. However, the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties considered that the technical message might be too long and complex. He therefore proposed dropping that message and concentrating efforts on producing a short, sharp and strategic political message, based on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Either the full text of the Strategic Plan could be attached to the single message, or both messages could be retained.
36. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina (on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean countries), Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, the European Union (and on behalf of its member States), Ghana, Guinea, India, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, New Zealand, Niger, Pakistan, the Philippines, Somalia, Sudan, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.
37. A statement was also made by a representative of IUCN.

38. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that it was decided that a single message would be sent to Rio+20. Contact Group I would continue discussions under agenda item 4 and a revised version of the message contained in annex II of document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/4 would be prepared, reflecting the views expressed by participants and written submissions to the Secretariat, for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

39. At the 6th session of the meeting, on 10 May 2012, the Working Group discussed a revised version of the draft recommendation.

40. Statements were made by representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Japan, the Marshall Islands, Mexico, Ukraine and Uruguay.

41. Following the exchange of views, the draft recommendation, as orally amended, was approved for formal adoption by the Working Group as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/L.xx.

ITEM 5. INTEGRATION OF BIODIVERSITY INTO POVERTY ERADICATION AND DEVELOPMENT

42. The Working Group took up agenda item 5 at the 3rd session of the meeting, on 8 May 2012. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it the report of the expert meeting on biodiversity for poverty eradication and development (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/5). It also had before it, as an information document, the proceedings from that meeting and the expert group analysis of the root causes of, and interlinkages between, biodiversity loss and poverty (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/11).

43. At the invitation of the Chair, Mr M.F. Farooqui (India) gave a short presentation on the meeting of the Expert Group for Biodiversity, Poverty Eradication and Development held in Dehradun, India, from 12 to 15 December 2011. Attended by 31 experts, it had been co-hosted by the Government of India and the Secretariat of the Convention. Thanks to generous contributions by the Governments of Japan, Germany and France, representatives of developing countries had been able to participate. He drew the attention of the Working Group to the background information, overview of issues addressed and discussion outcomes contained in document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/5, and to the Dehradun Recommendations and executive summary of the root causes of, and interlinkages between, biodiversity loss and poverty, contained respectively in annexes I and II thereto. Information document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/11 contained details of the proceedings of the meeting and the full text of the analysis undertaken by the expert group.

44. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, the European Union (and on behalf of its members States), Japan, Jordan, Mali, Mexico, Peru, the Philippines, South Africa, Thailand, Uganda, Uruguay and Yemen.

45. A statement was also made by a representative of the IIFB.

46. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that Contact Group I would continue discussions under agenda item 5 and a revised version of the draft recommendation contained in document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/5 would be prepared, reflecting the views expressed by participants and written submissions to the Secretariat, for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

47. At the 5th session of the meeting, on 10 May 2012, the Working Group discussed a revised version of the draft recommendation.

48. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, the European Union (and on behalf of its member States), Ghana, Grenada and South Africa.

49. Following the exchange of views, the draft recommendation, as orally amended, was approved for formal adoption by the Working Group as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/L.2.

ITEM 6. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGY FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION AND PROGRESS IN ASSESSING FINANCING NEEDS AND GAPS

50. The Working Group took up agenda item 6 at the 2nd session of the meeting, on 7 May 2012. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the review of implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6) and its addendum on methodological and implementation guidance for the “indicators for monitoring the implementation of the Convention’s strategy for resource mobilization” (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6/Add.1). It also had before it, as information documents, a scoping study assessing the adopted indicators for the implementation of the strategy on resource mobilization of the Convention on Biological Diversity (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/8), a co-chairs’ summary of the dialogue seminar on scaling up biodiversity finance, Quito, 6-9 March 2012 (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/9), an indicative road map for the mobilization of financial resources to implement the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/15) and a compilation of views, information and experience on the implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/16).

51. The Chair said that agenda item 6 was one of the main items to be considered at the current meeting and was a key item for the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Under the item, the Working Group would review the implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization, and progress in assessing financing needs and gaps. The agenda item was linked to decision X/3 and had several components to it. At the request of the Bureau, the Secretariat had provided an indicative Roadmap for the information of the Parties at the current meeting to help fully involve them in consideration of the issue, and to provide an organization of the work to be undertaken before the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

52. The indicative Roadmap proposed a logical sequence for achieving the goal of decision X/3 by highlighting the necessary steps to be taken. He said that due to the complexity of the issue, not all information was available but the current meeting should be able to make good progress towards implementing the decision by proceeding in a logical order, starting with technical discussions and exchanges of experience regarding the baselines and reporting framework. He reminded the meeting that pursuant to paragraph 8(i) of decision X/3, the Conference of the Parties had decided to adopt targets at its eleventh meeting provided that robust baselines had been identified and endorsed and that an effective reporting framework had been adopted.

53. At the invitation of the Chair, Ms. Maria Schultz (Sweden) gave a presentation on the dialogue seminar on the scaling-up of finance for biodiversity, held from 6 to 9 March 2012 in Quito, Ecuador, which she had co-chaired. A full summary of the proceedings and outcomes of that seminar can be found in document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/9.

54. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, the European Union (and on behalf of its member States), Guatemala, Mexico, Morocco, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Switzerland, Timor-Leste and Uruguay.

55. Statements were also made by representatives of Conservation International (speaking also on behalf of BirdLife International, The Nature Conservancy and WWF), EcoNexus and IUCN.

56. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that Contact Group II would continue discussions under agenda item 6 and a revised version of the draft recommendation contained in

document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/6 would be prepared, reflecting the views expressed by participants and written submissions to the Secretariat, for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

57. At the 5th session of the meeting, on 10 May 2012, Co-Chair Verleye reported that the contact group had met but required more time to conclude its discussions under agenda item 6.

ITEM 7. FINANCIAL MECHANISM: REVIEW OF GEF-5 AND NEEDS FOR GEF-6

58. The Working Group took up agenda item 7 at the 2nd session of the meeting, on 7 May 2012. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note on the financial mechanism: review of GEF-5 and the needs for GEF-6 (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/7). It also had before it, as an information document, the full assessment of the amount of funds needed for the implementation of the Convention for the sixth replenishment period of the trust fund of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/10).

59. At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Gilles Kleitz (France), representing the Expert Team, gave a presentation on the funding needs assessment for the sixth replenishment of the GEF trust fund, contained in document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/10.

60. Statements were made by representatives of Canada, China, Ethiopia, the European Union (and on behalf of its member States), Jordan, Mexico, Norway, South Africa, Thailand and Tunisia.

61. A statement was also made by a representative of GEF.

62. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that Contact Group II would continue discussions under agenda item 7 and a revised version of the draft recommendation contained in document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/7 would be prepared, reflecting the views expressed by participants and written submissions to the Secretariat, for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

63. At the 5th session of the meeting, on 10 May 2012, Co-Chair Verleye reported that the contact group had met but required more time to conclude its discussions under agenda item 7.

ITEM 8. COOPERATION WITH OTHER CONVENTIONS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND INITIATIVES, AND ENGAGEMENT OF STAKEHOLDERS

8.1. Cooperation with other conventions

8.2. Engagement with business

64. The Working Group took up agenda items 8.1 and 8.2 together at the 3rd and 4th sessions of the meeting, on 8 May 2012. In considering item 8.1, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on cooperation with other conventions: the biodiversity-related conventions and the Rio conventions (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/8), as well as an information document containing supplementary information on working arrangements for cooperation with other conventions (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/18). In considering item 8.2, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on engagement with business (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/9) and, as an information document, a review of the biodiversity requirements of technical standards and certification schemes (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/17).

65. At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Naoya Furuta (IUCN) gave a presentation on the outcomes of the first meeting of the Global Partnership for Business and Biodiversity, held from 15 to 16 December 2011 in Tokyo, Japan, which is more fully described in document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/9.

66. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Burkina Faso, Canada, Ethiopia, the European Union (and on behalf of its member States), Ghana, Guatemala, India, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Mexico, the Federated States of Micronesia, Morocco, Norway, the Philippines, South Africa, Switzerland, Uruguay and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

67. Statements were also made by representatives of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA/FAO).

68. A further statement was made by a representative of EcoNexus.

69. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that he would prepare a revised version of the draft recommendations contained in documents UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/8 and UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/9, reflecting the views expressed by participants and written submissions to the Secretariat, for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

70. At the 6th session of the meeting, on 10 May 2012, the Working Group discussed a revised version of the draft recommendation contained in document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/8 on cooperation with other conventions.

71. Statements were made by representatives of Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Ethiopia, the European Union (and on behalf of its member States), Grenada, Guatemala, Liberia, Mexico, Norway and South Africa.

72. A statement was also made by the representative of UNEP.

73. Following the exchange of views, the draft recommendation, as orally amended, was approved for formal adoption by the Working Group as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/L.5.

74. At the 6th session of the meeting, on 10 May 2012, the Working Group also discussed a revised version of the draft recommendation contained in document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/9 on engagement with business.

75. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Burkina Faso, Canada, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Japan and the Philippines.

ITEM 9. MULTI-YEAR PLAN OF ACTION FOR SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION ON BIODIVERSITY FOR DEVELOPMENT

76. The Working Group took up agenda item 9 at the 4th session of the meeting, on 8 May 2012. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the multi-year plan of action for South-South cooperation on biodiversity for development (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/10).

77. Statements were made by the European Union (and on behalf of its member States), Japan, Jordan and the Republic of Korea.

78. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that he would prepare a revised version of the draft recommendation contained in document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/10, reflecting the views expressed by participants and written submissions to the Secretariat, for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

79. At the 6th session of the meeting, on 10 May 2012, the Working Group discussed a revised version of the draft recommendation.

80. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Brazil, China, Ethiopia, the European Union (and on behalf of its member States), Grenada, Marshall Island (on behalf of the Cook Islands, Kiribati, the Federated State of Micronesia, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa and the Solomon Islands), Mexico, New Zealand, Norway and South Africa.

81. Following the exchange of views, the draft recommendation, as orally amended, was approved for formal adoption by the Working Group as draft recommendation UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/L.4.

ITEM 10. OTHER MATTERS

82. At the 5th session of the meeting, on 10 May 2012, Mr. Yoo Yeon Chul, Director General for International Cooperation, Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Korea, made a presentation. He said that his country was committed to the conservation of biodiversity; it had established its National Institute for Biological Resources, as well as a protected area in its demilitarized zone, and had enacted a law on conservation and use of biodiversity. It was also establishing a National Institute for Marine Biological Resources.

83. With its balanced perspective, the Republic of Korea had a unique bridging role to play between developed and developing countries, as well as between traditional knowledge and modern science. It was also well placed to host the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties because of its accumulated experience in hosting international events, its warm hospitality, and the ease with which it could be reached from international destinations.

84. The Working Group took note of the presentation.

ITEM 11. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

85. [To be completed].

ITEM 12. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

86. [To be completed].
