



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 4 December 2012

15612/12

ENV	824
AGRI	714
DEVGEN	293
PI	134
FORETS	76
PECHE	437
RECH	396
ONU	145
CADREFIN	448

INFORMATION NOTE

from: General Secretariat

to: Delegations

Subject: Eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 11) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
(Hyderabad, India, 8 to 19 October 2012)
- Compilation of statements / speaking points

Please find in Annex for information a compilation of statements/speaking points delivered on behalf of the European Union, its Member States and Croatia at the above-mentioned meeting, including the High Level Segment (17-19 October 2012).

Opening statement

Mr President,

I am speaking on behalf of the EU, its Member States and Croatia.

We would firstly like to pay tribute to India, the State of Andhra Pradesh and the city of Hyderabad for hosting COP 11 and we wish India all the best with its COP Presidency. Also, we would like to thank Japan for its successful Presidency in the last two years and its generous support to our Convention.

The agreement reached at COP 10 in Nagoya 2010, including an ambitious Strategic Plan 2011-2020 with the 20 Aichi Targets, the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing and the decision on resource mobilization, was indeed historical. COP 10 clearly emphasised that biodiversity is a cornerstone for sustainable development and poverty eradication, and demonstrated that multilateral environmental governance and institutions deliver to the benefit of all when there is shared political willingness. The central importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services was reaffirmed at the highest political level at the Rio+20 Summit in Brazil in June 2012. The Aichi Targets on biodiversity represent an essential contribution to the global Sustainable Development Goals which are to be developed as a follow-up to Rio+20.

All efforts have now turned to implementation to achieve tangible results on the ground. It is promising that many countries are now in the process of updating their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, or are planning to do so. The EU and its Member States have already adopted a new and ambitious Biodiversity Strategy to 2020, building on a set of targets, and in line with our Nagoya commitments. EU Member States are also actively developing their own strategies.

It is clear that effective implementation of the CBD and the Aichi Targets will require putting in place the right policy frameworks and governance structure as well as a significant increase in financial, human and technical resources from all sources. We will engage constructively in the negotiations on these important topics.

The EU and its Member States are making significant contributions to biodiversity funding – domestically and globally. At global level, we committed on average around 2.2 US\$ billion annually for biodiversity-related aid during the period 2006 to 2010, accounting for over 50% of Official Development Assistance for biodiversity from all donors. During the same period, we have more than doubled EU biodiversity assistance from around 1.7 billion US\$ in 2006 to around 3.9 billion in 2010. We are fully committed to the resource mobilization agenda as agreed in Nagoya. Quite clearly, resource mobilisation goes much beyond direct financial flows. A substantial share of additional resources must come from more effectively mainstreaming biodiversity across sectors and reflecting biodiversity values and priorities in decision making processes; and from further improving the effectiveness of existing funding streams. It is clear that the magnitude of the biodiversity funding challenge will also require the mobilisation of new types of funding sources, not least from promoting green economy and innovative financial mechanisms.

Mr President,

The Nagoya Protocol on ABS was a major achievement in our common endeavour to realise all three objectives of the CBD. It has the potential of making an important contribution to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity through the fair and equitable sharing of benefits from the utilization of genetic resources and its implementation can also help generating significant resources for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. The EU and its Member States are committed to its early ratification and implementation and we welcome the proposals for this COP to help to create conditions that would help to bring about a speedy ratification by CBD Parties.

Finally, we would like to stress that the CBD cannot and should not work in isolation. Whether at global, regional, national or local level, biodiversity policies can only be successful when they are integrated into a whole range of other policy areas, including economic policy. This underlines the crucial catalytic role of the Convention in reaching out to a wide range of stakeholders, including the private sector, NGOs, indigenous and local communities, as well as local authorities. Enhancing synergies with other UN organisations and multilateral environmental agreements and in particular biodiversity related conventions is also a priority. A successful implementation of the Convention and its Strategic Plan largely depends on such mainstreaming and synergies.

Mr President,

The success of COP 10 will only be a lasting success if we keep up the momentum from Nagoya here in Hyderabad. We have a global road map, now we need to put it to use and move ahead towards our common targets.

The EU and its Member States will do their utmost to maintain the momentum and make COP 11 successful.

Agenda item 2. Status of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from Their Utilization and related developments

We would like to express our appreciation to the Secretariat for the preparation of all the relevant documents to this agenda item.

The main message we like to convey from the EU and its MS and Croatia is that we are satisfied with the outcome of ICNP2 in New Delhi in July and support the recommendations from this meeting and see no need to open text.

We support the convening of a third meeting of the ICNP prior to the first meeting of the NP COP-MOP, as we believe that this is needed to further prepare key outstanding issues and keep momentum in the process towards the entry into force of the NP. The most appropriate timing of such a meeting is in our opinion when the reports are available from the various expert groups on particular issues of the Nagoya protocol.

We believe that the work plan for a third ICNP to be adopted by COP 11 could benefit from an exchange of experiences on implementation and ratification of the NP. Amongst other capacity development processes the EU and member states – notably the European Commission, Germany and Denmark – are supporting such exchange through the Multi-Donor ABS Capacity Development Initiative for Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific.

Secondly we believe the work plan for ICNP should include all items on which COP 11 will request intersessional work, prior to it being forwarded to NP COP/MOP 1.

Finally, we find that it should also include preparation of the NP COP/MOP 1 agenda item on forms and intervals of monitoring and reporting on implementation.

In order to keep the workload of a potential ICNP 3 feasible, we suggest that the following items could either be forwarded directly to NP COP/MOP1 or dealt with at ICNP3 as subsidiary agenda items. These are:

- Rules of procedure for meetings of the COP/MOP to the NP,
- Measures to raise awareness of the importance of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge,
- Guidance for resource mobilization for the implementation of the Protocol
- Programme budget for the biennium following the entry into force of the Protocol,
- Elaboration of guidance for the financial mechanism.

We further suggest that this COP invites Parties and all relevant stakeholders to submit information to the Executive Secretary on the issue of model contractual clauses, codes of conduct, guidelines and best practices and/or standards and requests the Executive Secretary to compile, analyse and structure this information and make it available for the consideration of ICNP 3. This information could also be included in the pilot phase of the ABS clearing house.

The EU and its MS are looking forward to engage in further negotiations and to further elaborate on elements of the NP together with our international partners.

Finally, we look forward to participating in the informal discussions at COP 11 on the status of ratification and implementation of the NP.

Agenda 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 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 technology transfer and cooperation**
- 3.3. Further development of tools and guidance for monitoring implementation, including the use of indicators**

The EU and its MS and Croatia welcome the work undertaken by the CBD Secretariat in preparation of these important topics including the review of the status of national targets and updated NBSAPs.

The importance of the Aichi Targets and the attention they have brought to biodiversity and the Convention cannot be underestimated. Given the early stages of the process, we understand that there are still only limited signs of progress on the ground in implementation of action to achieve the targets. But we are also delighted to see the growing number of initiatives that are being developed and undertaken around the World, which will hopefully lead to tangible results in the coming years. We will do our part to keep up the momentum necessary to achieve the Aichi Targets.

At national level, NBSAPs are key mechanisms for taking forward actions to achieve the Aichi Targets providing focal points for leadership, engagement and resource mobilisation to deliver national goals and targets. In this context the EU and its MS stress the importance of integrating NBSAPs with other sectoral development plans and developing and applying indicators to effectively track both national and global progress towards the Aichi Targets.

With the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 we have integrated the Strategic Plan at the regional level into all relevant policy sectors. Five of the MS have already updated their NBSAPs in accordance with Strategic Plan and several others are in the process of doing so.

Although only few countries worldwide have been able to revise their NBSAPs so far, we welcome the fact that many have taken steps to do so in the near future. In this context, we encourage all relevant stakeholders to facilitate the required enabling conditions with regard to the revision of NBSAPs. We would like to welcome in particular the regional and sub-regional capacity-building workshops on the review of NBSAPs as well as the many other capacity-building activities that have taken place as a follow up to the Strategic Plan mainly due to the generous support of the Japan Biodiversity Fund. Also the EU and its MS have been supporting this process and will continue to do so being fully aware of the importance of the timely revisions of the NBSAPs for an effective implementation of the Strategic Plan and the achievement of its Aichi Targets.

The EU and its MS also acknowledges the need to further strengthening the support through capacity building, the CHM and technology transfer and cooperation. Here, as the CBD Secretariat's document rightly states, "better coordinated and more efficient use of ongoing mechanisms will be needed... - there is already a wealth of information, expertise and experience among Parties and partner organisations. The challenge is to marshal this knowledge systematically to support the implementation of the Convention."

In this regard we are looking forward to further enhancing the Clearing House Mechanism and to developing a coherent, consistent and coordinated approach to technical and scientific cooperation that builds upon existing mechanisms. The EU and its MS also support the recommendations on the Issues of Clearing House Mechanism, Capacity Building and Awareness Raising made by The Second Meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol held in New Delhi in July 2012.

However, before developing new initiatives, the EU and its MS would prefer to have a dedicated discussion on a possible review and a gap analysis of existing mechanism, and would like to see proposals on an envisaged coherent, consistent and coordinated approach to technical and scientific cooperation.

Moving on to agenda item 3.3, the EU and its MS welcome the advances in relation to the development of tools and guidance for monitoring implementation of the Strategic Plan 2011-2020 of the Convention, including the development and application of indicators, and in particular the work done by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators and the Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions.

The EU and its MS strongly support the process of continued development and application of indicators for the Strategic Plan 2011-2020 and beyond. Making a difference for biodiversity requires that its present state and trends be identified and assessed, possible future changes evaluated and information be made available in a form suitable for decision makers in order to improve interventions. We believe that further monitoring, research and assessment is imperative in order to follow up progress towards the overall goals of the Strategic Plan.

As a general principle, the EU and its MS would encourage the full use of available information and tools generated by other institutions and processes in order to keep the burden of reporting for the Parties at a minimum, and to encourage multilateral institutions to improve their reporting on this issue.

The EU and its MS strongly support harmonization of global indicators and their use between the Convention on Biological Diversity and other conventions, regional agreements and processes.

Based on information submitted, the publication of the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook prior to COP-12 should provide a meaningful analysis of progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan four years on from Nagoya. Since the timing between the submission of the 5th national reports in March 2014 and the publication of GBO-4 is very tight, we strongly support the early submission in 2013 of data, information and case-studies, including the use of the indicative list of indicators for the Strategic Plan, so that this information can be presented and analysed in the fourth edition of the GBO.

We look forward to further guidance on the type of information that Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations, including indigenous and local communities, can submit in advance of 5th national reports.

Agenda item 4. Financial resources and financial mechanism

Opening Statement on Resource Mobilisation

The EU and its Member States and Croatia welcome the progress made at WGRI4 and the recommendations made by the Secretariat in document UNEP/CBD/COP/11/14 rev1.

We would also like to thank the governments of Sweden, Ecuador, Norway and Switzerland, the European Commission, OECD, the World Bank, GEF and the Secretariat for organising informal dialogues and expert meetings on resource mobilisation. These meetings have been most useful for the preparations for this COP.

Reporting and baseline

We have noted that, even though all parties without doubt have done their best to report on their existing expenditures in time, only 32 Parties have actually been able to report on aspects of resource mobilisation, 13 of those being EU Member States and the European Commission. It will be important to reflect on the reasons for the lack of reporting by parties and the implications, as we move forward with detailed discussions on the reporting framework, baseline and targets. However we would suggest to adopt the reporting framework, but with a review clause on decisions adopted at COP 11 and COP 12 regarding target setting and with an invitation to Parties other relevant institutions to continue to allocate funds to allow for better engagement in the reporting process.

Regarding the baseline, the EU and its Member States can in principle support the use of an average over the period of 2006 to 2010 as a baseline for resource mobilisation. However, some flexibility in terms of reporting will be needed in particular in the early stages, depending on data availability. Also this will need to be related to the discussion on targets, as baselines and targets are intrinsically linked.

Needs assessments

We would also like to thank the governments of the United Kingdom and India for having initiated the High-Level Panel of resources for implementing the Strategic Plan for biodiversity 2011 – 2020 and would like to see this work being extended and expanded prior to COP12 and would like to suggest changes to §11 to reflect this and broadening it to other interested parties.

On §4 of the WGRI-4 recommendations we would suggest to delete the brackets around §4 to encourage Parties to consider the initial findings of the high level panel and the global assessment of resources and add some wording around the importance of setting the right enabling conditions.

IFMs, enabling conditions, targets

Resource mobilisation goes beyond direct financial flows. A substantial share of additional resources must come from more effectively mainstreaming biodiversity across sectors and reflecting biodiversity values and priorities in decision making processes; and from further improving the effectiveness of existing funding streams. It is clear that the magnitude of the biodiversity funding challenge will also require the mobilisation of new types of funding sources, not least from promoting green economy and innovative financial mechanisms.

The EU and its Member States are fully committed to the implementation of the resource mobilisation strategy, in line with commitments made at COP10 in Nagoya. We are strongly committed to domestic and global biodiversity financing. One example of this is Official Development Assistance, where the EU and its Member States account for more than half of the global biodiversity-related ODA. Between 2006 and 2010, we have more than doubled EU biodiversity assistance from USD 1.7 billion in 2006 to USD 4 billion in 2010.

In addition, we have funded numerous projects and activities aiming at facilitating reporting and mobilising resources for the benefit of the objectives of the convention.

Regarding Innovative financial mechanisms, we would like to complement §8 with an additional paragraph to further develop the understanding of Innovative Financial mechanisms and encourage concrete steps for their implementation in line with the Rio +20 outcome. Also we would like to expand §17 on requests to the Executive secretary, to propose changes which would support the development of proposals for guiding principles and safeguards for the use of innovative financial mechanisms.

Specifically on target setting we think that before discussing the need for and possible content of any specific quantitative target, there needs to be a discussion on the wider needs of resource mobilisation in particular on enabling conditions for effectively mobilising resources. We will introduce text changes along these lines, including additional paragraphs in support of strengthening the enabling conditions for the setting of targets. We would like to propose a strengthening of the ambition level of the targets 12b and c, and in parallel invite relevant actors to support activities to achieve these targets.

Finally, we remain fully committed to the outcomes of the Rio +20 meeting. The Rio achievements and commitments on means of implementation/resource mobilisation will need to be reflected in all agreements at COP11 on resource mobilisation. However, when referring to the Rio +20 outcome on means of implementation, we would like to stress that this should be seen as a package, and not single out specific paragraphs.

In addition we will have more specific points on paragraph 5, 6, 7 and 14.

Agenda item 4. Financial resources and financial mechanism

- 4.1. Review of implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, including the establishment of targets**
- 4.2. Report of the Global Environment Facility**
- 4.3. Guidance to the financial mechanism: four-year framework of programme priorities and review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism**
- 4.4. Needs assessment for the sixth GEF replenishment cycle**

The EU and its Member States and Croatia welcome the four-year framework of programme priorities as contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/11/15 and the Report of the Global Environment Facility as contained in the document UNEP/CBD/COP/11/8 . These documents constitute a good basis for the discussions under this agenda item.

We would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the new GEF CEO and Chairperson on her appointment, and thank the outgoing CEO and Chairperson for her hard and fruitful work during her 6 years in this position. We would also like to thank the Expert team for its report on the amount of financial resources needed for the 6th replenishment period of the GEF.

As decided by the 10th Conference of the Parties, the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Targets should be taken fully into account when developing guidance to the Financial Mechanism. Furthermore, it was decided that guidance to the Financial Mechanism should be outcome-oriented and consist of a consolidated list of programme priorities where the GEF contributes with funding along with a needed, wide range of national and international, private and public funding agents.

The EU and its MS are indeed concerned about the fact that the fourth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism, has not been elaborated before this meeting, as requested in Decision X/27. It is very unfortunate that we shall not be able to draw upon the conclusions and lessons learnt from a fourth review. We find that this review is very important, because – as the financial requirements grow and many Parties face difficult economic challenges – there is a pronounced need to document that funds are used efficiently and transparently.

The EU and its MS, by the same token, express their gratitude to Canada for providing the necessary financial resources to elaborate the fourth review, which is due in December this year.

At the second meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol (ICNP2), a draft recommendation was developed for COP11 on guidance for the financial mechanism on the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund and on support for activities prior to the entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol. We generally support the text of the recommendation as part of the relevant COP decision with a view of providing for continuation of support to ABS, including the Nagoya Protocol. Due to the intrinsic link between the Nagoya Protocol and the Convention we believe that support for the preparations for the Protocol as well as for its implementation is important and will help to underpin the achievements of all three objectives of the Convention.

Regarding the Report of the Global Environment Facility the EU and its Member States find that it is particularly important to note that the operations of GEF are increasingly country-driven and that the processes for accessing funds are continuously streamlined and simplified. We therefore recommend that this process is continued. We would also like to highlight the importance of increased cooperation among conventions in order to achieve synergies and avoid overlaps.

We also welcome the GEF progress on reforms to improve country planning, speeding up project cycles, improving results measurement and learning; and the establishment of the Sustainable Forest Management and REDD+ Window which augments the CBD focal area. In the ongoing reform process we strongly encourage using the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Targets to facilitate the realisation of synergies amongst national targets and programme priorities set out in revised national biodiversity strategy and action plans as prioritised in country-driven project proposals towards 2020.

In light of the results already achieved by the GEF and the environmental challenges ahead of us we look forward to engage in fruitful discussions of the guidance of a successful 6th replenishment period of the GEF.

The EU and its Member States and Croatia would like to propose amendments for paragraph 1 in the draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/11/15/rev 2. We will submit our proposed amendments electronically to the secretariat

Agenda item 5. Cooperation, outreach and the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity:

5.1. United Nations Decade on Biodiversity

5.2. Cooperation with international organizations, other conventions and initiatives

Speaking note on UN decade:

The draft strategy on for the celebration of the UN decade on Biodiversity is an important contribution to the implementation of the Strategic Plan on Biodiversity and we believe that building public awareness at all levels and mainstreaming biodiversity concerns throughout government and all sectors of society through communication, education and awareness is essential. Therefore momentum in activities and encouragement of parties should be cross-cuttings issue and central objectives throughout the decade and we welcome the report on activities as an important contribution to continuous efforts and believe that such reporting should continue.

The EU, its Member States and Croatia fully support the paragraphs in UNEP/CBD/COP/11/4 on UN decade on Biodiversity. However, if the text is opened we wish to propose amendments by to adding two paragraph to the text, to promote sharing of information on and knowledge of biodiversity. We will provide our text proposals in writing.

Speaking note on Cooperation between international organisations, other conventions and initiatives:

The EU and its Member States attach great importance to cooperation at all levels for achieving full implementation of the CBD and its Strategic Plan 2011-2020 and support arrangements to ensure that the Strategic Plan and its Aichi Targets are embraced beyond the CBD by all institutions, organizations and processes concerned. We therefore welcome the draft decisions included in UNEP/CBD/COP/11/4.

Cooperation is an important topic within the overall International Environmental Governance and therefore coherent implementation of related conventions at all levels is important to increase their effectiveness, avoid duplication or even adverse effects and enhance efficient use of human and financial resources. This was reaffirmed at the highest political level as stated in paragraph 89 of “The Future We Want” adopted at the Rio+20 Conference. In this regard, we welcome the contribution of the Environmental Management Group, and in particular it’s Issues Management Group, to the streamlining of biodiversity targets throughout the UN system and encourages continuation of their efforts as an important contribution to the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Substantial progress has been achieved in cooperation at the international level between the biodiversity-related and the Rio Conventions and this mainly through the work of the two liaison groups and the Chairs of the Advisory Bodies of the Biodiversity related Conventions. The enhanced cooperation between CBD and relevant international agencies, organisations and institutions is also encouraging, but need to be further developed.

Consistent with and supportive of paragraph 89 of the Rio+20 Outcome Document, the EU and its Member States reaffirm their support to initiatives, including Party-driven ones, aimed at strengthening policy synergies between MEAs, including Biodiversity Conventions. The EU and its Member States call for further efforts and work from UNEP in this regard.

The EU and its MS find it very important that Parties focus on coordination and cooperation at the national level. This is essential to further promote what is the overall aim of any type of cooperation between the conventions namely coherent and synergistic implementation. In order to enhance national level synergies in the implementation of the conventions, it is essential to have a party driven process.

COPX/20 §10 already requested WGRI to determine the form and content of a process to enhance coordination, coherence and national level synergies among the biodiversity conventions, in order to increase the involvement of Parties in the work of the Liaison Group of the Biodiversity-related Conventions and the Joint Liaison Group of the Rio Conventions.

However WGRI4 did not engage in these discussions. In parallel to the on-going and future work carried out by UNEP on synergies, it is important that the COP repeats this request so that WGRI5 can explore possible mechanisms to bring representatives of Parties around the same table to discuss joint issues. The ES could be requested to propose possible mechanisms to increase the direct involvement of Parties, based on relevant existing experiences and ongoing activities, in particular on the revision of the NBSAPs, as well as taking into consideration the specific needs of the 6 biodiversity related conventions as well as the other two Rio conventions which can be discussed at WGRI5.

The EU and its Member States are encouraged by the general recognition by other biodiversity related conventions that the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011 – 2020 with its Aichi targets is also of importance for them and it is intended to offer an inclusive, overarching perspective. The revision and updating of NBSAPs in light of Aichi Target 17 provide unique opportunities for enhanced communication and cooperation at the national level between focal points of related conventions and with all relevant sectors to promote implementation of the CBD and its Strategic Plan. This could lead to more cost-effective national action through better mainstreaming of biodiversity in relevant sectors as well as through allocating resources for NBSAP preparation and implementation in a way that it not only benefits CBD but also the implementation of other relevant biodiversity related conventions.

The EU and its Member States would therefore like to propose amendments in draft decision adding paragraph 2(bis) welcoming the outcome of Rio+20 related to enhancing policy coherence and welcoming the work, including in particular by UNEP, on enhancing synergies between biodiversity-related conventions.

Furthermore we suggest adding text to paragraph 4 welcoming the report contained in CBD/COP/11/INFXX and requesting the Secretariat to further contribute to the activities of the EMG-IMG on biodiversity.

We welcome the 5th CBD/Ramsar Joint Work Plan, for 2011-2020 as the basis for the collaboration between the two Conventions and suggest adding a new paragraph 7(bis) to welcome the work plan. We will present all these proposals in writing.

Speaking notes on Arctic biodiversity

The EU and its MS welcome the SBSTTA 15 recommendations on Arctic biodiversity recognising the important work by the Arctic Council Working Group on Arctic flora and fauna (CAFF) and the need for close international cooperation in relation to the conservation and sustainable use of Arctic biodiversity. Conservation of Arctic biodiversity is especially important to the EU as we have both Member States with Arctic territory and which are members of the Arctic Council as well as other Member States which share responsibilities for migratory Arctic wildlife, some of whom are also observers to the Arctic Council. We therefore welcome the draft decision arctic biodiversity as it stands.

Speaking note on Biodiversity and Sustainable Tourism

The EU and its MS believe there is a need for enhanced collaboration and synergistic action also applies to the relationship between CBD and relevant UN organizations such as the UN World Tourism Organisation, and we support the SBSTTA 16 recommendations to that effect included in the draft decisions with regard to collaboration with FAO and WHO.

The existing CBD Guidelines on Biodiversity and Tourism Development provide for a comprehensive tool box and are a practical contribution to the implementation of the Strategic Plan. However, there seems to be a lack of knowledge with regard to the existence of the guidelines. Rio+20 called for the promotion of sustainable tourism and in light of the conclusions of UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/52/Rev.1, the EU and its MS believe that COP 11 should take a decision in this regard and have text to propose concerning ways and means to further enhance the use and application of the CBD Guidelines on biodiversity and tourism development at COP 12 and prepare this discussion at SBSTTA prior to COP12. We will provide our text proposal in writing.

Speaking note on Collaborative work on biodiversity and agriculture, forests and biodiversity and health:

Regarding the need for enhanced collaboration and synergistic action this also applies to the relationship between CBD and relevant UN organizations such as the UNWTO, FAO and UNFF, and we support the SBSTTA 16 recommendations on Collaborative work on biodiversity and agriculture, forests and biodiversity and health. Therefore we support lifting the brackets in paragraph 7 in SBSTTA recommendation XVI/15.

The EU and its Member States welcome the emphasis given to sound land and soil management in the context of the UNCCD in the Rio+20 outcome document, in particular its paragraph 206. Land and soil management presents a key opportunity for the protection of terrestrial biodiversity. In particular, meeting the challenges of land degradation and other global changes while having to sustain the productivity of our natural and managed lands requires not only knowing the role of soil biota but also acting on that knowledge. The EU and its Member States, therefore, suggest amending SBSTTA recommendation XVI/15 by welcome the establishment of the Global Soil Biodiversity Initiative (GSBI) and adding an invitation to Parties to support the Global Soil Biodiversity Atlas (GSBA):

We will submit all our proposed amendments electronically to the secretariat.

Agenda item 5. Cooperation, outreach and the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity:

5.3. Business and biodiversity

5.4. Engagement of other stakeholders, major groups and subnational authorities

Speaking note on Business and biodiversity:

Business engagement is a critical tool when developing appropriate enabling mechanisms for the mainstreaming of biodiversity into private sector and identifying innovative sources of finance for biodiversity and for successful implementation of the Strategic Plan on Biodiversity and we therefore need to strengthen the link between the business sector and biodiversity conservation.

Speaking note on Engagement of other stakeholders, major groups and subnational initiatives:

The EU and its MS and Croatia welcome the report on the implementation of the Plan of Action prepared by the Executive Secretariat and believe that follow up on decisions on promoting engagement of stakeholders and major groups should continue with the view to strengthen and improve activities based on prior experiences.

EU and its MS are looking forward to the launching of Cities and Biodiversity Outlook. The links and opportunities between urbanization and biodiversity are interesting and it should be investigated how to manage and restore ecosystem services in innovative ways.

EU and its MS strongly support enhanced South-South cooperation and recognise it as an important tool for achieving the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011 – 2020 including through further integration of biodiversity concerns into poverty eradication and welcomes the Multi-Year Plan of Action.

EU and its MS would also like to highlight that gender equality and women's empowerment are important prerequisites for environmental conservation and sustainable development. We therefore appreciate and welcome the progress made since the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to fully implement the Gender Plan of Action.

Agenda item 6. Operations of the Convention:

6.1. Periodicity of meetings

6.2. Consideration of the need to strengthen the existing mechanisms of the Convention and the need for and possible development of additional mechanisms

The EU and its Member States and Croatia welcome the progress made at SBSTTA15 and SBSTTA16 in considering the ways and means to improve the effectiveness of SBSTTA, as reflected in the reports from the two meetings and the recommended draft decisions.

We would also like to thank the Executive Secretary for preparing the Note on collaboration with IPBES.

The EU and its Member States and Croatia also welcome the establishment of IPBES in April this year in Panama City, Panama. We firmly believe that IPBES will contribute significantly to strengthening the application of science to policy and improving the evidence-base to support the implementation of CBD and other conventions and the synergy among them. We are committed to the further development and full operationalisation of the Platform, and encourage all parties, other Governments and relevant organisations to support the process.

It is our view that the Conference of the Parties to the CBD should provide SBSTTA and other CBD bodies with a mandate which is sufficiently broad in order to allow them to submit requests to IPBES on issues related to the mandate of IPBES to this body in the period between COP sessions, if the need arises.

Furthermore, we believe that SBSTTA should be allowed to send requests directly to IPBES on any scientific, technical or technological topic which COP has requested SBSTTA to consider including new and emerging issues on which COP has requested specific advice.

We also welcome the roundtable discussion on encouraging technical and scientific cooperation convened by the Bureau of SBSTTA at its 16th meeting. We believe that SBSTTA focal points in particular need tools to assist in improving the dissemination of the important work under the Convention.

Regarding the periodicity of meetings we believe that the overall focus of the CBD during this decade needs to be on the implementation of the Strategic Plan 2010-2020. Both the COPs and the CBD subsidiary bodies will have an important role to play in keeping implementation under review including the review of national target settings, updating NBSAPs and implementation of the Resource Mobilization Strategy.

The COPs themselves with their high-level segments and other events taking place in conjunction are also crucial for raising awareness and political attention to biodiversity related issues. To fulfill these functions and taking into account the other factors outlined in decision X/9, the current 2 years interval between COPs and 2 weeks duration of meetings seem to be appropriate also for the coming COPs between 2014 and 2020. However, the EU and its Member and Croatia states are willing to seriously discuss other options, on the understanding that any reorganisation should fully support the implementation of the CBD, keep the necessary political momentum and not lead to increased costs.

As regards to periodicity and length of subsidiary bodies meetings, the preferred option would also be status quo implying 2 SBSTTA meetings and one meeting of the Working Group of Review of Implementation and the Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions between COPs, each of one week's duration.

Synthetic biology

The EU, its MS and Croatia welcome the work done by SBSTTA16 in order to find a way forward regarding the proposal to consider synthetic biology as a new and emerging issue.

We consider that the information presented to Parties so far is not sufficient to take an informed decision on whether or not the issue of synthetic biology meets the criteria of a new and emerging issue to be considered by the CBD. Consequently, we are of the opinion that further analysis is required to better understand synthetic biology, its associated technologies, its implications as well as the application of existing regulatory frameworks such as the Cartagena Protocol, in order to be able to take an informed decision at a later stage.

In this context, with regard to the three proposed options for paragraph 3, we support the third option.

We are also of the view that the process to identify new and emerging issues from COP decision IX/29 needs refinement; and that the information made available to CBD Parties and stakeholders is not sufficient to take an informed decision in line with decision IX/29.

We support a collection of additional relevant information on synthetic biology, to be synthesised in a report by the Executive Secretary, which should be peer-reviewed. The synthesis report should be accompanied by a review of information in applying the criteria contained in paragraph 12 of decision IX/29, as proposed in paragraph 5.

Finally, we are of the view that the current proposal as contained in paragraph 4 is not justified and is too premature, considering the information available. However, we do wish to recognize the precautionary approach according to previous COP decisions.

We will provide the Secretariat with an alternative text that refers to the precautionary approach of the CBD, in line with previous COP decisions.

Agenda item 6. Operations of the Convention:

6.3. Retirement of decisions

The EU and its Member States and Croatia welcome the proposal for retirement of decisions and elements from COP 7 as contained in the document UNEP/CBD/COP/11/20 and UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/1. These documents constitute a good basis for discussion under this agenda item.

We agree with the proposed retirement of decisions and elements from COP7 except for one suggestion that was not included in the original table in notification 2011-225. The exception is Decision VII/5, §55 on marine and coastal biodiversity, which in our view is still relevant because it invites the General Assembly to further coordinate work relating to conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources of the deep seabed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

We are also of the view that the current retirement exercise might have a higher added value if it were conducted for all decisions on a particular issue at the time when a such decision is taken on the same subject matter and integrated in the preparation and adoption of new decisions. We would therefore suggest a modification of the focus of the exercise and would like to propose amendments to this effect to the draft decision.

We will submit our proposed amendments electronically to the secretariat.

[insert below to be read if the chair requests reading out the proposes text amendments]

“Recognising that the ‘retirement of decisions-exercise’ could have a higher added value if it were directed towards supporting the review of implementation of existing decisions.”

(New section)

“Requests the WGRI5 to propose options to change the focus of this exercise towards better supporting the review of implementation of existing decisions by integrating the exercise and proposals for retirement into the preparation and adoption of new decisions on the same subject matter, and present these for consideration by COP12.”

Agenda item 7. Article 8(j) and related provisions

The EU, its Member States and Croatia strongly support the promotion and preservation of indigenous and local communities' knowledge, innovations, practices and customary sustainable use of natural resources as important contribution to achieving the objectives of the Convention. Thus, we find it important to actively involve indigenous and local community representatives in the work of the Convention and to make all recommendations of WG8J transparent, understandable and useful in practice.

The EU and its Member States believe that the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets provide the overall frame of the work of the Convention towards 2020, and should also guide the work on Article 8(j) and related provisions. This implies integration of traditional knowledge, innovations, practices and customary sustainable use across the Aichi Targets and thereby implementation of Target 18.

We welcome the outcomes and recommendations of the 7th meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions in October/November 2011. We found the in-depth dialogue on ecosystem management, services and protected areas very useful.

The introduction of the in-depth dialogues together with enhanced focus on Article 10c and customary sustainable use have created renewed impetus to the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions.

Given the importance of traditional knowledge for achieving the objectives of the CBD and the Aichi Targets, the exchange of information of such knowledge is also important. This includes repatriation of information relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in accordance with Article 17.2

The EU and its Member States would like to propose following amendments to the recommendations in UNEP/CBD/COP/11/7:

- In Recommendation 7.1, paragraph 7 we support the next topics for indepth dialogue to be Climate change and biodiversity, with special focus on traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use and Education and research with a special focus on reviving and transmitting traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use practices.
- In recommendation 7.2, we propose to delete paragraph 21, as there already exist The International Day of the World's Indigenous Peoples which was declared by UNGA in 1994.
- In recommendation 7.4, we propose to delete "and international" in paragraph 6, and to insert a reference to COP12 in paragraph 7.
- In the annex to recommendation 7/4 we propose to lift the brackets around the reference to article 8(j) in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 and we propose the deletion of paragraph 3, subsection a and b. In paragraph 5 we propose to insert "other" before governments and in paragraph 6 we propose to insert a reference to COP.
- In recommendation 7/6, we propose to insert "approves" instead of "agrees on" in paragraph 2.

- In the annex to recommendation 7/4 we propose to lift the brackets in paragraphs 2 (task 3 and 4) and 4 (task 9) of the annex.

We will submit our proposed amendments electronically to the secretariat.

Agenda item 8. Review of the programme of work on island biodiversity

The EU, its Member States and Croatia would like to thank the Secretariat for the preparations on this agenda item. We welcome the review report and the progress in implementing the Programme of Work on Island Biodiversity identified and support the draft recommendation prepared for this item. We would also like to take the opportunity to acknowledge the constructive work of the Global Island Partnership (GLISPA).

The Member States of the EU include both Island Parties and Parties with islands. Islands in the EU, together with the overseas countries and territories of some EU Member States, individually and collectively, are of considerable value for their island biodiversity and many islands support communities who are dependent upon the sustainable use of this biodiversity. There are also those islands which do not support human populations, but which are very important for global biodiversity. This programme of work is thus of high importance to the EU and its Member States.

We note from the report that two of the six priority areas in the Programme of Work still need further work. In this regard, we believe that increased attention should be paid in the future in particular to Access and Benefit Sharing and Poverty Alleviation.

In this regard, we believe that the process towards signing and ratifying the Nagoya Protocol will assist in making progress in this priority area.

We support the proposal to accord priority to terrestrial protected areas including inland waters. These habitats are just as important as marine protected areas and deserve equal attention.

We welcome the work of the relevant IUCN Specialists Groups including Invasive Species Specialist Group as well as networks like the "Global Island Plant Conservation Network - GIPCN" in their support to the conservation and sustainable use of island biodiversity.

We recognise the particular vulnerability of islands facing increasing climate change and invasive alien species impacts, and emphasise the importance of the implementation of the Programme of Work in this regard and welcome the Island Innovations Event which will be hosted in the margins of this COP on 16 October 2012.

We would like to recall the "*Message from Reunion Island*", outcome of the conference "The European Union and its Overseas Entities: Strategies to counter Climate Change and Biodiversity Loss", Reunion Island, held in July 2008, which – inter alia- led to the BEST initiative to promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services in EU outermost regions and overseas countries and territories.

Agenda item 9. Ecosystem restoration

1st intervention

The EU its member states and Croatia, welcomes this draft recommendation.

We thank the Executive Secretary for the preparation of the report on progress on ecosystem restoration related issues, as requested by SBSTTA15. We also welcome that SBSTTA15 has provided a clean text for COP11 which we support.

We believe that work on ecosystem restoration should be integrated with work on specific ecosystems items like forests, wetlands, coastal ecosystems, etc. as they have different restoration needs and corresponding adaptive measures.

It is essential for us to underline that ecosystem restoration is the last resort and should never substitute for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, in particular intact ecosystems, and should not be a way to compensate destruction of other ecosystems.

The restoration of ecosystems is not only important for conservation reasons, but can also benefit objectives such as climate change mitigation, social economic development and food security.

2nd intervention

Recognising that other parties has proposed changes to the recommendation from SBSTTA15 the EU, its member states and Croatia, also has a proposal for a new paragraph in the preambular *recognising* that ecosystem restoration can also benefit objectives such as climate change mitigation, social-economic development and food security, as well as provide a framework for involvement of relevant stakeholders,

We will submit our proposed amendments electronically to the secretariat.

Agenda item 10. Marine and coastal biodiversity:

10.1. Identification of ecologically and biologically significant marine and coastal areas

10.2. Other matters related to marine and coastal biodiversity

The EU, its Member States and Croatia would like to thank the Executive Secretary for the progress reports on the important topics of marine and coastal biodiversity.

We are generally aware of the urgent need to enhance conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity, and have committed ourselves to a rapid and full implementation of relevant existing commitments, in particular the CBD Programme of Work on Marine and Coastal Areas and other ongoing processes. We further acknowledge that the Outcome of the Rio+20-conference is a strong message from the global community on the commitment to protect and restore the health, productivity and resilience of oceans and marine ecosystems and to maintain their biodiversity.

We therefore welcome the report on identification of ecologically or biologically significant areas (EBSAs) based on scientific criteria adopted by the CBD and call for further identifications of such areas. We congratulate the secretariat on the establishment of the prototype repository and stress that it should be further developed into a well functioning information-sharing mechanism. We find that there is an urgent need for improved international cooperation to create the necessary framework conditions for the establishment of protected areas in ABNJ. In this respect we recognise the work of the Regional Sea Conventions and others, such as Regional Fisheries Management Organisations, in identifying conservation areas in areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ). We reiterate that the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity in ABNJ should be done through an UNCLOS implementing agreement, and that negotiations should start as soon as possible in the framework of the UN General Assembly. Thus, we fully support the relevant outcome from the Rio+20 Conference and we hope that a decision to launch the negotiation of such an agreement can be taken as soon as possible. The identification of EBSAs is a very important tool to move this process forward.

The EU and its Member States therefore recommend the endorsement of the summary reports from the regional EBSA workshops. The endorsement should stimulate further workshops and identification of EBSAs. In that respect we support the recommendations from SBSTTA 16 noting that further scientific work and additional refinement is needed for the conclusive identification of EBSAs and their inclusion into the CBD repository in some regions.

The identification of areas that meet the agreed scientific criteria for EBSAs, as was agreed in COP9, is an open process that should be allowed revision – in particular when new scientific evidence is available. In this respect we are pleased with the participation of all relevant stakeholders in the regional EBSA workshops and we welcome in advance their invitation for additional regional workshops as a common practice from now on.

We have a strong commitment to push this process further. With regard to the Mediterranean areas the EU and its Member States are committed to continue the work in the framework of the Barcelona Convention to identify areas that meets the criteria. The contracting parties have asked the Secretariat of the Barcelona Convention to present the work carried out till now to the Secretariat of the CBD. It has been reiterated that this process must take place without prejudice to the competence of the Contracting Parties over marine areas that are or could be under their sovereignty or jurisdiction in accordance with international law as reflected in UNCLOS.

For the North East Atlantic we request to include in the repository the updated progress report jointly presented, but still to be endorsed, by OSPAR and NEAFC.

Having this in mind, we propose minor changes to paragraph 3 and 4, regarding the Mediterranean, as well as a new paragraph 4bis, related to the North-East Atlantic.

The EU and its Member States is committed to continue this process and therefore suggests to lift the brackets in paragraph 5 in order to endorse the summary reports as contained in the annex to the decision we want to adopt.

We will submit our proposed amendments electronically to the secretariat.

Furthermore, with regard to agenda item 10.2, we support all the conclusions in the reports on human impacts on marine and coastal biodiversity and we are convinced that all the issues deserve our attention. In particular we welcome the work relating to the impacts of marine debris and of underwater noise, including the call for development of indicators and frameworks for the monitoring of underwater noise. In relation to underwater noise, we would like to note that the European Union policies, as well as policies developed under the OSPAR, Barcelona Conventions and ACCOBAMS and ASCOBANS Agreements are in line with proposed criteria and indicators. In this sense, we would like to reaffirm the need for international, national as well as regional limitation of harmful underwater noise. In addition we note that HELCOM will develop criteria for underwater noise and criteria for litter for the Baltic Sea along the same lines.

We wish to underline the need to further collaboration in developing indicators and monitoring methodologies to ensure consistency and comparability. The implications of both marine debris and underwater noise need to be considered at a regional seas scale given the distances over which debris and noise travel in the marine environment and given the often highly mobile nature of sensitive species. Hence, we would like to highlight the work currently underway in numerous forums such as OSPAR, ASCOBANS and the EU Technical Subgroup Marine Litter and on Noise (established to support Member States in delivering the requirements of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD)) to develop indicators and monitoring programmes. It will be important for new activities to take into account existing processes in order to avoid overlap or duplication.

We also support the continuation of work on other impacts of human activities, as well as the voluntary guidelines on environmental impact assessment and strategic environmental assessment in marine and coastal areas. With regard to marine spatial planning, we fully support the organisation of expert and training workshops but we also think that the agenda of these workshops should leave room for a variety of different ways in which this tool can be employed in practice.

Finally we consider that there is a need for urgent action to manage all fish stocks sustainably, consistent with the precautionary principle and applying the ecosystem-based approach, to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing activities, to avoid overfishing and destructive fishing practices, and to ensure that fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems. This requires close co-operation between those responsible for fisheries management and those working with marine environmental issues in a broader sense.

We have a few amendments to the recommendation regarding paragraph 3 in order to clarify the role of regional fisheries management organisations, and also regarding paragraph 28 on marine litter trying to address the sources of marine litters and finally we support lifting the brackets in the voluntary guidelines paragraph 1 to 4.

To summarize, the EU, its member states and Croatia fully support the recommendations from SBSTTA 16 on agenda item 10.2.

Agenda item 11. Biodiversity and climate change and related issues:

11.1. Advice on the application of relevant safeguards for biodiversity with regard to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries

11.2. Studies on geo-engineering

11.3. Other matters related to biodiversity and climate change

The EU, its Member States and Croatia welcome the progress made at SBSTTA 16 and we appreciate the great efforts made by the Secretariat to provide the documents for the COP 11.

The EU and its Member States believe that it is central that the Parties at this COP provide advice on how to apply the REDD+ safeguards for biodiversity, as well as advice on how to monitor and assess the impacts of REDD+ on biodiversity. The strong link to the UNFCCC process as well as the urgency of moving to the implementation of REDD+ must be kept in mind during our discussions.

The EU and its Member States fully support the revised advice as put forward in document UNEP/CBD/COP/11/24 and welcome this advice as an annex. In addition the EU and its Member States finds it very important that the indicative list of indicators is referenced in the decision.

In the decision we also believe that the link to other relevant stakeholders should be kept. And as the paragraph has been opened by other parties to note that apart from the ongoing safeguards initiatives similar initiatives not directly directed towards safeguards also supports the safeguards on biodiversity.

In addition we would like to propose changes to paragraph 13 where we would suggest keeping reference to COP 12 in order to keep momentum and as paragraph 8c has been opened we have a minor insertion to the text.

On geo-engineering, the EU and its Member States welcome the background studies and the progress that has been made at SBSTTA 16. The EU and its Member States would like to emphasise, that the priority in terms of addressing climate change should be to address the problem at source, by a rapid and significant reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from human activities.

The EU and its Member States strongly support that the secretariat and relevant organizations continue to compile and update information on the biodiversity impacts of geo-engineering and on the regulatory framework. Updated information should build on the next assessment report from the IPCC as well as the report from the IPCC Expert meeting on this subject.

In addition we would like to propose changes to a few further paragraphs, namely Paragraph 12 where we support option 1 and paragraph 15b where we support to lift the brackets.

On other matters related to biodiversity and climate change, the EU and its Member States welcome the progress made at SBSTTA 16 and would like to thank the Secretariat and Parties for their continuing efforts. These efforts include building a knowledge base and information sharing, as reported in the progress report. In the context of this agenda item the EU and its Member States would like to stress that ecosystem-based approaches should be central to adaptation to those climate impacts that are unavoidable. We would also take this opportunity to stress the importance of wetlands for climate mitigation and adaptation, recognising the outcome of Ramsar Convention COP 11 in July 2012. In addition we have suggestions for revisions of paragraph 5.

The suggestions we have mentioned is only to bracketed or opened text. If agreed text is opened by other Parties we would like to reserve the right to come in with a few more suggestions at a later stage.

We will submit our proposed amendments to the secretariat and very much look forward to the discussions on these important topics.

Agenda item 12. Biodiversity and development

EU and its Member States and Croatia is of the opinion that the “Dehradun Recommendations” on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development include a number of good elements that further contribute to the integration and mainstreaming of biodiversity within poverty eradication strategies, official development aid practice, and sustainable development at large. However, in their current format written as a CBD COP decision with requests to Parties and others, we believe that it would not be appropriate for COP 11 to endorse them as such. At this stage, COP should *welcome* the Recommendations and encourage Parties to use them in up-dating and implementing national poverty reduction strategies and National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAP’s) as well as take them into account in related plans, policies and actions and in implementation of related programmes.

EU and its Member States support the continuation of the Expert Group on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development. Given the importance and the complexity of its work, the group should be clearly mandated to report to WGR15 which should then prepare a set of consolidated recommendations to COP12. This will require terms of reference aiming towards preparing for WGR15 and COP decision with the perspective to subsequently drafting a roadmap on the actual implementation of the recommendations. The terms of reference should have clear reference to the Dehradun Recommendations and build on the results and findings of the process so far, including the outcomes of the two expert meetings (2009 and 2011) and of COP10.

We would also like to stress that in the context of the outcomes of Rio+20, we acknowledge the role of access and benefit-sharing arising from the utilization of genetic resources in contributing to poverty eradication and environmental sustainability.

In the draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/11/33/REV.1. the EU and its Member States would like to propose adding a preamble in the beginning of text recognising the outcome of RIO+20. In paragraph 2 we *Welcome* the recommendations. We also have some amendments to the terms of reference which are reflected in the paragraph 3. EU and its MS also proposes a process towards preparing and for the issue to be further developed in order to ensure that the issue is further developed before bringing it to COP12 – this is procedure is reflected in paragraph 6 and by suggesting adding paragraph 7(bis).

In the draft Terms of reference in CBD/COP11/33/ADD.1. EU and its MS suggest amendments in paragraph 7 and 8 which reflects the above mentioned amendments to the draft COP decision.

We will submit our proposed amendments electronically to the secretariat

Agenda item 13. Other substantive issues arising from the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties:

13.1. Biodiversity of dry and sub-humid lands

The EU and its Member States and Croatia would like to thank the Secretariat for the preparations for this agenda item.

We welcome the report on the activities and progress achieved regarding the biodiversity of dry and sub-humid lands. We also welcome efforts to determine the impact of on-going actions, such as the collection of case-studies in a dedicated database. Such evidence should be taken into account in setting priorities under this programme of work.

Finally, we would like to highlight that deliberations under Item 5.2 of this meeting, which addresses cooperation between conventions, are relevant also for the present discussion. The conclusions we reach under Item 5.2 should be instructive not least for cooperation between the CBD and the UNCCD.

Agenda item 13. Other substantive issues arising from the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties:

13.3. Inland waters biodiversity

The EU its Member States and Croatia would like to thank the Secretariat for the preparations on this agenda item on Inland waters biodiversity and recognise the importance of water to most areas of the Strategic Plan.

We support the draft recommendations as contained in COP/11/1/Add.2 and recognise that water is essential for all biodiversity aspects. Thus we agree that water and the water cycle should be considered as a cross-cutting issue.

We support further collaboration on wetland issues between CBD and the Ramsar Convention and other related agreements, such as the African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement including the use of common definitions and terms in order to avoid duplication of work and overlap.

The EU and its Member States also welcome the results of the 11th meeting of the Parties to the Ramsar Convention that took place in Bucharest in July this year. We believe that the 5th CBD / Ramsar Joint Work Plan running until 2020 is an important basis for the collaboration between the conventions, and believe it is important for COP11 to welcome this Joint Work Plan.

We support the text as it is but will submit short amendments to the secretariat to reflect synergy with Ramsar and related agreements and the CBD Ramsar Joint work plan if it turns out that the text does not stand.

Agenda item 13. Other substantive issues arising from the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties:

13.4. Protected areas

On behalf of the EU, its Member States and Croatia, I would like to express our appreciation for the document prepared by the Secretariat on the important subject of Protected Areas and its Programme of Work. We support the recommendations.

Protected areas are of critical importance for halting the loss of biodiversity and for safeguarding natural resources and ecosystem services. The work on protected areas and in particular the Programme of Work on Protected Area Action Plans, supplemented by other effective area-based conservation measures are important in order to meet the Aichi Target 11 as well as to a number of other Aichi Targets such as 1, 2, 10, 14, 15 and 19.

We believe that adequately and equitably managed and well-governed protected areas and a representative network of protected areas worldwide is crucial to meet the 2020 mission of the Strategic Plan to take effective and urgent action to halt the loss of biodiversity, to ensure ecosystem services resilience and to contribute to and enhance human well-being. This applies to terrestrial as well as to marine protected areas, within as well as beyond national jurisdiction. For such protected areas to be established also in areas beyond national jurisdiction, we recognise the work of the Regional Sea Conventions and others in identifying and conserving areas in areas beyond national jurisdiction, but we maintain that an UNCLOS implementing agreement for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction should be negotiated in the framework of the United Nations General Assembly, and that in accordance with the outcomes of "Rio+20" a decision on such an implementing agreement will be taken before the end of UNGA 69.

We also appreciate the fact that 105 national action plans have been submitted to the CBD secretariat for analysis.

EU and its Member States welcome the recommendations to integrate the Programme of Work on Protected Area Action Plans into updated and revised national biodiversity strategies and action plans NBSAPS and to streamline the action plan to secure financing of the effective management of protected areas at national and regional level.

We further underline the need for accessible data and analytic tools to support the Programme of Work on Protected Areas and we will provide some text to refer to the use of these tools.

Since the recommendations are directed towards promoting international cooperation and partnerships at all levels and in particular South-to-South and North-to-South cooperation, we would also turn the attention to other biodiversity-related international agreements such as the Ramsar Convention and regional agreements such as the African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA), the Bern Convention and Regional Sea Convention, which have tools in place to promote such cooperation efforts on the ground for Protected Areas. We welcome the renewed work programme between the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Ramsar Convention for adoption at this Conference.

We would also like to introduce some short text that would create a link between the benefit sharing under the Nagoya Protocol and the establishment and management of Protected Areas.

Lastly, we are encouraged by the fact that the proportion of both terrestrial and marine protected areas - despite challenges - are increasing both in coverage and representativeness. We agree that additional challenges in front of us range from the establishment of functional protected-area networks to strengthening the inter-agency and inter-sectoral coordination as well as to mainstreaming Protected Areas into the wider land- and seascapes.

To reflect the views of the EU and its Member States and Croatia we would like to propose amendments for the following paragraphs 1a, 2, 6 bis, 7, 8, 8 bis and 9 in the draft decision. We will submit our proposed amendments electronically to the secretariat.

Thank you very much

Agenda item 13. Other substantive issues arising from the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties

13.6. Sustainable use of biodiversity

The EU and Member States and Croatia appreciate the progress made at SBSTTA15 on the important subject of sustainable use of biodiversity. We support the recommendation.

Sustainable use of biodiversity, the 2nd objective of the Convention is of critical importance both for halting the loss of biodiversity and sustaining livelihoods and to alleviate poverty. To this effect we highlight the role and relevance of sustainable use in the Aichi Targets and support its increased integration in all programmes of work of the Convention.

Sustainable use is closely linked to three other important CBD objectives: mainstreaming of biodiversity concerns across sectors, application of the ecosystem approach and the promotion of indigenous and local communities' traditional knowledge, innovation, practices and customary sustainable use of biodiversity.

In itself, sustainable use is a wide concept which needs to be broken up into specific, concrete areas to become operational. Unsustainable hunting and trade of wild animals for bushmeat is a very well-chosen topic for the CBD to focus on due to the serious threats to biodiversity, livelihoods and food security it is posing.

EU and its Member States welcome the recommendations of the Liaison Group on Bushmeat as a potential complement to the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines. We see them as a very useful instrument to promote alternatives to unsustainable management and use of wildlife with the involvement of indigenous and local communities, the scientific community and sectors such as agriculture, fisheries and forestry.

While the recommendations are directed to tropical and sub-tropical countries, we believe that they are also relevant and could be adapted to other countries.

Lastly, we are encouraged by the fact that the recommendations on bushmeat are also the result of a successful collaboration between the CBD and CITES. This type of collaboration between the biodiversity related conventions in our view is very important in achieving the Aichi targets.

Agenda item 13. Other substantive issues arising from the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties

13.7. Global Strategy for Plant Conservation

EU and its MS and Croatia support the updated Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, with the aim of integrating the GSPC within the wider Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and for achieving the Aichi targets.

EU and its MS welcome the analysis for developing common indicators as an example of ways that Parties can streamline monitoring of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation with monitoring of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, whilst recognising the importance of collating information pertinent for plant conservation activities.

EU and its MS have no amendments for text.

Agenda item 13. Other substantive issues arising from the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties

13.8. Biofuels and biodiversity

The EU and its Member States and Croatia, welcomes this draft recommendation.

The issue of biofuels has often been a matter of diverging views in CBD. We are therefore pleased to see that SBSTTA16 managed to solve the differences of opinion and produce a clean text without any outstanding issues. We therefore congratulate all parties involved in that process, as reflected in the report and recommendations from the SBSTTA16 meeting.

In this regard we note that the agreed recommendations are the result of a carefully balanced compromise and would therefore stress the importance of accepting the text as it stands.

In the EU we have a package of energy and climate change legislation which provides a legislative framework for Community targets for greenhouse gas emission savings. It encourages energy efficiency, energy consumption from renewable sources, the improvement of energy supply and the economic stimulation of a dynamic sector in which Europe is setting an example. The European system of sustainable production of raw materials for biofuels and bioliquids already attempts very ambitious to address environmental as well as social concerns. The sustainability criteria set out in Directive 2009/28/EC are related to greenhouse gas savings, land with high biodiversity value, land with high carbon stock and agro-environmental practices.

We believe that the draft recommendation is at step forward to ensure a sustainable development of the production of raw materials for biofuels and bioliquids.

Agenda item 13. Other substantive issues arising from the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties

13.9. Invasive alien species

The EU, its Member States and Croatia welcome the recommendations to COP 11 as put forward in document UNEP/CBD/COP11/2 on ways and means to address gaps in international standards primarily regarding invasive alien species introduced as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, as live bait and live food, but also other gaps and inconsistencies in the international regulatory framework.

We would also like to thank the Executive Secretary for preparing the progress report UNEP/CBD/COP/11/28.

For the EU and its Member States it is important that WTO's SPS Committee and relevant standard setting bodies should be encouraged to develop and improve international standards on IAS that pose threats to biodiversity but are not considered pest of plants, pathogens or parasites.

We would like to emphasise that the Aichi Targets should guide the future work of the CBDs cross cutting issues and thematic areas, and therefore find the considerations for the future work on the invasive alien species in paras 19 and 20 of the recommendation essential for implementing the Aichi Target 9. This should cover the whole range of issues identified in previous relevant COP decisions.

We would like the Executive Secretary to actively pursue the application of CBD observer status in the SPS Committee. In this way we would ensure coherence in the work done in different fora on this complicated issue. Therefore we would like the square brackets in para 14 to be deleted and to add a sentence at the beginning of the para 14 saying that the COP "invites the Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures of the World Trade Organization to favourably address the application of the CBD for observer status."

With regard to the proposal put forward by the Executive Secretary in document UNEP/CBD/COP/11/28 the EU and its Member States find the COP should welcome the Guidelines for Assessing the risk of Non-native Animals Becoming Invasive published by the World Organisation for Animal Health and that the COP should encourage Parties and Governments to make use of the guidelines in addressing the risk from invasive alien animal species.

We are happy to see that our contribution to the Global Invasive Alien Species Information Partnership has facilitated further collaboration among the organizations involved in the partnership. We support the related proposed recommendation as contained in COP/11/28. Besides the suggested lifting of the brackets in para 14 and adding a new sentence to para 14, we have some minor editorial changes in para 5, 10(a), 12 and 18.

We will provide all amendments in writing.

Agenda item 13. Other substantive issues arising from the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties

13.11. Incentive measures

The EU, its MS and Croatia would like to thank the Executive Secretary for the progress report and the analysis of the submissions received on this important topic. We are also pleased with the progress achieved at SBSTTA 16 on this issue.

We generally attach great importance to positive incentive measures as a means for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and for meeting not only Target 2, 3 and 4 but all the Aichi Targets.

Positive incentive measures for biodiversity are primarily intended to change behaviour, to limit pressures on resources and to promote virtuous behaviour. The main role of incentive measures, in terms of influencing consumption and production behaviours, is to reduce pressures on biodiversity and encourage positive impacts, thereby reducing financing needs, and the positive measures are justified because they correct environmental externalities.

Some incentive measures are also revenue-raising instruments and are therefore important for the implementation of the Resource Mobilization Strategy, including the promotion of innovative financing mechanisms and changed sectoral policies. At this point we therefore would like to recall and reiterate what we stated under agenda item 4.1 last Tuesday in our opening statement. Resource mobilisation goes beyond direct financial flows. A substantial share of additional resources must come from more effectively mainstreaming biodiversity across sectors and reflecting biodiversity values and priorities in decision making processes; and from further improving the effectiveness of existing funding streams. It is clear that the magnitude of the biodiversity funding challenge will also require the mobilisation of new types of funding sources, not least from promoting green economy and innovative financial mechanisms.

In this context positive incentive measures not only raise revenues, they also have an indirect effect as the use of incentives to support the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity reduces the pressures on biodiversity and thereby reduces financing needs. Using the right incentives measures is therefore crucial to mainstreaming the consideration of biodiversity in other sectors and delivering the Aichi targets in the most cost effective way possible.

The EU and its Member States welcome the many studies that have been carried out at national level on economic valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services often making use of the international study on The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB). We hope that this trend will continue and that the studies will be an integral part of the process to revise and update NBSAPs.

Studies on the economics of ecosystems and biodiversity provide a useful basis for the reform, removal or mitigation of perverse incentives, the promotion of positive incentives and thereby the promotion of sustainable production and consumption patterns - measures which are fundamental for achieving the objectives of the CBD.

As outlined in our earlier submission on this topic, the EU Biodiversity Strategy adopted in 2011 includes measures aimed at the removal or mitigation of perverse incentives, and the promotion of positive incentives for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. Some examples include:

- Financial and other incentives encouraging farmers, forest holders and fishermen to protect and enhance biodiversity and ecosystem services.
- Fostering innovative mechanisms, such as Payments for Ecosystem services to finance the maintenance and restoration of ecosystem services
- Action to map and assess the state of ecosystems and their services in Member States and promoting the integration of these values into accounting and reporting systems at EU and national level by 2020.

More generally, the EU is undertaking major reforms of key policy areas such as the Common Agricultural Policy, and the Common Fisheries Policy, as well as discussions on the next financial perspectives of 2014-2020 and is committed to mainstreaming biodiversity values in this context.

Finally we would like to make an organisational point with regard to this topic: Since incentives measures are clearly a cross-cutting topic with is closely linked with both the Strategic Plan and the Resource Mobilization Strategy we believe that future preparations of this topic for COP should take place in the Working Group for Review of Implementation rather than in SBSTTA.

Closing Statement

Madame President,

I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union and its 27 Member States, and Croatia.

Firstly, I would like to reiterate our sincere gratitude to you, Madame President, as well as to the Government and people of India, for having welcomed all of us here and for your valuable contribution to the success of this meeting.

The agreement which we have reached today represents an essential contribution towards achieving the objectives of the Strategic Plan 2011-2020 and its 20 Aichi Targets. It is our common responsibility to meet the hopes of the people and of the international community in tackling the challenge of global biodiversity protection.

It was with great emotion that the European Union received last week the historic news of the award of the 2012 Nobel Peace Prize. Even in these difficult times, we are convinced that biodiversity protection and its contribution to poverty alleviation and sustainable development are core elements of a more peaceful world.

Madame President,

the European Union and its Member States welcome all the important decisions that have been adopted here, often after challenging but always constructive negotiations, on issues such as, inter alia, the application of relevant biodiversity safeguards with regard to REDD+; better conservation and more sustainable use of marine biodiversity and the identification of Ecologically or Biologically Significant Areas; and the enhancement of cooperation and synergy within the three Rio Conventions and the biodiversity-related conventions.

On the crucial issue of resource mobilisation, the European Union and its Member States stand behind the commitments they made at COP10 to substantially increase financial, human and technical resources globally from all possible sources, including innovative financial mechanisms for biodiversity, balanced with the effective implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Strategic Plan, against an established baseline and an effective reporting framework.

In this regard, the European Union and its Member States, together, commit to doubling total biodiversity-related international financial resource flows from a variety of sources to developing countries, in particular least developed countries and Small Island Developing States, as well as countries with economies in transition, by 2015, and at least maintaining this level until 2020.
Madame President,

The European Union and its Member States want to express their sincere gratitude to all Parties for having done their utmost to contribute to the successful outcome of this 11th Conference of the Parties;

We look very much forward to continue working with all of you. I wish all of you safe home.

**High Level Segment
(17-19 October 2012)**

Opening Statement by Mr Sofoclis Aletraris, Minister of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment of Cyprus, President of the Council of the European Union

Madame President,

I am speaking on behalf of the European Union and its 27 Member States, and Croatia.

Firstly, I would like to thank you for your warm hospitality here in Hyderabad and to congratulate you for having the presidency of the Convention on Biological Diversity for the next two years. At the same time, I would like to thank Japan for its outstanding contribution to the Convention in the past two years.

The agreement reached at the 10th Conference of the Parties in Nagoya 2010, including an ambitious Strategic Plan 2011-2020 with the 20 Aichi Targets, the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing and the decision on resource mobilization, was, indeed, of utmost significance for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.

The Conference of the Parties Presidency has chosen four key topics to be discussed among ministers during these days. I would like to address them during my intervention:

All efforts have now turned to implementation to achieve tangible results on the ground. It is very promising that so many countries are now in the process of updating their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, or are planning to do so. The European Union and its Member States have already adopted a new and ambitious Biodiversity Strategy to 2020, building on a set of targets, and in line with our Nagoya commitments. The European Union Member States are also actively developing their own strategies.

The European Union and its Member States emphasize the need to substantially increase financial, human and technical resources globally from all possible sources, including innovative financial mechanisms for biodiversity, balanced with the effective implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Strategic Plan, against an established baseline. We stand behind our commitments made in Nagoya.

The European Union and its Member States are making significant contributions to biodiversity funding – domestically and globally. At global level, the European Union and its Member States committed on average around € 1.7 billion annually for biodiversity-related aid during the period 2006 to 2010, accounting for over 50% of Official Development Assistance for biodiversity from all donors. During the same period, we have more than doubled European Union biodiversity assistance, from € 1.3 billion in 2006 to € 3 billion in 2010.

I would like to underline that resource mobilisation is not only about financial flows between countries. Additional resources must also come from mainstreaming biodiversity across sectors and taking into account biodiversity values in decision making processes. The magnitude of the biodiversity funding challenge will also require the mobilisation of new types of funding sources, not least from promoting green economy and innovative financial mechanisms.

The Aichi Targets and the attention they have brought to biodiversity and the role of the Convention are of the outmost importance. There is a long way to go to ensure implementation, but we are delighted to see the growing number of initiatives that are being developed and undertaken around the world and we have high expectations that these will lead to tangible results in the coming years.

National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans are key mechanisms providing focal points for leadership, engagement and resource mobilisation to deliver national goals and targets.

Madame President,

Biodiversity underpins ecosystem services and thereby is an essential element to achieve sustainable development and poverty eradication. This was reaffirmed at the highest political level at the Rio+20 Summit in Brazil in June 2012. The Aichi Targets on biodiversity represent an important contribution to the global Sustainable Development Goals which are to be developed as a follow-up to Rio+20.

The European Union and its Member States welcome the “Dehradun Recommendations” on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development since they include a number of worthwhile elements contributing to the integration of biodiversity in poverty eradication strategies, official development aid practice, and sustainable development at large.

The European Union and its Member States are fully aware of the urgent need for better conservation and more sustainable use of marine biodiversity. We welcome the outcome of the Rio+20 Conference, which includes a strong commitment to protect and restore the health, productivity and resilience of oceans and marine ecosystems and to maintain their biodiversity. Rio has also given a very clear task for the process under the United Nations General Assembly to which work under this convention also needs to make a significant contribution. We therefore attach great importance to the identification of Ecologically or Biologically Significant Areas, and we would like to see more areas identified as such.

The European Union and its Member States also attach great importance to enhancing cooperation and synergy within the three Rio Conventions and the biodiversity related conventions. We are committed to contribute to the fulfilment of the mandate from Nagoya, for the Convention on Biological Diversity to provide advice on the application of relevant safeguards for biodiversity and indicators to assess the impacts of Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation measures on biodiversity. The European Union and its Member States are also very interested to see the work on synergies between biodiversity related Conventions stepped up and will contribute actively to all efforts in this direction, including those undertaken by the United Nations Environment Programme as mandated by the Rio outcome.

The European Union and its Member States are strong supporters of the Nagoya Protocol. With our signatures we have signalled our commitment to contribute to its full implementation and early entry into force. It is in this perspective that the European Commission has recently presented a draft legislative proposal for consideration by the Council of the European Union and the European Parliament. Once the legislative procedure is completed, the European Union and its Member States will be able to ratify and we are confident that we will be able to participate as Parties of the Protocol at the 12th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Madame President,

The European Union and its Member States will do their utmost to contribute to the successful outcome of the 11th Conference of the Parties, and we have no doubt that Hyderabad will energise our efforts to meet the challenge ahead.
