



# Brief for Pacific Island Countries



## Convention on Biological Diversity Tenth Conference of the Parties

18 - 29 October, 2010  
Nagoya, Japan



## **PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief**

### **Introduction**

The Pacific CBD COP10 Brief (Pacific Brief) was prepared in response to a request by Pacific Island Countries at the Pacific regional CBD COP10 preparatory meeting held in Nadi, Fiji from the 16-18 August, 2010. The overall purposes of the Pacific Brief are to provide substantive information on key agenda items that are of relevance to the Pacific and to propose possible positions for the 14 Pacific Island Countries that are parties to the CBD to consider and take forward as part of the One Pacific Voice approach.

SPREP, with funding from the EU-UNEP MEA Capacity Building Project, contracted a consultant to assist with the drafting of the Pacific Brief. The Brief encapsulates the key relevant COP10 recommendations and proposes possible recommendations for the Pacific to consider. It also draws on key regional policies, strategies and agreements. The first draft of the Pacific Brief was circulated to all SPREP Member countries and partners for review and input. The final Pacific Brief incorporates comments and inputs received.

The Pacific Brief encompasses the overarching themes and recommendations from the Pacific CBD COP10 Preparatory Meeting. More importantly, the 21 SPREP Ministers' Communiqué which supports the One Pacific Voice at COP10 on the understanding that there are common issues of relevance and importance to the Pacific, which should be best pursued within the wider Pacific context. Notwithstanding these, there are also national issues of national interest to some countries which individual countries may wish to pursue.

The Pacific Brief does not intend to provide all the answers to the issues to be discussed at COP10 nor does it attempt to address all agenda items; however, it provides an excellent platform for coordination and an opportunity for Pacific Island Countries to have a common position of key selected issues that are of importance and relevance to the Pacific as a whole. The proposed positions are for consideration by the Pacific Island Country members that are party to the CBD. Decisions on whether to accept, modify or reject these recommendations are solely the prerogatives of the Pacific Island Country party members.

### **Strategy for effective participation at COP10**

Effective participation at COP10 is one of the key strategies which was discussed and agreed to at the Pacific CBD COP10 preparatory meeting. This is delivered through the Pacific Voice in the form of the Pacific Brief, Pacific side events, coordinated support and assistance from CROP agencies and collaborating partners and better coordination of Pacific meetings and briefings at COP10.

Country leads and co-leads have been identified for the key relevant agenda items. They will follow the issues, report back to the group and make interventions which have been supported collectively by the Pacific group at plenary and in the working groups. Overall coordinators for the two parallel working groups have been identified and their main tasks are to provide overall coordination, keep track of the issues being discussed and provide guidance to the groups. Organizations such as SPREP, CROP agencies, NGOs and collaborating partners will be available on site to provide technical support, advice and assistance to the Pacific group.

The Pacific group will also work closely with GLISPA to coordinate with other island parties particularly on issues that are of concerns to small island developing countries. An island briefing will be held on Sunday the 17<sup>th</sup> October organized by GLISPA and supported by partners including SPREP. The Island Briefing will provide an opportunity for Pacific delegates to be updated on key issues at COP10 and to establish contacts with other island countries who may be able to support Pacific positions.

## **PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief**

At COP10, the Pacific will highlight and showcase some of its key conservation successes and achievements as a way to demonstrate the commitment of the Pacific to biodiversity conservation. The Pacific has many species which are of global significance. However, some of these species are in danger of becoming extinct due to the impacts of climate change, invasive species, and other environmental threats. To assist the Pacific address some of these key challenges, there are key areas of support which will be required to strengthen the implementation of biodiversity conservation priorities and these include increased financial resources and technical assistance from the international community and donors.

To raise the profile of the Pacific, two side events are organized by SPREP for the Pacific which will highlight successes, achievements and challenges of the Pacific through statements by key speakers and exhibitions of Pacific biodiversity products and key initiatives. Other side events are organized by some of the Pacific national governments including other organizations and these will also feature the Pacific. A Pacific Voyage information pamphlet is being prepared providing a roadmap to the Pacific specific side events and it will also have key information to help guide the delegates through the COP meeting.

Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme  
**TWENTY-FIRST SPREP MEETING**  
Madang, Papua New Guinea  
6 – 10 September 2010

**PACIFIC ENVIRONMENT MINISTERS' COMMUNIQUÉ**

1. The 21st Meeting of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme convened in Madang, Papua New Guinea, 6 - 10 September 2010. The high-level segment was attended by Ministers from Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, New Caledonia, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Tokelau, Tonga and Vanuatu and Heads of Delegation from American Samoa, Australia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, France, French Polynesia, New Zealand, Niue, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu and the United States of America.
2. Heads of Delegation thanked the Government of Papua New Guinea and the Provincial Government and people of Madang for the kind hospitality extended to them during their stay in Madang.
3. The Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Pacific region responsible for environmental conservation and management, having met in Madang, Papua New Guinea during this International Year of Biodiversity, **affirmed** that:
  - biological diversity is the foundation of the well-being of our communities and cultures;
  - in the face of the predicted irreparable damage to the ability of ecosystems to provide the goods and services on which people depend, all must work together to conserve biodiversity, use it sustainably and respond to threats to its integrity; and
  - the loss of biodiversity is compounded by the overwhelming threat of climate change, and the region's response to climate change must be linked to its efforts to conserve and manage the region's species and ecosystems.

They further:

2011-2015 Strategic Plan

4. **Adopted** the new Strategic Plan 2011-2015 as the guiding document for regional environmental priorities and the work of SPREP to address these in the coming five years. They welcomed the consultative process that led to development of the plan, and endorsed the vision of '*The Pacific environment, sustaining our livelihoods and natural heritage in harmony with our cultures.*'
5. **Adopted** the four priorities of the Strategic Plan as climate change, biodiversity and ecosystem management, waste management and pollution prevention, and environmental monitoring and governance.
6. **Encouraged** the Secretariat to prioritise and facilitate systematic monitoring and reporting on outputs and contributions to outcomes at the national level in order to demonstrate results.
7. **Directed** the Secretariat to ensure that resource allocation reflects the priorities in the Strategic Plan with core resources prioritised to core functions in the first instance, and to secure the resources and to facilitate and implement partnerships to meet the goals of the Strategic Plan.
8. **Requested** donor agencies and partner organisations to note that the Strategic Plan outlines the key environmental priorities for Pacific countries and territories and urged them to support implementation of the Strategic Plan.

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

### Climate Change

9. **Noted** with concern the ongoing issues of global climate change and the resulting impacts on Pacific islands including threat to the survival of some of these islands.
10. **Endorsed** the leadership role played by SPREP in supporting climate change activities in the region; in particular its leading role in the effective coordination and implementation of climate change mitigation and adaptation efforts, including on coordination and harmonisation of climate change financing in the region.
11. **Urged** Members of SPREP to enhance capacity at the national level to continue access and coordination of financing from bilateral partners and multilateral sources, noting the principles adopted at the 2010 Forum Leaders' Meeting.
12. **Noted** the commitment of all Members to move towards a durable, environmentally effective and legally binding outcome in the UNFCCC as quickly as possible and to use COP16 in Cancun to achieve this objective.
13. **Urged** all countries to fulfil their voluntary commitments enshrined in the Copenhagen Accord including the implementation of mitigation commitments and actions, enhanced adaptation actions and commitments to fast-start and longer term financing. They welcomed the fast-start pledges of developed countries and the delivery of fast-start funding to date.
14. **Directed** the Secretariat to continue to provide technical information and support to Pacific island countries and territories (PICTs) on climate change issues and negotiations, including assisting PICTs with a preparatory meeting prior to UNFCCC COP16 in Cancun.
15. **Reiterated**, in relation to climate change issues and negotiations, the value and significance of cooperation and exchange of information between SPREP Members and with the Secretariat.
16. **Endorsed** the approach to revision of the PIFACC to take account of the findings of the mid-term review and developments over the first five years of its operation. Furthermore, timely support from donors to implement the PIFACC over the next five years was called for.

### Conservation of the Ocean

17. **Emphasised** the critical importance of ensuring the sustainable development, management and conservation of our ocean.
18. **Reiterated** the critical role of SPREP in the promotion of, and support for the management and conservation of island, coastal and marine ecosystems through its new Strategic Plan.
19. **Welcomed** the decision of the Pacific Islands Forum Leaders in Port Vila in August 2010 to endorse the Framework for the Pacific Oceanscape, noting with appreciation the role of SPREP in its development, and welcomed their request to CROP agencies to implement the Framework in partnership with other relevant organisations.
20. **Directed** the Secretariat to work with CROP agencies and to develop a recommended approach for SPREP in implementing the Framework in the context of the Strategic Plan for consideration by the 22nd SPREP Meeting.

### Biodiversity

21. **Noted** with concern the increasing challenge and need for greater commitment to achieve the 2010 biodiversity targets and the continuing high rate of biodiversity loss and decline of ecosystem services in the Pacific.
22. **Commended** the Republic of Kiribati for establishing the Phoenix Islands Protected Area, the world's largest marine protected area, and its successful inscription as a World Heritage Area; the United States for the establishment of its new Pacific marine monuments; and the successful inscription of the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument as a World Heritage Area; and New Caledonia's lagoons and coral reefs that were inscribed as a World Heritage Area in July 2008.
23. **Encouraged** other Pacific island countries and territories to take similar action to conserve and manage important terrestrial and marine ecosystems.

## **PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief**

24. **Noted** the importance of having One Pacific Voice at the forthcoming 10<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in Nagoya, Japan, to ensure that COP decisions, including on developing post-2010 strategic plan goals and targets, take into account the needs of Small Island Developing States, as well as at other international conventions, in particular the UNFCCC.

25. **Noted and welcomed** the collaborative work of Republic of the Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and Palau, which aims to conserve 30% of their nearshore marine resources and 20% of their terrestrial resources by 2020 as part of the Micronesia Challenge.

26. **Noted** the success of the regional pre-COP 10 meeting held in Nadi, Fiji, and

27. **Directed** the SPREP Secretariat to support Pacific island countries at the CBD COP10 meeting in Nagoya and at the UNFCCC COP16 meeting in Cancun.

*Madang, Papua New Guinea, 9 September 2010.*

**Pacific Regional Preparatory Meeting for the 10th Conference of the Parties**

**to the Convention on Biological Diversity**

16 – 18 August, 2010

**Final Meeting Statement**

The Pacific Regional Preparatory Meeting for the 10th Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity held in Nadi, Fiji from 16 to 18 August, 2010, was attended by 11 Pacific island Parties to the Convention, partners, donors and non-governmental organizations from the region; and concluded with a Statement on:

**Reaffirming** the commitment by Pacific island countries to implement the three objectives of the Convention;

**Recognising** the importance of accelerating action to avoid further loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services;

**Drawing attention to** the fact that approximately 80% of Pacific island communities live on the coast and rely mostly on natural resources which underlines the importance of addressing integrated island ecosystem management;

**Recalling and further recognising** the achievements and initiatives of the Pacific through community-based and co-management approaches, national and multi-country challenges and commitments such as Locally Managed Protected Areas, Micronesia Challenge, Coral Triangle Initiative, Phoenix Islands Protected Area and World Heritage Site;

**Acknowledging** the continuing leadership demonstrated by Pacific island countries and territories in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use (eg. LMMA and MMAs, regional initiatives, efforts in fisheries conservation and management by the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA));

**Recognising** the value of collaborating and working in partnership with PI territories and other SIDS to implement biodiversity and related programmes;

**Recognising** that Pacific SIDS are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and emphasising the role of biodiversity in climate change mitigation and adaptation as well as to the increasing impacts of climate change on biodiversity,

**Further emphasising** the need for targeted capacity building, technical assistance and adequate and timely financial support as critical to achieving the implementation of Convention objectives in the Pacific region,

***The Meeting proposes the following recommendations for consideration.***

AND in accordance with the Agenda Items for COP10 the Pacific Island Countries highlighted the following priorities and provides guidance:

**CBD STRATEGIC PLAN**

**Note** the importance of the Strategic Plan in establishing a road map for CBD implementation post 2010 and recognise that goals and targets must be specific, measurable, achievable, ambitious, relevant and timely with a longer term vision.

**Call** for support to review, update and align the NBSAPs to the new Strategic Plan. 2

**FINANCING BIODIVERSITY**

**Urge** the GEF and other donors to give consideration to the special circumstances of SIDS and LDCs in addressing the need to provide funding for priority environmental issues in an expedited manner.

**Further elaborate** the need to increase support for biodiversity-related activities both through increasing ODA as well as through innovative financing mechanisms (such as long-term trust funds) and request more support for this area particularly in terms of assistance in identifying and developing these mechanisms.

## **PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief**

### **BIOFUELS AND BIODIVERSITY**

*Note* that while biofuels may have potential for mitigating climate change, their production may have adverse effects on biodiversity through loss of species diversity, destruction of natural ecosystems and introduction of invasive species. Therefore the precautionary approach needs to be applied, including application of robust risk assessment and risk management systems within an ecosystem-based management framework.

### **ACCESS AND BENEFIT SHARING (ABS) AND TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE (TK)**

*Recognise* the importance of the ABS Protocol for the Pacific and urge all Parties to ensure the conclusion of the negotiations for its adoption at CBD COP10 in Nagoya.

*Recognise* the role of Article 8j on traditional knowledge, innovations and practices and of Article 10c on Customary Use in the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity,

*Further urge* Parties to ensure that the protection and utilisation of TK is incorporated as a cross-cutting issue in the ABS regime.

### **MARINE and COASTAL**

*Reaffirm* the importance of marine and coastal ecosystems to Pacific livelihoods, commit to the meaningful implementation of the Programme of Work on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity and seek the support of donors, development partners and the private sector through adequate and timely financial and technical assistance.

*Recognise* the adverse impacts on marine and coastal ecosystems of ocean fertilization and acidification as emerging and important issues for the Pacific to consider in national and regional development plans.

### **PROTECTED AREAS**

*Emphasise* the fundamental importance of PAs in conserving biodiversity and their role in adapting to the impacts of climate change and recognising their mitigation potential and urge partners to ensure sustainable financing mechanisms are established and maintained for the effective management of PAs, including implementation of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA).

### **BIODIVERSITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE**

*Encourage* Parties to the CBD to provide financial and technical support to assist PICs in developing effective adaptation and mitigation actions that address the linkages between biodiversity and CC.

*Encourage* regional and international organisations to provide targeted, nationally appropriate capacity building to assist PICs in reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, reducing the loss of biodiversity and identifying co-benefits in actions to address REDD.

*Further recognise* the need for support for capacity building to assist PICs in identifying, assessing and monitoring impacts of climate change on biodiversity. 3

### **FOREST and AGRICULTURE BIODIVERSITY**

*Reaffirm* the importance of agriculture biodiversity as the foundation for food and nutrition, food security, contribute to wider ecosystem functions such as maintenance of water quality and carbon sequestration and providing incentives for conservation areas.

*Call* for a closer collaboration of environment, climate change and agriculture actors to ensure a holistic approach to conservation, adaptation and sustainable use.



## **PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief**

### **INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES (IAS)**

*Recognise* the serious threat of IAS to island biodiversity, which is exacerbated by climate change and the limited human, technical and financial resources in PICs.

*Urge* Parties to address IAS as a significant driver of biodiversity loss in the CBD Strategic Plan and post-2010 targets, and to allocate adequate and timely funding to prevent, control and manage IAS.

### **GLOBAL TAXONOMIC INITIATIVE**

*Recall* the importance of taxonomy in the implementation of the CBD objectives encourages Governments and partners to ensure that taxonomy is reflected in the CBD Strategic Plan.

## **PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief**

### **CBD COP10 AGENDA**

Please note that not all agenda items are covered in this Brief. The Agenda is hyperlinked to [UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2 \(DRAFT DECISIONS FOR THE TENTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY\)](#)

#### **I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS**

#### **II. CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS**

- Item 2.1. Reports of the intersessional meetings of the subsidiary bodies
- Item 2.2. Report of the Global Environment Facility
- Item 2.3. Report of the Executive Secretary on the administration of the Convention and the budget for the Trust Fund of the Convention

#### **III. ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING**

#### **IV. STRATEGIC ISSUES FOR EVALUATING PROGRESS AND SUPPORTING IMPLEMENTATION**

- Item 4.1. Progress toward the 2010 biodiversity target, including national reports and the Global Biodiversity Outlook
- Item 4.2. Revised Strategic Plan, biodiversity target and indicator
- Item 4.3. Operations of the Convention, including programme of work for the period 2011-2022 and periodicity of meetings of the Conference of the Parties
- Item 4.4. Strategy for resource mobilization
- Item 4.5. Clearing-House Mechanism and Scientific and Technical Cooperation
- Item 4.6. Technology transfer
- Item 4.7. Global Strategy for Plant Conservation
- Item 4.8. Communication, Education and Public Awareness and the International Year of Biodiversity
- Item 4.9. Cooperation with other conventions and international organizations and initiatives, engagement of stakeholders, including business and biodiversity, cities and biodiversity, and South/South cooperation
- Item 4.10. Financial mechanism: fourth review of effectiveness and guidance

#### **V. ISSUES FOR IN-DEPTH CONSIDERATION**

- Item 5.1. Inland waters biodiversity
- Item 5.2. Marine and coastal biodiversity
- Item 5.3. Mountain biodiversity
- Item 5.4. Protected areas
- Item 5.5. Sustainable use of biodiversity
- Item 5.6. Biodiversity and climate change
- Item 6.1. Agricultural biodiversity
- Item 6.2. Biodiversity of dry and sub-humid lands
- Item 6.3. Forest biodiversity
- Item 6.4. Biofuels and biodiversity
- Item 6.5. Invasive alien species
- Item 6.6. Global Taxonomy Initiative
- Item 6.7. Article 8(j) and Related Provisions
- Item 6.8. Incentive measures
- Item 6.9. New and emerging issues

#### **VII. ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY MATTERS**

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b> Item 1.2</p> <p><b>Election of Officers</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At its ninth meeting, the Conference of the Parties elected ten Vice-Presidents for a term that will end at the closure of the tenth meeting. The Cook Islands was one of these. This term will end at COP 10.</li> <li>Regional groups will be asked to nominate new Bureau members. They are urged to submit their nominations at the opening of the meeting so that the nominees can attend Bureau meeting as observers.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>None</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>It is important for the Pacific to have an ongoing representation on the Bureau</p>	<p>Having a Pacific representative on the Bureau ensures that issues of importance to the Pacific are properly reflected and addressed in the meeting agenda. The Bureau generally decides whether or not to hold contact groups on certain issues, therefore it is very useful to have a Pacific representative on the Bureau to ensure that our issues are given adequate treatment.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b> Tania is not available to sit on the Bureau for another term.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>PICs may wish to suggest another PIC representative on a regional rotation basis, noting however that other countries within the Asia-Pacific may consider that the Pacific has had its turn.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> PICs need to decide who will be the regional nominee and who will nominate our nominee</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b></p> <p><b>Item 2.1:</b></p> <p><b>Reports of Intersessional Meetings of the Subsidiary Bodies and Regional Preparatory Meetings.</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Pacific Regional Preparatory Meeting for the 10th Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity held in Nadi, Fiji from 16 to 18 August, 2010, was attended by 11 Pacific island Parties to the Convention, partners, donors and non-governmental organizations from the region. The key outcomes of this meeting are included in the Final Meeting Statement and the Report of the Meeting</li> <li>• Various intersessional meetings have been held these include: Open-ended Ad Hoc Inter-Sessional Working Group on the Implementation of Article 8(j) and Related Provisions (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/2); the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/3); the third meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on the Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4) and the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing.</li> <li>• Substantive discussion on these items will be discussed in agenda Item 3.</li> <li>• However, for this agenda item Parties will be invited to report on the results of the preparatory meetings held immediately prior to the COP.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b></p> <p>1. Pacific Regional Preparatory Meeting for the 10th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity 16 – 18 August, 2010: Final Meeting Statement</p> <p>2. Report of the Pacific Regional CBD COP10 Preparatory Meeting</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>The Pacific region has been very active in the implementation of the CBD and has given due consideration to the COP 10 agenda.</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <p>The Statement from the Pacific Regional COP 10 Preparatory Meeting could provide the basis for a plenary statement on this agenda item.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to provide a statement outlining the key elements of the Pacific Regional COP 10 Preparatory Meeting</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Cook Islands</p> <p><b>Co-Lead:</b></p>	

**PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief**

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b></p> <p><b>Item 2.2</b></p> <p><b>Report of the Global Environment Facility</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <p>The Conference of the Parties is invited to take note of the GEF report, on the understanding that the substantive issues arising, will be taken up under agenda item 4.10</p> <p>(See agenda item 4.10)</p>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>Report of the GEF (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/6)</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> GEF-PAS Update Report prepared by SPREP</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Funding through the GEF for biodiversity projects is an important source of funding for the Pacific</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <p>It is useful to signal and intent to follow this issue further.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to indicate that they have noted the Report of the GEF and will make substantive comments on the financial mechanism under Agenda item 4.10.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> FSM may wish to take the lead on this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b></p> <p><b>Partner Support/Backup:</b> SPREP</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b></p> <p><b>Item 2.3:</b></p> <p><b>Report of the Executive Secretary on the Administration of the Convention and the Budget for the Trust Fund of the Convention</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A budget contact group will be established to prepare a budget, which will be submitted to plenary for adoption.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>UNEP/CBD/COP/10/7 and Add.1</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Some PICs may come close to a GDP contribution scale that would create a significant budgetary burden for them.</p> <p>PICs need to be aware that for any budget cuts or reallocation of funds, it is usually the Trust Fund that is affected. This means less money for participation by developing countries</p>	<p>A GDP budgetary scale disadvantages small population countries like SIDS. It does not take into account economic vulnerabilities due to high import costs of commodities or high environmental vulnerable that could wipe out a country's GDP in one severe weather event.</p> <p>Due to the economic situation, participation by developing countries to many CBD meetings has been limited including PICs and less attention is accorded to small islands or LDCs</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support other SIDS who would be disadvantaged by a GDP scaling for assessed contributions.</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to seek special dispensation for SIDS from a GDP contribution scale due to their high economic and physical vulnerability.</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to express concern about any cuts to the Trust Fund and how this will affect participation by developing countries at COPs. PICs may wish to refer to Article 20 of the Convention (Financial Resources) which obliges developed countries to provide assistance to developing countries to meet their obligations under the Convention (including attending COPs)</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> FSM may wish to take the lead on this issue.</p>	
<p><b>Co-lead:</b></p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b></p> <p><b>Item 3:</b></p> <p><b>Access and Benefit Sharing</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing (Working Group on ABS) held three meetings prior to COP 10 in order to complete the elaboration and negotiation of the international regime on access and benefit-sharing.</li> <li>• The COP will be invited to consider for adoption the protocol on access and benefit sharing based on the text prepared by the Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing.</li> <li>• The Interregional negotiating group met in September and achieved some progress towards an improved common understanding on key elements of the international ABS regime, most notably on the concept of utilization of genetic resources and its relation to derivatives. Some progress was also achieved on provisions on benefit-sharing and access.<sup>1</sup></li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers:</b> UNEP/CBD/COP/10/5/Add.1; UNEP/CBD/COP/10/5/Add.2; UNEP/CBD/COP/10/5/Add.3</p> <p>UNEP/CBD/WG-ABS/9/ING/1</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> Regional framework for the protection of traditional knowledge and expressions of culture (SPC)</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>The access and benefit sharing is very important for PICs in ensuring the traditional knowledge is properly protected and any benefits that derive from that knowledge is properly shared by the owners.</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>The outcome of the latest round of negotiations on the ABS regime is not clear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to ensure that the protection and utilization of traditional knowledge is incorporated as a cross-cutting issue in the ABS regime.</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to include free access provisions for biodiversity that is used for biological control of invasive alien species (suggestion by SPC)</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Cook Islands may wish to take the lead on this issue.</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Palau</p> <p><b>Partner Support/Backup:</b> SPREP</p>	

<sup>1</sup> For a summary report of the ING meeting see: [http://www.iisd.ca/biodiv/absing/brief/absing\\_briefe.html](http://www.iisd.ca/biodiv/absing/brief/absing_briefe.html)

Agenda Item and Issue	Brief background
<p><b>Item 4.1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Progress toward the 2010 Biodiversity Target,</b></li> <li>• <b>Review of National Reports</b></li> <li>• <b>Global Biodiversity Outlook</b></li> </ul> <p>Relevant papers:</p> <p>Global Biodiversity Outlook Executive Summary (see <a href="http://www.cbd.int/qbo/qbo3/doc/GBO3-Summary-final-en.pdf">http://www.cbd.int/qbo/qbo3/doc/GBO3-Summary-final-en.pdf</a>)</p> <p>Technical Report: "Connecting Biodiversity and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation" <a href="http://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-41-en.pdf">http://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-41-en.pdf</a> (see UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 5).</p> <p><b>Other relevant documents:</b> GLISPA Guide to GBO3 for SIDS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO)</i> is the flagship publication of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Drawing on a range of information sources, including <a href="#">National Reports</a>, <a href="#">biodiversity indicators information</a>, <a href="#">scientific literature</a>, and a study assessing <a href="#">biodiversity scenarios for the future</a> [4MB], the <a href="#">third edition of Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-3)</a> summarizes the latest data on status and trends of biodiversity and draws conclusions for the future strategy of the Convention.</li> <li>• A background technical report for the GBO entitled: <i>Connecting Biodiversity and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</i> (See reference) makes reference to the concept of ecosystem-based adaptation. However this report is heavily weighted towards adaptation of terrestrial ecosystems. The impacts of climate change and invasive species on the marine environment is not well addressed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>It is important that the GBO recognizes the importance of Pacific biodiversity, particularly the marine environment and the impacts of climate change and invasive species on marine ecosystems.</p>	<p>The Global Biodiversity Outlook is a useful tool for identifying key biodiversity threats in our region. Unfortunately it consideration of the Pacific marine environment which is not well developed.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>In the context of the GBO the two draft decision being proposed that warrant consideration are:</p> <p>9. <i>Agrees</i> to use the third edition of Global Biodiversity Outlook to guide and orient the scientific and technical discussions on the updating of the future Strategic Plan of the Convention, the updating of the programmes of work and discussions during future meetings of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and of the Conference of the Parties; (see UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, para 9)</p> <p>11. <i>Requests</i> the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of the necessary resources;</p> <p>(b) To commission a review of the process of preparation and production of the third edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook in order to further improve the process for future editions of the Global Biodiversity Outlook and maintain comparability with earlier editions where necessary and to report to a meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice prior to eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties; (see UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, para 9).</p>	



## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

Considering the proposal for a decision on the review of the GBO it may be useful to highlight the need for further elaboration of work related to biodiversity in the Pacific region and in particular marine biodiversity.

- *PICs may wish to insert text concerning the review of the GBO that gives emphasis to the need for elaboration of work on the impacts of climate change and invasive species on the marine ecosystems of the Pacific.*

Lead country/Point person for Issue: Palau may wish to take the lead on this issue

Co-lead: Kiribati may wish to co-lead this issue

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.1: Implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Funding for updating NBSAPs</b></li> <li>• <b>Capacity building SIDS</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Relevant papers</b>                  Recommendation 3/1 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 8</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> GEF-PAS Document and Update Report (SPREP)</p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report of the Working Group on Review of the Implementation of the Convention notes the limited capacities and technical and financial resources have been an obstacle to achieving the 2010 target in many countries, especially in developing countries, in particular the least developed countries and <b>small island developing States</b>, as well as countries with economies in transition</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. GEF is the main funding for environmental programmes in the Pacific</li> <li>2. The introduction of the GEF-PAS saw a number of full size projects being developed in the Pacific at the national and regional levels</li> <li>3. Important to note that there has been some challenges in the start up of the GEF-PAS with late implementation of projects which runs through the GEF 5 replenishment cycle. Need to know how this will impact on GEF 5 priorities for the Pacific.</li> <li>4. Important to gain addition funding for PICs</li> </ol>	<p>There will be opportunities under GEF 5 for an integrated approach to all the three focal areas of the GEF namely Climate Change, Biodiversity and Land degradation. Direct access by countries to GEF funding to assist with reporting requirements and support enabling activity types of interventions.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b> The draft decision coming from Recommendation 3/1 states:</p> <p><i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility to provide adequate and timely financial support for the updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and related enabling activities, and requests the Global Environment Facility and its implementing agencies to ensure that procedures are in place to ensure an expeditious disbursement of funds;</p> <p><i>Invites</i> other donors, Governments and multilateral and bilateral agencies to provide financial, technical and technological support to developing countries, particularly least developed countries and <b><u>small island developing States</u></b>, as well as countries with economies in transition, to strengthen their capacities to implement the Convention, including support for relevant initiatives and strategies of indigenous and local communities;</p>	

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

- *PICs may wish to strongly support these two key elements of the draft decision*
- *PICs may wish highlight the hope that allocations for preparations and review of NBSAPs are not hampered by GEF project cycles including the GEF STAR<sup>2</sup>*
- *PICs may also wish to express concern that the GEF STAR has only allocated \$500,000 for both Climate Change National Communications and NBSAPs. As CC Nat Comms cost at least \$400k for all the assessments required, this leaves very little money for NBSAPs.*
- *PICs may wish to express concerns on any potential impacts in accessing GEF 5 resources due to the late implementation of GEF PAS projects*

Lead country/Point person for Issue: FSM may wish to lead this issue

Co-lead: Samoa may wish to co-lead this issue

---

<sup>2</sup> The System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) is how the GEF determines the amount of resources that a given country can access in a replenishment period. It replaces the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF) that was used during the fourth replenishment period of the GEF (GEF-4),v

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.1: Integration of biodiversity into poverty eradication and development</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Report of the WG on Review of Implementation of the Convention welcomes ongoing initiatives linking biodiversity, development and poverty eradication, such as the Equator Initiative, the ABS Capacity Development Initiative for Africa, the LifeWeb initiative and the Poverty-Environment Initiative.</li> <li>• A number of PICs have proposals under the LifeWeb initiative (see box)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers:</b></p> <p>Recommendation 3/3 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 10</p>	<p>LifeWeb proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishment of Effective Management System for Protected Areas in Timor-Leste</li> <li>• Utilizing Effective Remote Management Mechanisms to Enhance the Federated States of Micronesia’s Landscape and Seascape Connectivity</li> <li>• Utilizing Effective Remote Management Mechanisms to Enhance the Federated States of Micronesia’s Landscape and Seascape Connectivity</li> <li>• Fiji Marine Ecological Gap Analysis</li> <li>• Building National Capacity for Mainstreaming Protected Areas Outcomes that Support Payments for Ecosystem Service and Climate Change Adaptation in the Solomon Islands</li> <li>• Protected Area System Expression of Interest (FSM)</li> <li>• Management support to the Northern Reefs management area (Palau)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is important to note that some of the Pacific Island locally managed community initiatives have won the Equator Prize. This is an example of community based integrated approaches practiced mostly in the Pacific.</li> <li>2. It is important that commitments made under this programme, particularly LifeWeb are fulfilled.</li> </ol>	<p>The Pacific has a number of proposed programme under the LifeWeb initiative. These need to be carried out. The Pacific should be able to highlight the fact that the maintenance of marine biodiversity is a major poverty alleviation strategy in the region.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <p>PICs may wish to emphasis the importance of the LifeWeb programme in fulfilling poverty alleviation strategies in the Pacific and in facilitating a national vision for protected areas. The current draft decision states:</p> <p><i>Welcomes ongoing initiatives linking biodiversity, development and poverty eradication, such as the Equator</i></p>	

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

Initiative, the ABS Capacity Development Initiative for Africa, the LifeWeb initiative and the Poverty-Environment Initiative and may wish to highlight the integrated community based approaches to biodiversity conservation practiced in the Pacific;

The decision further states:

*Decides* to establish an Expert Group on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development with the terms of reference outlined in the annex to this decision;<sup>3</sup>

The terms of reference for the Expert Group states that the group should be “regionally balanced”

- *PICs may wish to enhance the current draft decision on “Integration of biodiversity into poverty eradication and development” by suggesting an enhancement of the programme through greater donor support.*
- *PICs may wish to support the establishment of an Expert Group on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development, so long as there is representation from the Pacific*
- *PICs may wish to add a sentence to the terms of reference to the EGBPED linking biodiversity, poverty eradication and the impacts of climate change. In particular PICs may wish to emphasise the fact that development or poverty eradication in our context also means addressing climate change.*

Lead country/Point person for Issue: Solomon Islands may wish to take the lead on this issue.

Co-lead: Micronesia may wish to co-lead this issue

---

<sup>3</sup> The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention notes that the convening of an expert group has financial implications and is therefore subject to a decision by the Conference of the Parties.

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p>
<p><b>Item 4.2. Revised Strategic Plan, biodiversity target and indicator</b></p> <p><b>Relevant papers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft decision taken from paragraph 4 of recommendation XIV/9 of the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/3) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 15</li> <li>• UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/10</li> <li>• Updated technical rationale for the proposed goals and targets of the Strategic Plan (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/9)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In line with decision IX/9, the Conference of the Parties at its tenth meeting is expected to consider for adoption a revised and updated Strategic Plan for the Convention, on the basis of a recommendation from the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention at its third meeting.</li> <li>• At its fourteenth meeting, SBSSTA conducted an examination of the outcome-oriented goals and targets (and associated indicators) and their possible adjustment for the period beyond 2010 on the basis of document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/10</li> <li>• The Conference of the Parties may wish to refer to updated and revised Strategic Plan of the Convention 2011-2020 as "the Aichi Nagoya Strategic Plan".</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>A new Strategic Plan should give greater attention to the issues of concern to PICs.</p>	<p>The current Strategic Plan includes indicators for Island Biodiversity nevertheless there are particular concerns for the Pacific that warrant elaboration. These include: protection of island protection of agrobiodiversity, loss of ethnobiodiversity, impacts of climate change coral reefs, loss of island forest ecosystems, invasive species.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <p>Consistent with the PIC Meeting Statement, PICs may wish to note the importance of reviewing the Strategic Plan and strengthening financial support for the implementation of the Plan</p> <p>The current draft decision states:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii)3. <i>Agrees to:</i></p> <p><i>(c) Complement these global headline indicators with additional indicators which are suitable for monitoring progress towards those targets for which suitable indicators have not yet been identified, in particular in relation to the economics of biodiversity and ecosystem services and the benefits to people derived from these services;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to add a specific reference to island biodiversity.</i></li> </ul>	

The Decision also states:

5. *Requests the Executive Secretary, pending the availability of the necessary financial resources, to convene a meeting, at the earliest opportunity, of an Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group<sup>4</sup> on Indicators for the Strategic Plan 2011-2020*

- *PICs may wish to ensure that a representative from the Pacific is included in this AHTEGISP*

In the Strategic goal A. Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 23) there is reference to planning process.

Target 2: By 2020, at the latest, the values of biodiversity are integrated into [national accounts], national and local development and poverty reduction and climate strategies and planning processes.

- *PICs may wish to add a reference to climate in Target 2 (suggestion by CI) and delete the bracket around the words "national accounts" (suggestion by IUCN)*

In the Strategic goal A there is reference to incentives.

*Target 3: By 2020, at the latest incentives, [including subsidies,] harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, [consistent with relevant international obligations].*

- *PICs may wish to add a reference to positive incentives as suggested above (suggested by CI IUCN has proposed similar language)*

In the Strategic Goals and the 2020 Headline Targets there is Strategic goal B. Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use there is reference to loss of habitats. (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2 page 24), More clarity in referring to human induced loss and not selecting any particular habitats may be useful.

*Target 5: By 2020, the gross human-induced loss and degradation and fragmentation of natural habitats, [including forests], is reduced by at least half.*

- *PICs may wish to refer to gross human-induced, a deletion of the reference to forests (as marine ecosystems are equally important) and a realistic reduction of half as suggested above (suggested by CI although they suggest specific reference to terrestrial, inland water and marine habitats. Note IUCN and GPI prefer the target to brought close to zero. GPI also suggest the inclusion of the term peatlands)*

There are two options for Target 6 relating to overfishing:

*Target 6: [By 2020, overfishing is ended, destructive fishing practices are eliminated, and all fisheries are managed sustainably.] or*

*[By 2020, all exploited fish stocks and other living marine and aquatic resources are harvested sustainably [and restored], and the impact of fisheries on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems are within safe ecological limits]*

- *PICs may wish to support the second option as it is more likely to be achieved. (Note IUCN uses*

<sup>4</sup> SBSTTA notes that the convening of an AHTEG has financial implications and is therefore subject to a decision by the Conference of the Parties. SBSTTA also wishes to refer to a list of all recommendations that have financial implications prepared by the Secretariat in accordance with paragraphs 11 and 12 of decision VIII/10.

*language referring to harvest being sustainable, legal and traceable. Note GPI prefers the first option)*

(Note GPI suggests additional milestones on IUU fishing with respect to fishing mortality, and sanctions (see GPI brief)

Target 7: on agriculture, aquaculture, and forestry

Note GPI suggests additional milestones with respect to synthetic fertilizers and pesticides and targets for sectors or commodities (see GPI brief)

There is also brackets around part of Target 10:

*Target 10: By [2020][2015], to have minimized the multiple pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning.*

- *PICs may wish to support the 2015 to indicate the urgency need to address the pressures on coral reefs, noting that sufficient funding would be required to achieve this target. (Note IUNC prefers the 2020 date and prefers ending goal with the words " increase the resilience of biodiversity and ecosystem services)*

In relation to strategic goal C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity there are option for percentages (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 24):

*Target 11: By 2020, at least 25% of terrestrial, inland- water and 15% of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through comprehensive, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of effectively managed protected areas and other means, **designed to facilitate adaptation to climate change impacts and integrated into the wider land- and seascape.***

- PICs may wish to suggest the percentages as indicated in bold and suggest additional text as indicated in bold relating to climate change impacts (IUCN proposes these percentages, Note GPI suggests a 2015 target year and a reference to **vulnerable marine ecosystems**. PICs may wish to add this term)

In relation to improvement in conservation status there is brackets around a percentage (page 24)

*Target 12: By 2020 the extinction and decline of known threatened species has been prevented and improvement in the conservation status **[for at least 10% of them]** has been achieved.*

- *PICs may wish to suggest the removal of the brackets (suggestion by CI and IUCN)*

In the section on strategic goal D: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services a more appropriate reference to climate change could be considered:

*Target 15: By 2020, the ability of ecosystems to adapt ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to **climate change mitigation and adaptation** ~~carbon stocks~~ has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15% of degraded ecosystems. ~~thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.~~*

- PICs may wish to suggest alternative text which better links climate change to ecosystem resilience as suggested above (suggestion by CI) or they may wish to consider GPI text



*referring to terrestrial, freshwater and marine biodiversity that provide critical ecosystem services (see GPI brief)*

In the section on Strategic goal E. Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building

**Target 16** By 2020, at the latest, the international regime on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) is in force and operational, sustainable access to genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources is enhanced, and equitable benefits are shared consistent with the international regime on ABS.

- *PICs may wish to support simplified text as above (proposed by IUCN) (Note that GPI suggests that this target should be achieved by 2015)*

**Target 17:** *By 2020, each Party in coordination with all relevant ministries and planning processes has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and implemented, an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan contributing to the achievement of the objectives of the 2020 targets.*

- *PICs may wish to add a reference to coordination among ministries and a contribution to the 2020 targets as suggested by bold text above (suggested by CI) (Note GPI suggests inclusion of language referring to legislation, and relevant international and regional organizations (see GPI brief on target 16 not 17)*

Another Target relevant to PICs is Target 18:

**Target 18:** *By [2020], [[have [sui generis legal] systems in place to protect] traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities that are relevant to biodiversity and their customary sustainable use of biodiversity are respected, preserved and maintained, and their contribution to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity is recognized and enhanced.] [The traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use relevant to biodiversity of indigenous and local communities are fully recognized and mainstreamed in the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, its programmes of work and cross-cutting issues, at all levels.]*

- *PICs may wish to remove all brackets from this paragraph in support of legal systems to protect traditional knowledge and to support wider programmes for the recognition of traditional knowledge (Note IUCN suggests a more simplified text without reference to sui generis legal systems)*

With respect to human resources and financing it may be appropriate to relate capacity increase to the Convention and 2020 targets:

**Target 20:** *By 2020, capacity (human resources and financing) for implementing the Convention has increased to sufficient levels to achieve the Conventions objectives and specifically the 2020 targets, at least [tenfold].*

- *PICs may wish to highlight significant national commitments and contributions to biodiversity conservations such as the Micronesia Challenge, Phoenix Island Protected Area, Locally Managed Marine Areas and other regional initiatives and to note the need for increased technical and financial support from the international donor communities to fully implement the convention through these innovative initiatives.*

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

- *PICs may wish to support a tenfold increase in human resources and international financing and a reference to the Convention and 2020 targets. (suggested by CI) The burden should not be placed on national governments, particularly LDC and SIDs. (Note IUCN suggests a one hundred fold increase)*

Lead country/Point person for Issue: The Cook Islands may wish to take the lead on this issue

Co-lead: Papua New Guinea may wish to co-lead this issue

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.3. (part 1)</b></p> <p><b>Operations of the Convention, including programme of work for the period 2011-2022 and periodicity of meetings of the Conference of the Parties</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.3(a)</b></p> <p><b>The multi-year programme of work of the Convention for the period 2011-2020 and periodicity of meetings and organization of work of the Conference of the Parties</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COP 11 will take place in 2012 and it is proposed that a number of issues will be addressed in the COP. These are included in <i>recommendation 3/6 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention</i>.</li> <li>• There are some unresolved issues. One of these relates to cooperation among international biodiversity-related organizations taking into account, inter alia, proposals for: a United Nations Decade on Biodiversity; possible options for cooperation among the Rio conventions.</li> <li>• There are some legal complications in linking the three Rio Conventions as not all countries are Party to each of these agreements. Therefore mandates or decisions arising from one Convention may not naturally flow to another.</li> <li>• Nevertheless the linkage particularly between climate change and biodiversity is a significant issue for island nations as noted in the PIC COP10 Preparatory Meeting Statement and the Pacific Islands Round Table for Nature Conservation Meeting Statement.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers:</b></p> <p>Recommendation 3/6 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 30</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> Pacific Regional CBD COP10 Preparatory Meeting Statement; Pacific Round Table Meeting Outcome Statement 2010</p>	<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>The linkage between the loss of biodiversity and the impacts of climate change are a particular concern for PICs</p>
<p><b>Possible Position :</b></p> <p>The draft decision on agenda item 4.3a states:</p> <p><i>(a)(v) Cooperation among international biodiversity-related organizations taking into account, inter alia, proposals for: a United Nations Decade on Biodiversity; possible options for cooperation among the Rio conventions[, including the preparation of a possible joint work programme; and the convening of a joint high-level segment or joint extraordinary Conference of the Parties of the three Rio conventions];</i></p> <p>Logistically and legally this element of the decision may be extremely difficult. Getting all Parties to each of the 3 Rio Conventions in the one place at the one time would be near impossible.</p>	

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

- *PICs may wish to support establishment of a joint working group of experts on the 3 Rio conventions. The purpose of this group would be to develop policy recommendations for each of the Convention to enhance synergies. This group would meet intersessionally. It may also be possible to convene an intersessional high level meeting of Ministers to discuss and propose policies on the synergies between the 3 Conventions.*

Lead country/Point person for Issue: The Cook Islands may wish to lead.

Co-lead: Tonga may wish to co-lead this issue

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue: \</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.3. (part 2) Operations of the Convention, including programme of work for the period 2011-2022 and periodicity of meetings of the Conference of the Parties</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.3(a) The multi-year programme of work of the Convention for the period 2011-2020 and periodicity of meetings and organization of work of the Conference of the Parties</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COP 11 will take place in 2012 and it is proposed that a number of issues will be addressed in the COP. These are included in recommendation 3/6 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention.</li> <li>• One of the recommended agenda items for COP 11 is an in-depth review of the programme of work on island biodiversity;</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers:</b></p> <p>Recommendation 3/6 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 30</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>The Programme of Work on Island Biodiversity is extremely important for the Pacific.</p>	<p>The Pacific took a lead in the development of the Programme of Work. A review of implementation should highlight areas where additional action and new financing and capacity building is required.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>The draft decision on the agenda for COP 11 states:</p> <p><i>(a)(viii) The in-depth review of the programme of work on island biodiversity;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support an in-depth review of the programme of work on island biodiversity and suggest that an ad hoc working group be established ahead of COP 11 to facilitate a review process and to make recommendation to the COP.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Based on past work on this agenda item Palau may wish to take the lead on this issue.</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b></p> <p><b>Partners backup support:</b> SPREP, GLISPA</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.3(b)</b></p> <p><b>National reporting: review of experience and proposals for the fifth national report</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fifth national report would be due in time for consideration by COP 12</li> <li>• The reporting burden of preparing the next report will require additional financial support</li> <li>• The draft decision makes special reference to the needs of SIDS</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>Recommendation 3/7 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 33</p>	<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preparing national reports provides an opportunity for PICs to (i) highlight issues of particular concern to island nations and island biodiversity; and (ii) update national biodiversity information</li> <li>2. Funding availability to assist with the preparation of national reports to the CBD have helped PICs to prepare reports</li> <li>3. The national reporting process is one of the effective ways for the PICs to engage in the convention.</li> </ol> <p>Fourth national reports were due in March 2009 however, not many PICs met this deadline. In April 2010, the CBD Secretariat in collaborations with SPREP through a capacity building workshop on the 4<sup>th</sup> National Reports which provided technical support and guidance to the PICs. As of August 2010, a total of 7 PICs have submitted their 4<sup>th</sup> National Reports to the CBD Secretariat. It is important to note that this is probably the first time a good number of national reports have been completed and submitted by PIC parties.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>The draft decision on national reporting states:</p> <p><i>9. Invites other donors, Governments and multilateral and bilateral agencies to provide financial and technical support to developing countries, particularly the least developed countries and small island developing States amongst them, and countries with economies in transition, for preparing their national reports;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to ensure that this paragraph is retained. It may be useful to delete the words “amongst them” as this would intend to imply that only SIDS that are also LDCs are given special consideration. The use of the term “amongst them” is not used in some other draft decisions.</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support enhanced funding arrangements for the preparation of 5<sup>th</sup> national reports (see also agenda item 4.1 on GEF STAR funding).</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to acknowledge and request continued capacity building support from the CBD Secretariat in collaborations with SPREP to support the preparations of national reports.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> A number of PICs identified an interest in following funding issues at the</p>	

## **PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief**

Nadi pre-COP workshop. These included FSM, RMI, Palau, Tuvalu and Tonga. One of these countries may wish to take the lead on this issue.

**Co-lead:**

**Partners backup support:** SPREP, IUCN

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.3(e)</b></p> <p><b>New and emerging issues</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current draft decision on New and Emerging issues notes that ocean acidification is not a new issue.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>Recommendation XIV/16 of the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/3) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 39</p>	<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Ocean acidification is a very serious concern for PICs</p> <p>Ocean acidification due to increase dissolved CO<sub>2</sub> in the ocean weakens coral and shellfish and could have very serious economic implications for PICs</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <p>The current draft decision on New Issues states that ocean acidification is not a new issue (see draft decision below). The political implications of this statement are not clear.</p> <p><i>(a) Consider the impacts of ocean acidification on marine biodiversity and habitats as part of the ongoing activities under the programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity, in accordance with the provision in paragraph 4 of decision IX/20;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>PICs may wish to monitor consideration of this agenda item to ensure that the issue of ocean acidification is not swept under the table. PICs may wish to seek an assurance when this agenda item comes up that ocean acidification will be properly considered within the work of marine and coastal biological diversity.</i></li> <li><i>PICs may wish to highlight the seriousness of ocean acidification and seek proper consideration of the issue within the agenda on marine and coastal biodiversity.</i></li> <li><i>PICs may wish to insert a call to regional organisations to assist in an assessment of ocean acidification in the Pacific</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Palau may wish to take the lead on this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Marshall Islands may wish to co-lead</p> <p><b>Partner support backup:</b> SPREP, WWF and WCS may wish to provide support on this issue</p>	



<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b> Item 4.4: <b>Strategy for resource mobilization (Part 1)</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Strategy for resource mobilization in support of the Convention's three objectives for the period 2008-2015 (decision IX/11 B) was adopted at COP 9.</li> <li>• Under this agenda item, the COP is invited to consider for finalization and adoption the recommendations which are contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2:</li> <li>• The draft decision invites Parties to create a "resource mobilization focal point"</li> <li>• It also invites the GEF to provide timely and adequate financial support to update NBSAPs</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b> Recommendation 3/8 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 43</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> GEF-PAS and GEF-PAS Update Report (SPREP)</p>	<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b> This agenda item two key elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One useful for PICs</li> <li>• One burdensome for PICs</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New funding for updating NBSAPs is important.</li> <li>• Creating new administrative burdens by establishing a resource mobilization focal point may not be helpful for PICs with limited staff levels.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Possible Position</b> PICs may wish to consider this draft decision carefully. Two key elements of the draft decision are:</p> <p><i>1. Invites Parties that have not done so to appoint a "resource mobilization focal point" to facilitate national implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization;</i></p> <p><i>4. Requests the Global Environment Facility to provide timely and adequate financial support to updating national biodiversity strategies and action plans, which may include the development of country-specific resource mobilization strategies;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to consider whether the establishment of resource mobilization focal points is an added burden on reporting requirements under the Convention.</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to ensure that the text referring to the GEF and "timely and adequate financial support" is preserved. They may wish to insert the words "based on simplified funding request procedures" after support to speed up the process of accessing GEF funding.</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support expedited funding by the GEF but may wish to note capacity limitations in establishing resource mobilization focal points and suggest that this is not a viable proposition for small island developing States.</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to highlight the need include as an integral part of the funding for updating NBSAPs the need for establishing proper monitoring systems to support monitoring activities and assist with policy, planning and reporting requirements.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> FSM may wish to take the lead on this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Samoa may wish to co-lead this issue</p>	

Partner Support Backup: SPREP, IUCN

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.4: (Part 2)</b></p> <p><b>Policy options concerning innovative financial mechanisms</b></p> <p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation 3/9 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 45</li> <li>• Report of the proceedings of the International Workshop on Innovative Financial Mechanisms (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/INF/5) (see link &lt; <a href="http://www.cbd.int/wgri3/meeting/Documents.shtml">http://www.cbd.int/wgri3/meeting/Documents.shtml</a>&gt;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This agenda item recognizes the persistent and critical shortage of financial resources available to support ecosystem services and underlying biodiversity, and that the achievement of the 2020 biodiversity target, to a large extent, will depend upon the level of available funding in all relevant sectors and at all levels.</li> <li>• <i>The draft decision for this agenda item encourages Parties to take an active part in ongoing processes to enhance innovative financing, such as the LifeWeb initiative</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>While PICs have been very successful in finding innovative finances to support the establishment of marine protected areas, the ongoing maintenance of these areas creates a significant financial burden.</p>	<p>Some PICs have created innovative financial mechanism to support ongoing conservation efforts. For example the Micronesia Challenge and the Palau tourist levy. These innovations should be showcased.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to highlight innovative financial mechanism already established in the region</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to suggest an additional phrase to the current draft decision</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Invites relevant international and regional organizations and initiatives to, where relevant, cooperate with the Executive Secretary, to:</i></p> <p><u>4(a) Cooperate on the development of innovative financial mechanisms, as appropriate; including the development of National and Regional Biodiversity Trust Funds to provide long-term and predictable funding for activities under the Convention.</u></p>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Palau may wish to take the lead on innovative mechanisms. Tuvalu may wish to suggest the trust fund concept.</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Tuvalu may wish to co-lead this issue</p> <p><b>Partner Support Backup:</b> SPREP, CI</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.4 (part 3)</b></p> <p><b>Strengthening existing financial mechanisms</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New and addition funding is necessary to allow countries, particularly LDCs and SIDS to implement the new strategic plan.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p><i>Draft decision on the resource mobilization strategy on the basis of document UNEP/CBD/COP/13 found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 49</i></p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>New and additional funding is necessary for PICs to implement the Strategic Plan and provide the necessary security</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>(iii) A draft decision on the resource mobilization strategy on the basis of document UNEP/CBD/COP/13 was prepared by the Executive Secretary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to strongly support the following paragraph in the draft decision</i></li> </ul> <p><i>16. Invites Parties and relevant organizations to continue to examine the need and modalities for new and additional funding programmes through voluntary contributions to support the three objectives of the Convention, and provide elaborated proposals in this regard for consideration by the fourth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention;</i></p>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> FSM may wish to take the lead on this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead(s):</b> RMI, Palau, Tuvalu and Tonga may wish to co-lead</p> <p><b>Partner Support Backup:</b> SPREP</p>	

Agenda Item and Issue	Brief background
<p>Item 4.7.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Global Strategy for Plant Conservation</li> <li>• Proposals for a consolidated update of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (decision VI/9, annex) was adopted in 2002 with the ultimate goal to halt the current and continuing loss of plant diversity.</li> <li>• In decision IX/3, the Conference of the Parties decided to consider the further development and implementation of the Strategy beyond 2010, including an update of the current targets within the broader context of and consistent with the new Strategic Plan beyond 2010,</li> </ul>
<p>Relevant papers</p> <p><i>Recommendation XIV/8 of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 60</i></p> <p><i>Updated technical rationale for the targets of the Strategy in document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/19.</i></p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Certain aspects of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation are particularly important for PICs. These relate to plants important for island agriculture and those related to traditional use</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to give strong support to the following paragraph in the draft decisions including removal of brackets around reference to financial mechanism</i></li> </ul> <p><i>3. Emphasizes the need for capacity-building, particularly in developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States <u>among them</u>, and Parties with economies in transition, to facilitate implementation of the Strategy;</i></p> <p><i>5. Invites Parties, other Governments, [the financial mechanism], and funding organizations to provide adequate, timely and sustainable support to the implementation of the Strategy, especially by developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States <u>among them</u>, and Parties with economies in transition;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may also wish to strongly support the following target with the support of the term “protected”</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Target 9: 70 per cent of the genetic diversity of crops including their wild relatives and other socio-economically valuable plant species conserved, and associated indigenous and local knowledge respected, [preserved][protected] and maintained. (see UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 65)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to give strong support for capacity building and additional financial resources to support LDCs and SIDs. It may be useful to remove the words “among them” in paragraph 3 and 5 (see underlined text).</i></li> </ul>	

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

- *PICs may also wish to emphasize the importance of plant genetic resources related to indigenous and local knowledge.*

Lead country for Issue: Fiji may wish to take the lead on this issue.

Co-lead: Vanuatu may wish to co-lead this issue

Partner Support/Backup: SPC may wish to provide support on this issue

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p>Item 4.8.</p> <p><b>Communication, Education and Public Awareness and the International Year of Biodiversity</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In its decision IX/32, the Conference of the Parties welcomed the contributions of Parties and of the Executive Secretary to the implementation of the programme of work on communication, education and public awareness (CEPA).</li> <li>• Under this agenda item, the Conference of the Parties is invited to consider for review and adoption the recommendations developed by the Executive Secretary on the basis of document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/16</li> <li>• The key element of the decision appears to be related to the development of new indicators.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p><i>Draft decision by the Executive Secretary on the basis of document UNEP/CBC/COP/10/16 found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 67</i></p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Communication, education and public awareness is a crucial issue in the Pacific.</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>The key element of this draft decision states:</p> <p><i>2. Requests the Executive Secretary to work with Parties and relevant organizations to develop indicators and guidelines for survey methodologies that support achievement of the targets and goals for CEPA contained in the revised Strategic Plan.</i></p> <p>It seems a pity that the development of indicators is seen as a major outcome of the COP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to add an additional paragraph calling for regional and subregional workshops to strengthen efforts on communication, education and public awareness on biodiversity issues.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> The Cook Island may wish to take the lead on this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Fiji may wish to co-lead this issue</p> <p><b>Partner Support/ Backup:</b> SPREP, WWF</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.10</b></p> <p><b>Financial mechanism: fourth review of effectiveness and guidance</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The agenda item reviews all past decisions made in relation to the Financial Mechanism</li> <li>• The four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities as related to utilization of Global Environment Facility resources for biodiversity for the period from 2010 to 2014 is contained in the annex to decision IX/31 B<sup>5</sup>.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers:</b></p> <p>Recommendation 3/10 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4)</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Special funding requirements for PICs are very important. The high vulnerability and high biodiversity makes SIDS a special case</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <p>The COP 9 Decision IX/31 invites the GEF to <i>address capacity constraints in developing countries Parties, especially Small Island developing States and least developed countries, as well as countries with economies in transition with regard to the implementation of the Resource Allocation Framework</i>. Despite this invitation, it appears that the GEF has not properly addressed the capacity constraints of SIDS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to highlight the particular circumstances of SIDS including high biodiversity and high vulnerability. PICs may wish to call for a special funding window for SIDS</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> FSM may wish to take the lead on this issue.</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Samoa may wish to co-lead this issue</p> <p><b>Partner Support/Backup:</b> SPREP</p>	

<sup>5</sup> See <http://www.cbd.int/decision/cop/?id=11674>

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p>
<p><b>Item 5.2.</b></p> <p><b>Marine and Coastal Biodiversity (part 1)</b></p> <p><b>Relevant papers:</b></p> <p>UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/4</p> <p>UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2 page 102</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> The Vava'u Declaration on Fisheries Resources 2007</p> <p><b>Other relevant papers</b></p> <p>WWF – Position Paper</p> <p>IUCN – Position Paper</p> <p>CI – Position Paper</p> <p>Greenpeace Marine Priorities – SBSTTA 14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The in-depth review of the programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity was considered by SBSTTA on the basis of documents UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/4</li> <li>• COP is invited to consider SBSTTA recommendation XIV/3 (In-depth review of the implementation of the programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity),</li> <li>• Recommendation XIV/3, contains sections on: the identification of ecologically or biologically significant areas and scientific and technical aspects relevant to environmental impact assessment in marine areas; impacts of destructive fishing practices, unsustainable fishing, and IUU fishing; the impacts of ocean fertilization; the impacts of ocean acidification; and the impacts of unsustainable human activities.</li> <li>• Recommendation XIV/3 includes paragraphs still within brackets. These include:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relationship between the CBD and the UNFCCC (para 8)</li> <li>• The precautionary principle or approach (para 14)</li> <li>• Other issues related to marine biodiversity beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (discussed in next section)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>The programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity is a critical issue for PICs</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On the relationship between climate change and biodiversity the three options are:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Option 1. [In accordance with the recommendation XIV/5, on biodiversity and climate change, requests the Executive Secretary to include the interaction between oceans and climate change in future collaboration between the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), in particular with regard to the development of a joint work programme between the three Rio conventions:]</i></li> <li><i>Option 2. [Requests the Executive Secretary to convene an expert workshop on oceans biodiversity and climate change with a view of assessing the potential impacts of climate change on ocean biodiversity and propose options for mitigating such impacts. Such a workshop should ideally involve the participation of the</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	



## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

*Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC):]*

*Option 3. [Requests the Executive Secretary to invite the Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) to jointly convene an expert workshop on oceans and climate change with a view of promoting better understanding of issues of common interest to the two Rio conventions;]*

- *PICs may wish to support the second workshop. Please note that WWF in its briefing note recommends option 1 (see attached WWF briefing note). It is highly unlikely that a joint work programme would be achieved as this would need the approval of 3 COPs. The second option is more feasible.*
- *On the precautionary [principle][approach] (paragraph 14) PICs may wish to support the use of the term precautionary principle as this is more consistent with Agenda 21 and is more formal in nature. Note this view is supported by WWF. Note precautionary approach was consistently used in Decisions in COP 9*

Lead country/Point person for Issue: Marshall Islands

Co-leads: Fiji and Tuvalu

Partners backup/support: SPREP, WWF, IUCN, CI, FFA, Greenpeace

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 5.2.</b></p> <p><b>Marine and Coastal Biodiversity (part 2) (Identification of ecologically or biologically significant areas (EBSAs) and scientific and technical aspects relevant to environmental impact assessment in marine areas</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COP is invited to consider SBSTTA recommendation XIV/3 (In-depth review of the implementation of the programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity)</li> <li>• There is a debate whether the CBD has jurisdictional authority in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.</li> <li>• Some suggest that consideration of this issue should be made by the UN General Assembly and the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. Others say that the CBD has a role as.</li> <li>• The UNGA Resolution 64/71 paragraph 154 (second part) states: .....notes with satisfaction that the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its ninth meeting adopted scientific criteria for identifying ecologically or biologically significant marine areas in need of protection in open-ocean waters and deep-sea habitats and the scientific guidance for selecting areas to establish representative networks of marine protected areas, including in open-ocean waters and deep-sea habitats, and took note of the four initial steps to be considered in the development of representative networks of marine protected areas;66</li> <li>• Text remaining in brackets includes:</li> <li>• Ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs) beyond national jurisdiction (para 19)</li> <li>• Marine protected areas beyond limits of national jurisdiction (para 24)</li> <li>• Funding for capacity building for LDCs and SIDS (para 30)</li> <li>• Bottom fishing on high seas (para 43)</li> <li>• Environmental impact assessments (EIAs) and strategic environmental assessments (SEAs), (para (d) of Annex I)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/4</p> <p>UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2 page 102</p> <p>UN GA Resolution: 64/71. Oceans and the law of the sea (see footnote for hyperlink <sup>6</sup>)</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Policy and Framework for Integrated Strategic Action; Framework for Pacific Oceanscape</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>The protection of marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction is important for protecting migratory fish stocks of significance to PICs</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p>	

<sup>6</sup> <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N09/466/09/PDF/N0946609.pdf?OpenElement>

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

On the relationship between the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea and the CBD and designation of ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs) beyond national jurisdiction (paragraph 19), there are two options. WWF suggests combining the options. This would mean that the UNGA and UNCLOS would be responsible for designating marine protected areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction while the CBD would play a role in identifying ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs).

- *PICs may wish to support this view as it appears both legally and politically sound. (In their brief, GPI also makes reference to vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs), PICs may wish to consider adding this term)*

On the work of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Informal Working Group established by UNGA there are brackets around a [*on a process towards the designation of marine protected areas in areas beyond national jurisdiction*] (paragraph 24)

- *PICs may wish to support the removal of the brackets so work on the designation of MPAs in expedited. (This view is supported by WWF and GPI. GPI also suggest setting up a formal process to develop an agreement which addresses the current gaps in high seas governance, including a mechanism for establishing marine protected areas in areas beyond national jurisdiction.)*

Note GPI has additional text proposals including on: preventing the destructive impacts of deep-sea fisheries on marine biodiversity and vulnerable marine ecosystems in areas beyond national jurisdiction; UN Fish Stocks Agreement; ratifying the FAO agreement on Port States measures to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU fishing; a centralised global record of fishing vessels (see GPI brief).

- *PICs may wish to give due consideration to proposing these additional elements in the decision on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity*

A reference to inviting the Global Environment Facility to extend support for capacity-building to developing countries, small island developing States, least developed countries, and countries with economies in transition, in order to identify ecologically or biologically significant and/or vulnerable marine areas in need of protection, ... (paragraph 32) is currently in brackets.

- *PICs may wish to support the removal of these brackets and hence support additional funding for SIDS. Note that the words "amongst them" are not used in this formulation.*

On environmental impact assessments (EIAs) and strategic environmental assessments (SEAs), (para (d) of Annex I), there are two options, the first is broader and refers to marine protected areas and representative networks of marine protected areas but does not refer to the concept of ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs). This is found in the second option. A reference to EBSAs may give more formal recognition of the concept and the role of the CBD.

- *PICs may wish to combine both options with a reference to MPAs and EBSAs. (Note WWF suggests deleting the reference to EBSAs)*

Lead country/Point person for Issue: Marshall Islands

Co-lead: Fiji and Tuvalu

Partners backup/support: SPREP, WWF, IUCN, CI, FFA, Greenpeace

Agenda Item and Issue	Brief background
Item 5.4.  Protected areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The programme of work on protected areas was adopted in 2004, in decision VII/28. In paragraph 28 of this decision, the Conference of the Parties decided to assess progress in the implementation of the programme of work at each of its meetings until 2010.</li> <li>SBSTTA 14 reviewed the implementation of the programme of work on the basis of documents UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/5 and Add.1</li> <li>The COP will be invited to recommendations made by SBSTA and the reporting framework prepared by the Secretariat</li> <li>The remaining contentious issues (found in brackets) relate to GEF finance and one on MPA beyond limits of national jurisdiction</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommendation XIV/4 of the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/3) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2 (page 120)</li> <li>Reporting framework on national implementation of the programme of work contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2 (page 127)</li> </ul> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> Action Strategy for Nature Conservation 2008-2012</p> <p><b>Other relevant papers:</b></p> <p>WWF position paper</p> <p>Fiji Position Paper</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b> The establishment and management of protected areas was recognized as an important issue in the Nadi pre-COP workshop.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traditional systems of management are a key element of protected areas in the Pacific</li> <li>It is important to ensure that long-term, expedited and predictable financing is provided to assist PICs manage their protected areas</li> </ul>
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>There are brackets around an entire paragraph which invites other Governments and international financial institutions including the Global Environment Facility, the regional development banks, and other multilateral financial institutions to provide the adequate, predictable and timely financial support for protected areas (para 9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>PICs may wish to remove the brackets around this paragraph as financing is essential. The WWF briefing note on protected areas supports this view.</i></li> </ul> <p>There are brackets around an entire paragraph referring to timely and appropriately use the GEF-5 for protected-area biodiversity allocations (para 10(b))</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>PICs may wish to remove the brackets around this paragraph and support time finances from the GEF</i></li> </ul> <p>There are brackets around an entire paragraph on streamlining deliver of finances from the GEF and</p>	

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

Implementing Agencies (para 13)

- *PICs may wish to remove the brackets around this paragraph and support expedited finance.*

In the section on Marine Protected areas there is brackets around the reference to a process towards designation of marine protected areas in areas beyond national jurisdiction (para 20)

- *PICs may wish to support the deletion of these brackets so as to support an expedited process for designating MPA in the high seas.* (This view is supported by WWF).

Note, WWF has a number of textual proposals with respect to protected areas. PICs may wish to give consideration to these proposals. (see WWF briefing).

- *PICs may wish to support an additional reference to traditional and indigenous knowledge (para 13 (b)).*
- *PICs may wish to apply caution to the text proposal relating to the use of climate finance to support protected areas. While this may be appropriate in the context of adaptation finance it may be problematic in the context of carbon markets and offsetting mechanisms (para 15).*
- *PICs may wish to support a new text proposal by WWF on ecosystem-based adaptation (para 15 bis)*

Lead country/Point person for Issue: Fiji

Co-lead: Palau

Partners backup/support: SPREP, WCS, WWF, CI, IUCN

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 5.6</b></p> <p><b>Biodiversity and Climate Change</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBSTTA adopted recommendation XIV/5 which, <i>inter alia</i>, welcomed the report of the second ad hoc technical expert group on biodiversity and climate change and made a number of recommendations based on its findings on the following topics: assessing impacts of climate change; reducing impacts; ecosystem-based approaches for adaptation; ecosystem-based approaches for mitigation; reducing impacts of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures, valuation and incentive measures.</li> <li>• There are a number of paragraphs in the SBSTTA recommendations that remain in brackets. These primarily relate to financial issues and include references to the LifeWeb Initiative.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>SBSTTA recommendation XIV/5 (<i>In-depth review of the work on biodiversity and climate change</i>), contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, (page 141)</p> <p>Outcome of the consultations on possible joint activities (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/23);</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> Pacific Islands Framework of Action for Climate Change (PIFACC); Action Strategy for Nature Conservation 2008-2012; SPREP Strategic Action Plan 2011-2015</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>The impacts of climate change on biodiversity within the Pacific are extremely significant. The potential survival of some PICs and their respective biodiversity may be threatened by the impacts of climate change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actions to use an ecosystem based approach to addressing the impacts of climate change are consistent with traditional coping practices in the Pacific</li> <li>• Issues relating to the protection of coral reefs and forests are vital issues in the Pacific</li> </ul>
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>Four paragraphs relating to finance including reference to the GEF and the LifeWeb Initiative remain in brackets (paras 3-6). Financing particularly related to biodiversity and the impacts of climate change are important issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>PICs may wish to support the removal of brackets around these paragraphs. This view is supported by WWF.</i></b></li> </ul> <p>A paragraph referring to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) and considering land ownership and land tenure, respecting, preserving and maintaining the knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity remains in brackets (para 7q)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>PICs may wish to support the removal of the brackets and to lend strong support to the importance of maintaining the knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities.</i></b></li> </ul> <p>A paragraph relating to the exclusion of ocean fertilization and other forms of geo-engineering activities until there is an adequate scientific basis is currently in brackets (para 7 (w))</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>PICs may wish to support the removal of the brackets around this paragraph as geo-engineering activities aimed at addressing climate change are unproven and have the potential to have a serious negative impact on marine biodiversity.</i></b></li> </ul> <p>There are two options for a paragraph on monitoring the biodiversity impacts of REDD activities.(para 9 (g). The</p>	

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

first makes reference to a discussion on biodiversity safeguards, the second refers to consultation with Parties in order to avoid any possible negative impacts.

- *PICs may wish to combine the two paragraphs so that the concepts of Party consultations and biodiversity safeguards are combined. Note WWF prefers the first option.*

There are two options for a paragraph relating to a joint work programme between the 3 Rio Conventions. While the idea of convening joint meetings of the 3 Conventions has merit, the logistics and legal complications of having Parties attend who not party to all of the Conventions may make such a process difficult.

- *PICs may wish to support the second option which refers to joint programmes. This language could be improved by including elements from the first option. WWF prefers the first option.*

WWF has a number of other textual proposals relating to the work on climate change and biodiversity. Some of these suggest end dates for work.

- *PICs may wish to support adding end dates for work under this theme.*
- *PICs may wish to apply caution to a WWF recommendation to include a paragraph on the accounting of degradation and restoration of peatlands as mandatory under LULUCF regulations. The IPCC have not developed detailed methodologies for accounting for emissions and removals from peatlands and this may open the door for incorrect or exaggerated accounting by some Kyoto Party countries.*

Possible recommendation:

**Lead country/Point person for Issue:** Tuvalu and PNG may wish to lead this issue

**Co-lead:** Fiji and Solomon Islands may wish to co-lead this issue

**Partners backup/support:** SPREP, USP – PACE-SD, IUCN, WCS, CI

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 6.1</b></p> <p><b>Agricultural biodiversity</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>SBSTTA recommendation XIV/10 A (Agricultural biodiversity, follow up to the requests of the Conference of the Parties in decision IX/1), contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2 (page 149)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBSTTA adopted recommendation XIV/10 A concerning, <i>inter alia</i>, the areas of cooperation between the Convention, FAO and its Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, as well as the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.</li> <li>• The COP will be invited to consider the SBSTTA recommendations</li> <li>• There are brackets within the text of the SBSTTA recommendations. Some of these relate to intellectual property, land security, restoration of agricultural landscapes,</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Agricultural biodiversity in the Pacific is the foundation for food and nutrition, food security and contributes to wider ecosystem functions such as the maintenance of water quality and carbon sequestration and providing incentives for conservation areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traditional agricultural knowledge is an important part of the culture of the Pacific</li> <li>• Modern agricultural practices are destroying traditional practices and also destroying important habitats for biodiversity.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>A paragraph calling for a study on the trends of patents and intellectual property is currently in brackets. Understanding any trends in patenting and potential loss of traditional knowledge would be an important issue for the Pacific (para 6d, p150)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around this paragraph.</i></li> </ul> <p>A paragraph referring to minimizing, or avoiding, negative impacts of biofuels on biodiversity, including .....[as well as impacts on land security] has a reference to land security in brackets (para 6f, p151). Land security and land tenure is an important issue in the Pacific. Any impacts on land security should be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around the reference to land security.</i></li> </ul> <p>There three options for a paragraph referring to: [Promoting the conservation, [restoration] and the sustainable management of [biodiversity-rich] agricultural landscapes....] (para 6(i), p151). The main point of content is whether the actions to promote sustainable management of agricultural landscapes are consistent with the CBD. It would seem logical that a connection is made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support Option 2 as it makes a connection to the CBD and is slightly less complicated than Option 3.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Vanuatu may wish to take the lead on this issue.</p>	
<p><b>Co-lead:</b> Tonga may wish to co-lead this issue</p>	
<p><b>Partner Support/Backup:</b> SPC, SPREP, USP</p>	



Agenda Item and Issue	Brief background
<p><b>Item 6.3</b></p> <p><b>Forest Biodiversity</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Executive Secretary prepared a note on collaboration with the United Nations Forum on Forests and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/14).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/14</li> <li>SBSTTA recommendation XIV12 (<i>Forest biodiversity: Collaboration with the secretariat of the United Nations Forum on Forests and report on cooperation on the monitoring of forest biodiversity and on clarifying the definitions of forest and forest types</i>), contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 157</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SBSTTA 14 adopted recommendation XIV/12 on matters related to forest biodiversity</li> <li>COP 10 is invited to consider SBSTTA recommendation XIV12</li> <li>The SBSTTA recommendations contain two options relating to the development of biodiversity safeguards and mechanisms to monitor impacts on biodiversity.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b> A number of PICs have extensive forest biodiversity with high levels of endemism</p>	<p>Establishing effective mechanisms to sustainably manage the forests of the Pacific is an important goal for the region</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b> The paragraph (para 12, page 151) relating to biodiversity safeguards (and containing two options) is similar to the paragraph on Biodiversity and Climate Change (Agenda Item5.6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>PICs may wish to combine the two paragraphs so that the concepts of Party consultations and biodiversity safeguards are combined.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Solomon Islands may wish to lead this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Vanuatu and Papua New Guinea may wish to co-lead this issue</p> <p><b>Partners backup/support:</b> SPREP, SPC</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p>
<p><b>Item 6.4.</b></p> <p><b>Biofuels and biodiversity</b></p> <p><b>Relevant papers</b> SBSTTA recommendation XIV/10 B (<i>Biofuels and biodiversity: Consideration of ways and means to promote the positive and minimize the negative impacts of the production and use of biofuels on biodiversity</i>), contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 160</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COP 9 adopted decision IX/2, on agricultural biodiversity: biofuels and biodiversity, in which it encouraged the sharing of information related to monitoring the effects of biofuels on biodiversity and on promoting the positive and minimizing the negative impacts of biofuels on biodiversity</li> <li>• COP 10 is invited to consider SBSTTA recommendation XIV/10B</li> <li>• On many aspects of the recommendation, it was not possible to reach consensus and many options remain in the recommendation for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Biofuels may have potential for mitigating climate change, their production may have adverse effects on biodiversity through loss of species diversity, destruction of natural ecosystems and introduction of invasive species. (Nadi Meeting Statement)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biofuels, particularly ethanol production from sugar cane, has the potential to be a significant new revenue source for some PICs</li> <li>• Other biofuels, for instance, palm oil is having a serious impact on biodiversity in some parts of the Pacific region</li> <li>• The precautionary approach needs to be applied, including application of robust risk assessment and risk management systems within an ecosystem-based management framework.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>The first preambular paragraph on the potential intended and unintended impacts of biofuels on biodiversity and impacts remains in brackets (first preamble, page 160). It may be important to highlight this concern.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around the first preambular paragraph</i></b></li> </ul> <p>The second preambular paragraph on improved monitoring, scientific assessment, open and transparent consultation is also in brackets (page 160). Improved monitoring seems logical.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around the second preambular paragraph</i></b></li> </ul> <p>A paragraph on scientific assessments of the impacts of biofuel production is in brackets (para 3, page 160). It seems logical to have scientific assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around the third paragraph</i></b></li> </ul> <p>There are two options on a paragraph on tools or toolkit to assess direct and indirect effects and impacts on biodiversity of the production and use of biofuels (para 4, page 161). Both options are reasonable. The second option makes reference to an Asia- Pacific workshop.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>PICs may wish to support the second option for paragraph 4, although either option appears acceptable.</i></b></li> </ul> <p>There are brackets around a paragraph requesting the Executive Secretary to contribute to ongoing work of relevant partner organizations and processes to promote the positive and minimise the negative impacts of [the</p>	

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

production and use of biofuels] (para 6, page 161). This seems logical.

- *PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 6.*

There are brackets around a paragraph inviting Parties develop inventories and] undertake as appropriate adequate bio-conservation measures of areas of high biodiversity value [, critical ecosystems,]...(para 10(a)). This seems logical

- *PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 10(a)*

There are brackets around a paragraph which urges donor countries and agencies and relevant organizations to provide technical and financial support to developing countries, in particular LDC, SIDS and EITS to develop policy frameworks for the sustainable production and use of biofuels (para 12, page 162). Financial support is important.

- *PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 12*

There are brackets around a paragraph which decides to establish an ad-hoc technical expert group on synthetic biotechnologies to assess their impacts on biodiversity is in brackets. (para 14, page 163). A footnote suggests that there are financial implications in establishing such a group and a question on the need.

- *PICs may wish to consider what other less costly alternatives could be established to make an assessment of synthetic biotechnologies and propose text this effect.*

There are brackets around a paragraph that invites Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to address both direct and indirect impacts that the production and use of biofuels might have on biodiversity, in particular inland waters biodiversity. (para 15, page 163). This seems logical.

- *PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 15*

There are brackets around a paragraph that urges Parties and other Governments, in accordance with the precautionary approach, to ensure that living organisms produced by synthetic biology are not released into the environment until there is an adequate scientific basis (para 16, page 163). This seems logical.

- *PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 16*

There are two options for a paragraph recognizing the threats to biodiversity from the use of invasive alien species in biofuels production and applying the precautionary approach (para 18, page 164). The first option is more straightforward.

- *PICs may wish to support the first option for paragraph 18 with the replacement of the word precautionary "approach" with "principle" in consistency with a previous agenda item proposal*

Lead country/Point person for Issue: Solomon Islands may wish to lead this issue

Co-lead: Vanuatu and Fiji may wish to co-lead

Partners backup/support: SPREP, SPC

Agenda Item and Issue	Brief background
<p><b>Item 6.5</b></p> <p><b>Invasive alien species</b></p> <p><b>A. Invasive alien species introduced as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, and as live bait and live food</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBSTTA 14 considered the issue of invasive alien species introduced as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, as live bait and live food</li> <li>• COP 9 conducted an in depth review of its work on invasive alien species requested the Executive Secretary : (i) to conduct a systematic analysis of resources and opportunities to meet the capacity needs, and (ii) to report on implementation of this decision, and decision VIII/27.</li> <li>• Financing to support the establishment of an Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on invasive alien species introduced as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, as live bait and live food seems to be the only point of contention.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b>                      Recommendation XIV/13A of SBSTTA 14 (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/3) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 164.</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> Regional Invasive Guidelines (SPREP)</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>IAS is a serious threat to island biodiversity, which is exacerbated by climate change and the limited human, technical and financial resources in PICs.</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position</b>                      There are brackets around a paragraph referring to financing for meetings of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (para 3(b), page 164). Holding meetings of this group is important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 3(b)</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Kiribati</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> FSM, Palau, Samoa and Tonga may wish to co-lead this issue</p> <p><b>Partners backup/support:</b> SPREP, GISP, GLISPA</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 6.5</b></p> <p><b>Invasive alien species</b></p> <p><b>B. Other matters related to invasive alien species</b></p> <p><b>C: Recommendations developed by the Executive Secretary</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The COP welcomes the report of the workshop “Helping Islands Adapt: A Workshop on Regional Action to Combat Invasive Alien Species on Islands to Preserve Biodiversity and Adapt to Climate Change” held in Auckland, 2010.</li> <li>• The only contentious issues refer to the risks of IAS used as biofuel crops and for carbon sequestration.</li> <li>• The further elements from the Executive Secretary are not controversial</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBSTTA recommendation XIV/13 B (Other matters related to invasive alien species) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 164</li> <li>• Further recommendations developed by the Executive Secretary on the basis of the progress report on cross-cutting issues (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/21) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 164</li> </ul> <p><b>Other relevant papers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helping Islands Adapt Synopsis</li> <li>• Helping Islands Adapt Proceedings</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b> The introduction of alien invasive species is very serious concern for PICs, particularly with the introduction of new varieties of plants as biofuels</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>There are brackets around a paragraph referring to risks of IAS used as biofuel crops and for carbon sequestration (para 3, page 165). These risks are serious and should be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 3</i></li> </ul> <p>Para 2. Parties acknowledge the report of the workshop held in New Zealand ‘Helping Islands Adapt’, which was attended by many PICs. The PICs may wish to strengthen the outcomes of this workshop by suggesting the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PICs may wish to add an additional sentence in paragraph 2 inviting parties to assist with the implementation of key recommendations from the Workshop.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Kiribati may wish to lead this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> FSM, Palau, and Niue may wish to co-lead</p> <p><b>Partners backup/support:</b> SPREP, GISP, GLISPA, NZ</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 6.6</b></p> <p><b>Global Taxonomy Initiative</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In decision IX/22, the COP a set of outcome-oriented deliverables for each of the planned activities of the programme of work on the Global Taxonomy Initiative.</li> <li>• The Executive Secretary was also requested to develop planned activities on island biodiversity and protected areas in consultation with the Coordination Mechanism of the Global Taxonomy Initiative.</li> <li>• The only controversial issues relate to the exchange of taxonomic voucher specimens and financial matters.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>SBSTTA recommendation XIV/14 (<i>The Global Taxonomy Initiative: results and lessons learned from regional taxonomic needs assessments and identification of priorities</i>), contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 168</p>	<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>The GTI has a special programme on Island Biodiversity.</p> <p>The importance of taxonomy in the implementation of the CBD objectives encourages Governments and partners to ensure that taxonomy is reflected in the CBD Strategic Plan.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>There are brackets around a paragraph referring to exchange of taxonomic voucher specimens and a link to the ABS regime (para 10, page 169). It would seem logical to retain this paragraph.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 10</i></li> </ul> <p>There are brackets around a paragraph requesting the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and <i>inviting</i> other donors to put higher priority for funding to GTI proposals (para 12, page 169). Additional financing to support the GTI seems warranted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 12, and replace the term “put high priority for funding” with “increase funding for the GTI”. (As priorities for funding should be country driven)</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Cook Islands</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b></p> <p><b>Partners backup/support:</b> SPREP, BioNET-International</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 6.7</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Article 8(j) and related provisions</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Mechanisms to promote the effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the work of the Convention</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and related provisions held its sixth meeting, in Montreal from 2 to 6 November 2009</li> <li>The Working Group finalized a recommendation (6/1) on mechanisms to promote the effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the work of the Convention.</li> <li>The decision has three key elements:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity-building efforts</li> <li>Development of communications, mechanisms and tools to facilitate the effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the work of the Convention</li> <li>Participation of indigenous and local communities in the work of the Convention, including through the Voluntary Fund for Facilitating the Participation of Indigenous and Local Communities in the Convention Process</li> </ul> </li> <li>There are no paragraphs in brackets</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers:</b></p> <p>Recommendation 6/1 (Mechanisms to promote the effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the work of the Convention); found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 171</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b> Due to the strong cultural heritage of the Pacific, issues relating to Article 8j and related provisions are an integral in how the Pacific approaches its response to the CBD</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>PICs may wish to strongly support all elements of the decision on 8j and related provisions</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Cook Islands</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Samoa may wish to co-lead this issue</p> <p><b>Partners backup/support:</b> SPREP, Neva Collings</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 6.7</b></p> <p><b>Article 8(j) and related provisions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Elements of sui generis systems for the protection of traditional knowledge</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and related provisions finalized a recommendation (6/2) on elements of <i>sui generis</i> systems for the protection of traditional knowledge.</li> <li>• There is no bracketed text in this element</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>Recommendation 6/2 (<i>Elements of sui generis systems for the protection of traditional knowledge</i>) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 173</p> <p>Updated note by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/WG8J/6/5)</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b> Protecting Pacific cultural heritage through innovative legal measures (<i>sui generis</i>) is crucial if the region is to ensuring the survival of traditional practices.</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to strongly support all elements of the decision on sui generis systems for the protection of traditional knowledge</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Niue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Samoa may wish to co-lead this issue</p> <p><b>Partners backup/support:</b> SPREP, SPC, USP</p>	



<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 6.7</b></p> <p><b>Article 8(j) and related provisions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Elements of a code of ethical conduct to ensure respect for the cultural and intellectual heritage of indigenous and local communities</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Relevant papers</b>            Recommendation 6/3 (<i>Elements of a code of ethical conduct to ensure respect for the cultural and intellectual heritage of indigenous and local communities</i>) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 175</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> Regional Framework for the Protection of Traditional Knowledge and Expression of Culture (SPC)</p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and related provisions advanced elements of a code of ethical conduct to ensure respect for the cultural and intellectual heritage of indigenous and local communities relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.</li> <li>• Elements of the Code of Ethical Conduct remain in brackets. These relate to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ lands and waters traditionally occupied or used by indigenous and local communities</li> <li>○ prior informed consent</li> <li>○ Access to traditional resources</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b>            Respect for traditional knowledge is a very important issue in the Pacific</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>There are brackets within a preambular paragraph of the Code of Ethical Conduct referring to lands and waters [traditionally occupied or used by indigenous and local communities], ... (eighth preambular para, page 176 ). Traditional use is important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around the reference to traditionally occupied or used by indigenous and local communities in the preamble.</i></li> </ul> <p>There is brackets within a paragraph referring to [approval and involvement] [prior informed consent] (para 9, page 179). The use of the term prior informed consent is more formal and respectful of traditional knowledge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to delete the words “approval and involvement” and retain the reference to prior informed consent.</i></li> </ul> <p>There is brackets within a paragraph referring to [Indigenous and local communities ought to determine for themselves, the nature and scope of their respective traditional resource regime(s) according to their customary law(s)] (para 16, page 180). It may be more respectful to allow indigenous and local communities to determine traditional resource regimes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>.PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets within para 16</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Niue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Samoa and Cook Islands may wish to co-lead</p> <p><b>Partners backup/support:</b> SPREP, SPC</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 6.7</b></p> <p><b>Article 8(j) and related provisions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Multi-year programme of work on the implementation of Article 8(j) and related provisions</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and related provisions developed a multi-year programme of work which revised the programme of work to include a new major focus on Article 10(c) (Customary sustainable use); and also decided that meetings of the Working Group would include in-depth dialogues on thematic areas and other cross-cutting issues.</li> <li>There is only one element of the programme of work which remains to be resolved and this relates to whether to have an in-depth dialogue at its seventh meeting on one of the following theme: [Benefit-sharing modalities / Protected areas / Biodiversity and climate change];</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>Recommendation 6/4 (Multi-year programme of work on the implementation of Article 8(j) and related provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 183</p>	<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Due to the strong cultural heritage of the Pacific, a multi-year programme of work relating to Article 8j and related provisions is a key element of the Pacific's response to the CBD.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <p>There are brackets within a paragraph relating to an in-depth dialogue at its seventh meeting on one of the following theme: [Benefit-sharing modalities / Protected areas / Biodiversity and climate change] (para 30, page 135). Each of these themes is valid. Perhaps from a Pacific perspective a focus on biodiversity and climate change may be appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>PICs may wish to support a reference to biodiversity and climate change within paragraph</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Niue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Samoa and Cook Islands may wish to co-lead</p> <p><b>Partners backup/support:</b> SPREP, SPC</p>	

## **PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief**

### **Introduction**

The Pacific CBD COP10 Brief (Pacific Brief) was prepared in response to a request by Pacific Island Countries at the Pacific regional CBD COP10 preparatory meeting held in Nadi, Fiji from the 16-18 August, 2010. The overall purposes of the Pacific Brief are to provide substantive information on key agenda items that are of relevance to the Pacific and to propose possible positions for the 14 Pacific Island Countries that are parties to the CBD to consider and take forward as part of the One Pacific Voice approach.

SPREP, with funding from the EU-UNEP MEA Capacity Building Project, contracted a consultant to assist with the drafting of the Pacific Brief. The Brief encapsulates the key relevant COP10 recommendations and proposes possible recommendations for the Pacific to consider. It also draws on key regional policies, strategies and agreements. The first draft of the Pacific Brief was circulated to all SPREP Member countries and partners for review and input. The final Pacific Brief incorporates comments and inputs received.

The Pacific Brief encompasses the overarching themes and recommendations from the Pacific CBD COP10 Preparatory Meeting. More importantly, the 21 SPREP Ministers' Communiqué which supports the One Pacific Voice at COP10 on the understanding that there are common issues of relevance and importance to the Pacific, which should be best pursued within the wider Pacific context. Notwithstanding these, there are also national issues of national interest to some countries which individual countries may wish to pursue.

The Pacific Brief does not intend to provide all the answers to the issues to be discussed at COP10 nor does it attempt to address all agenda items; however, it provides an excellent platform for coordination and an opportunity for Pacific Island Countries to have a common position of key selected issues that are of importance and relevance to the Pacific as a whole. The proposed positions are for consideration by the Pacific Island Country members that are party to the CBD. Decisions on whether to accept, modify or reject these recommendations are solely the prerogatives of the Pacific Island Country party members.

### **Strategy for effective participation at COP10**

Effective participation at COP10 is one of the key strategies which was discussed and agreed to at the Pacific CBD COP10 preparatory meeting. This is delivered through the Pacific Voice in the form of the Pacific Brief, Pacific side events, coordinated support and assistance from CROP agencies and collaborating partners and better coordination of Pacific meetings and briefings at COP10.

Country leads and co-leads have been identified for the key relevant agenda items. They will follow the issues, report back to the group and make interventions which have been supported collectively by the Pacific group at plenary and in the working groups. Overall coordinators for the two parallel working groups have been identified and their main tasks are to provide overall coordination, keep track of the issues being discussed and provide guidance to the groups. Organizations such as SPREP, CROP agencies, NGOs and collaborating partners will be available on site to provide technical support, advice and assistance to the Pacific group.

The Pacific group will also work closely with GLISPA to coordinate with other island parties particularly on issues that are of concerns to small island developing countries. An island briefing will be held on Sunday the 17<sup>th</sup> October organized by GLISPA and supported by partners including SPREP. The Island Briefing will provide an opportunity for Pacific delegates to be updated on key issues at COP10 and to establish contacts with other island countries who may be able to support Pacific positions.

## **PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief**

At COP10, the Pacific will highlight and showcase some of its key conservation successes and achievements as a way to demonstrate the commitment of the Pacific to biodiversity conservation. The Pacific has many species which are of global significance. However, some of these species are in danger of becoming extinct due to the impacts of climate change, invasive species, and other environmental threats. To assist the Pacific address some of these key challenges, there are key areas of support which will be required to strengthen the implementation of biodiversity conservation priorities and these include increased financial resources and technical assistance from the international community and donors.

To raise the profile of the Pacific, two side events are organized by SPREP for the Pacific which will highlight successes, achievements and challenges of the Pacific through statements by key speakers and exhibitions of Pacific biodiversity products and key initiatives. Other side events are organized by some of the Pacific national governments including other organizations and these will also feature the Pacific. A Pacific Voyage information pamphlet is being prepared providing a roadmap to the Pacific specific side events and it will also have key information to help guide the delegates through the COP meeting.

Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme  
**TWENTY-FIRST SPREP MEETING**  
Madang, Papua New Guinea  
6 – 10 September 2010

**PACIFIC ENVIRONMENT MINISTERS' COMMUNIQUÉ**

1. The 21st Meeting of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme convened in Madang, Papua New Guinea, 6 - 10 September 2010. The high-level segment was attended by Ministers from Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, New Caledonia, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Tokelau, Tonga and Vanuatu and Heads of Delegation from American Samoa, Australia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, France, French Polynesia, New Zealand, Niue, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu and the United States of America.
2. Heads of Delegation thanked the Government of Papua New Guinea and the Provincial Government and people of Madang for the kind hospitality extended to them during their stay in Madang.
3. The Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Pacific region responsible for environmental conservation and management, having met in Madang, Papua New Guinea during this International Year of Biodiversity, **affirmed** that:
  - biological diversity is the foundation of the well-being of our communities and cultures;
  - in the face of the predicted irreparable damage to the ability of ecosystems to provide the goods and services on which people depend, all must work together to conserve biodiversity, use it sustainably and respond to threats to its integrity; and
  - the loss of biodiversity is compounded by the overwhelming threat of climate change, and the region's response to climate change must be linked to its efforts to conserve and manage the region's species and ecosystems.

They further:

2011-2015 Strategic Plan

4. **Adopted** the new Strategic Plan 2011-2015 as the guiding document for regional environmental priorities and the work of SPREP to address these in the coming five years. They welcomed the consultative process that led to development of the plan, and endorsed the vision of '*The Pacific environment, sustaining our livelihoods and natural heritage in harmony with our cultures.*'
5. **Adopted** the four priorities of the Strategic Plan as climate change, biodiversity and ecosystem management, waste management and pollution prevention, and environmental monitoring and governance.
6. **Encouraged** the Secretariat to prioritise and facilitate systematic monitoring and reporting on outputs and contributions to outcomes at the national level in order to demonstrate results.
7. **Directed** the Secretariat to ensure that resource allocation reflects the priorities in the Strategic Plan with core resources prioritised to core functions in the first instance, and to secure the resources and to facilitate and implement partnerships to meet the goals of the Strategic Plan.
8. **Requested** donor agencies and partner organisations to note that the Strategic Plan outlines the key environmental priorities for Pacific countries and territories and urged them to support implementation of the Strategic Plan.

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

### Climate Change

9. **Noted** with concern the ongoing issues of global climate change and the resulting impacts on Pacific islands including threat to the survival of some of these islands.
10. **Endorsed** the leadership role played by SPREP in supporting climate change activities in the region; in particular its leading role in the effective coordination and implementation of climate change mitigation and adaptation efforts, including on coordination and harmonisation of climate change financing in the region.
11. **Urged** Members of SPREP to enhance capacity at the national level to continue access and coordination of financing from bilateral partners and multilateral sources, noting the principles adopted at the 2010 Forum Leaders' Meeting.

### Meeting.

12. **Noted** the commitment of all Members to move towards a durable, environmentally effective and legally binding outcome in the UNFCCC as quickly as possible and to use COP16 in Cancun to achieve this objective.
13. **Urged** all countries to fulfil their voluntary commitments enshrined in the Copenhagen Accord including the implementation of mitigation commitments and actions, enhanced adaptation actions and commitments to fast-start and longer term financing. They welcomed the fast-start pledges of developed countries and the delivery of fast-start funding to date.
14. **Directed** the Secretariat to continue to provide technical information and support to Pacific island countries and territories (PICTs) on climate change issues and negotiations, including assisting PICTs with a preparatory meeting prior to UNFCCC COP16 in Cancun.
15. **Reiterated**, in relation to climate change issues and negotiations, the value and significance of cooperation and exchange of information between SPREP Members and with the Secretariat.
16. **Endorsed** the approach to revision of the PIFACC to take account of the findings of the mid-term review and developments over the first five years of its operation. Furthermore, timely support from donors to implement the PIFACC over the next five years was called for.

### Conservation of the Ocean

17. **Emphasised** the critical importance of ensuring the sustainable development, management and conservation of our ocean.
18. **Reiterated** the critical role of SPREP in the promotion of, and support for the management and conservation of island, coastal and marine ecosystems through its new Strategic Plan.
19. **Welcomed** the decision of the Pacific Islands Forum Leaders in Port Vila in August 2010 to endorse the Framework for the Pacific Oceanscape, noting with appreciation the role of SPREP in its development, and welcomed their request to CROP agencies to implement the Framework in partnership with other relevant organisations.
20. **Directed** the Secretariat to work with CROP agencies and to develop a recommended approach for SPREP in implementing the Framework in the context of the Strategic Plan for consideration by the 22nd SPREP Meeting.

### Biodiversity

21. **Noted** with concern the increasing challenge and need for greater commitment to achieve the 2010 biodiversity targets and the continuing high rate of biodiversity loss and decline of ecosystem services in the Pacific.
22. **Commended** the Republic of Kiribati for establishing the Phoenix Islands Protected Area, the world's largest marine protected area, and its successful inscription as a World Heritage Area; the United States for the establishment of its new Pacific marine monuments; and the successful inscription of the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument as a World Heritage Area; and New Caledonia's lagoons and coral reefs that were inscribed as a World Heritage Area in July 2008.

## **PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief**

23. **Encouraged** other Pacific island countries and territories to take similar action to conserve and manage important terrestrial and marine ecosystems.
24. **Noted** the importance of having One Pacific Voice at the forthcoming 10<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in Nagoya, Japan, to ensure that COP decisions, including on developing post-2010 strategic plan goals and targets, take into account the needs of Small Island Developing States, as well as at other international conventions, in particular the UNFCCC.
25. **Noted** and **welcomed** the collaborative work of Republic of the Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and Palau, which aims to conserve 30% of their nearshore marine resources and 20% of their terrestrial resources by 2020 as part of the Micronesia Challenge.
26. **Noted** the success of the regional pre-COP 10 meeting held in Nadi, Fiji, and
27. **Directed** the SPREP Secretariat to support Pacific island countries at the CBD COP10 meeting in Nagoya and at the UNFCCC COP16 meeting in Cancun.

*Madang, Papua New Guinea, 9 September 2010.*

**Pacific Regional Preparatory Meeting for the 10th Conference of the Parties**

**to the Convention on Biological Diversity**

16 – 18 August, 2010

**Final Meeting Statement**

The Pacific Regional Preparatory Meeting for the 10th Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity held in Nadi, Fiji from 16 to 18 August, 2010, was attended by 11 Pacific island Parties to the Convention, partners, donors and non-governmental organizations from the region; and concluded with a Statement on:

**Reaffirming** the commitment by Pacific island countries to implement the three objectives of the Convention;

**Recognising** the importance of accelerating action to avoid further loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services;

**Drawing attention to** the fact that approximately 80% of Pacific island communities live on the coast and rely mostly on natural resources which underlines the importance of addressing integrated island ecosystem management;

**Recalling and further recognising** the achievements and initiatives of the Pacific through community-based and co-management approaches, national and multi-country challenges and commitments such as Locally Managed Protected Areas, Micronesia Challenge, Coral Triangle Initiative, Phoenix Islands Protected Area and World Heritage Site;

**Acknowledging** the continuing leadership demonstrated by Pacific island countries and territories in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use (eg. LMMA and MMAs, regional initiatives, efforts in fisheries conservation and management by the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA));

**Recognising** the value of collaborating and working in partnership with PI territories and other SIDS to implement biodiversity and related programmes;

**Recognising** that Pacific SIDS are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and emphasising the role of biodiversity in climate change mitigation and adaptation as well as to the increasing impacts of climate change on biodiversity,

**Further emphasising** the need for targeted capacity building, technical assistance and adequate and timely financial support as critical to achieving the implementation of Convention objectives in the Pacific region,

**The Meeting proposes the following recommendations for consideration.**

AND in accordance with the Agenda Items for COP10 the Pacific Island Countries highlighted the following priorities and provides guidance:

**CBD STRATEGIC PLAN**

**Note** the importance of the Strategic Plan in establishing a road map for CBD implementation post 2010 and recognise that goals and targets must be specific, measurable, achievable, ambitious, relevant and timely with a longer term vision.

**Call** for support to review, update and align the NBSAPs to the new Strategic Plan. 2

**FINANCING BIODIVERSITY**

**Urge** the GEF and other donors to give consideration to the special circumstances of SIDS and LDCs in addressing the need to provide funding for priority environmental issues in an expedited manner.

**Further elaborate** the need to increase support for biodiversity-related activities both through increasing ODA as well as through innovative financing mechanisms (such as long-term trust funds) and request more support for this area particularly in terms of assistance in identifying and developing these mechanisms.



## **PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief**

### **BIOFUELS AND BIODIVERSITY**

*Note* that while biofuels may have potential for mitigating climate change, their production may have adverse effects on biodiversity through loss of species diversity, destruction of natural ecosystems and introduction of invasive species. Therefore the precautionary approach needs to be applied, including application of robust risk assessment and risk management systems within an ecosystem-based management framework.

### **ACCESS AND BENEFIT SHARING (ABS) AND TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE (TK)**

*Recognise* the importance of the ABS Protocol for the Pacific and urge all Parties to ensure the conclusion of the negotiations for its adoption at CBD COP10 in Nagoya.

*Recognise* the role of Article 8j on traditional knowledge, innovations and practices and of Article 10c on Customary Use in the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity,

*Further urge* Parties to ensure that the protection and utilisation of TK is incorporated as a cross-cutting issue in the ABS regime.

### **MARINE and COASTAL**

*Reaffirm* the importance of marine and coastal ecosystems to Pacific livelihoods, commit to the meaningful implementation of the Programme of Work on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity and seek the support of donors, development partners and the private sector through adequate and timely financial and technical assistance.

*Recognise* the adverse impacts on marine and coastal ecosystems of ocean fertilization and acidification as emerging and important issues for the Pacific to consider in national and regional development plans.

### **PROTECTED AREAS**

*Emphasise* the fundamental importance of PAs in conserving biodiversity and their role in adapting to the impacts of climate change and recognising their mitigation potential and urge partners to ensure sustainable financing mechanisms are established and maintained for the effective management of PAs, including implementation of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA).

### **BIODIVERSITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE**

*Encourage* Parties to the CBD to provide financial and technical support to assist PICs in developing effective adaptation and mitigation actions that address the linkages between biodiversity and CC.

*Encourage* regional and international organisations to provide targeted, nationally appropriate capacity building to assist PICs in reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, reducing the loss of biodiversity and identifying co-benefits in actions to address REDD.

*Further recognise* the need for support for capacity building to assist PICs in identifying, assessing and monitoring impacts of climate change on biodiversity. 3

### **FOREST and AGRICULTURE BIODIVERSITY**

*Reaffirm* the importance of agriculture biodiversity as the foundation for food and nutrition, food security, contribute to wider ecosystem functions such as maintenance of water quality and carbon sequestration and providing incentives for conservation areas.

*Call* for a closer collaboration of environment, climate change and agriculture actors to ensure a holistic approach to conservation, adaptation and sustainable use.

## **PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief**

### **INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES (IAS)**

*Recognise* the serious threat of IAS to island biodiversity, which is exacerbated by climate change and the limited human, technical and financial resources in PICs.

*Urge* Parties to address IAS as a significant driver of biodiversity loss in the CBD Strategic Plan and post-2010 targets, and to allocate adequate and timely funding to prevent, control and manage IAS.

### **GLOBAL TAXONOMIC INITIATIVE**

*Recall* the importance of taxonomy in the implementation of the CBD objectives encourages Governments and partners to ensure that taxonomy is reflected in the CBD Strategic Plan.

## **PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief**

### **CBD COP10 AGENDA**

Please note that not all agenda items are covered in this Brief. The Agenda is hyperlinked to [UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2 \(DRAFT DECISIONS FOR THE TENTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY\)](#)

#### **I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS**

#### **II. CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS**

- Item 2.1. Reports of the intersessional meetings of the subsidiary bodies
- Item 2.2. Report of the Global Environment Facility
- Item 2.3. Report of the Executive Secretary on the administration of the Convention and the budget for the Trust Fund of the Convention

#### **III. ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING**

#### **IV. STRATEGIC ISSUES FOR EVALUATING PROGRESS AND SUPPORTING IMPLEMENTATION**

- Item 4.1. Progress toward the 2010 biodiversity target, including national reports and the Global Biodiversity Outlook
- Item 4.2. Revised Strategic Plan, biodiversity target and indicator
- Item 4.3. Operations of the Convention, including programme of work for the period 2011-2022 and periodicity of meetings of the Conference of the Parties
- Item 4.4. Strategy for resource mobilization
- Item 4.5. Clearing-House Mechanism and Scientific and Technical Cooperation
- Item 4.6. Technology transfer
- Item 4.7. Global Strategy for Plant Conservation
- Item 4.8. Communication, Education and Public Awareness and the International Year of Biodiversity
- Item 4.9. Cooperation with other conventions and international organizations and initiatives, engagement of stakeholders, including business and biodiversity, cities and biodiversity, and South/South cooperation
- Item 4.10. Financial mechanism: fourth review of effectiveness and guidance

#### **V. ISSUES FOR IN-DEPTH CONSIDERATION**

- Item 5.1. Inland waters biodiversity
- Item 5.2. Marine and coastal biodiversity
- Item 5.3. Mountain biodiversity
- Item 5.4. Protected areas
- Item 5.5. Sustainable use of biodiversity
- Item 5.6. Biodiversity and climate change
- Item 6.1. Agricultural biodiversity
- Item 6.2. Biodiversity of dry and sub-humid lands
- Item 6.3. Forest biodiversity
- Item 6.4. Biofuels and biodiversity
- Item 6.5. Invasive alien species
- Item 6.6. Global Taxonomy Initiative
- Item 6.7. Article 8(j) and Related Provisions
- Item 6.8. Incentive measures
- Item 6.9. New and emerging issues

#### **VII. ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY MATTERS**

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b> Item 1.2</p> <p><b>Election of Officers</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At its ninth meeting, the Conference of the Parties elected ten Vice-Presidents for a term that will end at the closure of the tenth meeting. The Cook Islands was one of these. This term will end at COP 10.</li> <li>Regional groups will be asked to nominate new Bureau members. They are urged to submit their nominations at the opening of the meeting so that the nominees can attend Bureau meeting as observers.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>None</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>It is important for the Pacific to have an ongoing representation on the Bureau</p>	<p>Having a Pacific representative on the Bureau ensures that issues of importance to the Pacific are properly reflected and addressed in the meeting agenda. The Bureau generally decides whether or not to hold contact groups on certain issues, therefore it is very useful to have a Pacific representative on the Bureau to ensure that our issues are given adequate treatment.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b> Tania is not available to sit on the Bureau for another term.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>PICs may wish to suggest another PIC representative on a regional rotation basis, noting however that other countries within the Asia-Pacific may consider that the Pacific has had its turn.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> PICs need to decide who will be the regional nominee and who will nominate our nominee</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b></p> <p><b>Item 2.1:</b></p> <p><b>Reports of Intersessional Meetings of the Subsidiary Bodies and Regional Preparatory Meetings.</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">The Pacific Regional Preparatory Meeting for the 10th Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity held in Nadi, Fiji from 16 to 18 August, 2010</a>, was attended by 11 Pacific island Parties to the Convention, partners, donors and non-governmental organizations from the region. The key outcomes of this meeting are included in the Final Meeting Statement and the Report of the Meeting</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b></p> <p><a href="#">1. Pacific Regional Preparatory Meeting for the 10th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity 16 – 18 August, 2010: Final Meeting Statement</a></p> <p>2. Report of the Pacific Regional CBD COP10 Preparatory Meeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Various intersessional meetings have been held these include: Open-ended Ad Hoc Inter-Sessional Working Group on the Implementation of Article 8(j) and Related Provisions (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/2); the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/3); the third meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on the Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4) and the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing.</li> <li>• Substantive discussion on these items will be discussed in agenda Item 3.</li> <li>• However, for this agenda item Parties will be invited to report on the results of the preparatory meetings held immediately prior to the COP.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>The Pacific region has been very active in the implementation of the CBD and has given due consideration to the COP 10 agenda.</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <p>The Statement from the Pacific Regional COP 10 Preparatory Meeting could provide the basis for a plenary statement on this agenda item.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to provide a statement outlining the key elements of the Pacific Regional COP 10 Preparatory Meeting</i></li> </ul>	
<p>Lead country/Point person for Issue: Cook Islands</p> <p>Co-Lead:</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b></p> <p><b>Item 2.2</b></p> <p><b>Report of the Global Environment Facility</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <p>The Conference of the Parties is invited to take note of the GEF report, on the understanding that the substantive issues arising, will be taken up under agenda item 4.10</p>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>Report of the GEF (<a href="#">UNEP/CBD/COP/10/6</a>)</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b></p> <p>GEF-PAS Update Report prepared by SPREP</p>	<p>(See agenda item 4.10)</p>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Funding through the GEF for biodiversity projects is an important source of funding for the Pacific</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <p>It is useful to signal and intent to follow this issue further.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>PICs may wish to indicate that they have noted the Report of the GEF and will make substantive comments on the financial mechanism under Agenda item 4.10.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> FSM may wish to take the lead on this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b></p> <p><b>Partner Support/Backup:</b> SPREP</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b></p> <p><b>Item 2.3:</b></p> <p><b>Report of the Executive Secretary on the Administration of the Convention and the Budget for the Trust Fund of the Convention</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A budget contact group will be established to prepare a budget, which will be submitted to plenary for adoption.</li> </ul>
<p>Relevant papers</p> <p><a href="#">UNEP/CBD/COP/10/7 and Add.1</a></p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Some PICs may come close to a GDP contribution scale that would create a significant budgetary burden for them.</p> <p>PICs need to be aware that for any budget cuts or reallocation of funds, it is usually the Trust Fund that is affected. This means less money for participation by developing countries</p>	<p>A GDP budgetary scale disadvantages small population countries like SIDS. It does not take into account economic vulnerabilities due to high import costs of commodities or high environmental vulnerable that could wipe out a country's GDP in one severe weather event.</p> <p>Due to the economic situation, participation by developing countries to many CBD meetings has been limited including PICs and less attention is accorded to small islands or LDCs</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support other SIDS who would be disadvantaged by a GDP scaling for assessed contributions.</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to seek special dispensation for SIDS from a GDP contribution scale due to their high economic and physical vulnerability.</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to express concern about any cuts to the Trust Fund and how this will affect participation by developing countries at COPs. PICs may wish to refer to Article 20 of the Convention (Financial Resources) which obliges developed countries to provide assistance to developing countries to meet their obligations under the Convention (including attending COPs)</i></li> </ul>	
<p>Lead country/Point person for Issue: FSM may wish to take the lead on this issue.</p>	
<p>Co-lead:</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b></p> <p><b>Item 3:</b></p> <p><b>Access and Benefit Sharing</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing (Working Group on ABS) held three meetings prior to COP 10 in order to complete the elaboration and negotiation of the international regime on access and benefit-sharing.</li> <li>• The COP will be invited to consider for adoption the protocol on access and benefit sharing based on the text prepared by the Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing.</li> <li>• The Interregional negotiating group met in September and achieved some progress towards an improved common understanding on key elements of the international ABS regime, most notably on the concept of utilization of genetic resources and its relation to derivatives. Some progress was also achieved on provisions on benefit-sharing and access.<sup>1</sup></li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers:</b></p> <p><a href="#">UNEP/CBD/COP/10/5/Add.1</a>; UNEP/CBD/COP/10/5/Add.2; UNEP/CBD/COP/10/5/Add.3</p> <p>UNEP/CBD/WG-ABS/9/ING/1</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> Regional framework for the protection of traditional knowledge and expressions of culture (SPC)</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>The access and benefit sharing is very important for PICs in ensuring the traditional knowledge is properly protected and any benefits that derive from that knowledge is properly shared by the owners.</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>The outcome of the latest round of negotiations on the ABS regime is not clear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to ensure that the protection and utilization of traditional knowledge is incorporated as a cross-cutting issue in the ABS regime.</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to include free access provisions for biodiversity that is used for biological control of invasive alien species (suggestion by SPC)</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Cook Islands may wish to take the lead on this issue.</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Palau</p> <p><b>Partner Support/Backup:</b> SPREP</p>	

<sup>1</sup> For a summary report of the ING meeting see: [http://www.iisd.ca/biodiv/absing/brief/absing\\_briefe.html](http://www.iisd.ca/biodiv/absing/brief/absing_briefe.html)



Agenda Item and Issue	Brief background
<p><b>Item 4.1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Progress toward the 2010 Biodiversity Target,</b></li> <li>• <b>Review of National Reports</b></li> <li>• <b>Global Biodiversity Outlook</b></li> </ul> <p>Relevant papers:</p> <p>Global Biodiversity Outlook Executive Summary (see <a href="http://www.cbd.int/qbo/qbo3/doc/GBO3-Summary-final-en.pdf">http://www.cbd.int/qbo/qbo3/doc/GBO3-Summary-final-en.pdf</a>)</p> <p>Technical Report: “Connecting Biodiversity and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation” <a href="http://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-41-en.pdf">http://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-41-en.pdf</a> (see UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 5).</p> <p><b>Other relevant documents:</b> GLISPA Guide to GBO3 for SIDS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO)</i> is the flagship publication of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Drawing on a range of information sources, including <a href="#">National Reports</a>, <a href="#">biodiversity indicators information</a>, <a href="#">scientific literature</a>, and a study assessing <a href="#">biodiversity scenarios for the future</a> [4MB], the <a href="#">third edition of <i>Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-3)</i></a> summarizes the latest data on status and trends of biodiversity and draws conclusions for the future strategy of the Convention.</li> <li>• A background technical report for the GBO entitled: <i>Connecting Biodiversity and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</i> (See reference) makes reference to the concept of ecosystem-based adaptation. However this report is heavily weighted towards adaptation of terrestrial ecosystems. The impacts of climate change and invasive species on the marine environment is not well addressed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>It is important that the GBO recognizes the importance of Pacific biodiversity, particularly the marine environment and the impacts of climate change and invasive species on marine ecosystems.</p>	<p>The Global Biodiversity Outlook is a useful tool for identifying key biodiversity threats in our region. Unfortunately it consideration of the Pacific marine environment which is not well developed.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>In the context of the GBO the two draft decision being proposed that warrant consideration are:</p> <p>9. <i>Agrees</i> to use the third edition of Global Biodiversity Outlook to guide and orient the scientific and technical discussions on the updating of the future Strategic Plan of the Convention, the updating of the programmes of work and discussions during future meetings of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and of the Conference of the Parties; (see UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, para 9)</p> <p>11. <i>Requests</i> the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of the necessary resources;</p> <p>(b) To commission a review of the process of preparation and production of the third edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook in order to further improve the process for future editions of the Global Biodiversity Outlook and maintain comparability with earlier editions where necessary and to report to a meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice prior to eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties; (see UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, para 9).</p>	

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

Considering the proposal for a decision on the review of the GBO it may be useful to highlight the need for further elaboration of work related to biodiversity in the Pacific region and in particular marine biodiversity.

- *PICs may wish to insert text concerning the review of the GBO that gives emphasis to the need for elaboration of work on the impacts of climate change and invasive species on the marine ecosystems of the Pacific.*

Lead country/Point person for Issue: Palau may wish to take the lead on this issue

Co-lead: Kiribati may wish to co-lead this issue

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.1: Implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Funding for updating NBSAPs</b></li> <li>● <b>Capacity building SIDS</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b>                      Recommendation 3/1 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 8</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> GEF-PAS Document and Update Report (SPREP)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The report of the Working Group on Review of the Implementation of the Convention notes the limited capacities and technical and financial resources have been an obstacle to achieving the 2010 target in many countries, especially in developing countries, in particular the least developed countries and <b>small island developing States</b>, as well as countries with economies in transition</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. GEF is the main funding for environmental programmes in the Pacific</li> <li>2. The introduction of the GEF-PAS saw a number of full size projects being developed in the Pacific at the national and regional levels</li> <li>3. Important to note that there has been some challenges in the start up of the GEF-PAS with late implementation of projects which runs through the GEF 5 replenishment cycle. Need to know how this will impact on GEF 5 priorities for the Pacific.</li> <li>4. Important to gain addition funding for PICs</li> </ol>	<p>There will be opportunities under GEF 5 for an integrated approach to all the three focal areas of the GEF namely Climate Change, Biodiversity and Land degradation. Direct access by countries to GEF funding to assist with reporting requirements and support enabling activity types of interventions.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b> The draft decision coming from Recommendation 3/1 states:</p> <p><i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility to provide adequate and timely financial support for the updating of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and related enabling activities, and requests the Global Environment Facility and its implementing agencies to ensure that procedures are in place to ensure an expeditious disbursement of funds;</p> <p><i>Invites</i> other donors, Governments and multilateral and bilateral agencies to provide financial, technical and technological support to developing countries, particularly least developed countries and <b><u>small island developing States</u></b>, as well as countries with economies in transition, to strengthen their capacities to implement the Convention, including support for relevant initiatives and strategies of indigenous and local communities;</p>	

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

- *PICs may wish to strongly support these two key elements of the draft decision*
- *PICs may wish highlight the hope that allocations for preparations and review of NBSAPs are not hampered by GEF project cycles including the GEF STAR<sup>2</sup>*
- *PICs may also wish to express concern that the GEF STAR has only allocated \$500,000 for both Climate Change National Communications and NBSAPs. As CC Nat Comms cost at least \$400k for all the assessments required, this leaves very little money for NBSAPs.*
- *PICs may wish to express concerns on any potential impacts in accessing GEF 5 resources due to the late implementation of GEF PAS projects*

Lead country/Point person for Issue: FSM may wish to lead this issue

Co-lead: Samoa may wish to co-lead this issue

---

<sup>2</sup> The System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) is how the GEF determines the amount of resources that a given country can access in a replenishment period. It replaces the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF) that was used during the fourth replenishment period of the GEF (GEF-4),v

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.1: Integration of biodiversity into poverty eradication and development</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Report of the WG on Review of Implementation of the Convention welcomes ongoing initiatives linking biodiversity, development and poverty eradication, such as the Equator Initiative, the ABS Capacity Development Initiative for Africa, the LifeWeb initiative and the Poverty-Environment Initiative.</li> <li>• A number of PICs have proposals under the LifeWeb initiative (see box)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers:</b></p> <p>Recommendation 3/3 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 10</p>	<p>LifeWeb proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishment of Effective Management System for Protected Areas in Timor-Leste</li> <li>• Utilizing Effective Remote Management Mechanisms to Enhance the Federated States of Micronesia’s Landscape and Seascape Connectivity</li> <li>• Utilizing Effective Remote Management Mechanisms to Enhance the Federated States of Micronesia’s Landscape and Seascape Connectivity</li> <li>• Fiji Marine Ecological Gap Analysis</li> <li>• Building National Capacity for Mainstreaming Protected Areas Outcomes that Support Payments for Ecosystem Service and Climate Change Adaptation in the Solomon Islands</li> <li>• Protected Area System Expression of Interest (FSM)</li> <li>• Management support to the Northern Reefs management area (Palau)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is important to note that some of the Pacific Island locally managed community initiatives have won the Equator Prize. This is an example of community based integrated approaches practiced mostly in the Pacific.</li> <li>2. It is important that commitments made under this programme, particularly LifeWeb are fulfilled.</li> </ol>	<p>The Pacific has a number of proposed programme under the LifeWeb initiative. These need to be carried out. The Pacific should be able to highlight the fact that the maintenance of marine biodiversity is a major poverty alleviation strategy in the region.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <p>PICs may wish to emphasis the importance of the LifeWeb programme in fulfilling poverty alleviation strategies in the Pacific and in facilitating a national vision for protected areas. The current draft decision states:</p> <p><i>Welcomes ongoing initiatives linking biodiversity, development and poverty eradication, such as the Equator</i></p>	

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

Initiative, the ABS Capacity Development Initiative for Africa, the LifeWeb initiative and the Poverty-Environment Initiative and may wish to highlight the integrated community based approaches to biodiversity conservation practiced in the Pacific;

The decision further states:

*Decides* to establish an Expert Group on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development with the terms of reference outlined in the annex to this decision;<sup>3</sup>

The terms of reference for the Expert Group states that the group should be “regionally balanced”

- *PICs may wish to enhance the current draft decision on “Integration of biodiversity into poverty eradication and development” by suggesting an enhancement of the programme through greater donor support.*
- *PICs may wish to support the establishment of an Expert Group on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and Development, so long as there is representation from the Pacific*
- *PICs may wish to add a sentence to the terms of reference to the EGBPED linking biodiversity, poverty eradication and the impacts of climate change. In particular PICs may wish to emphasise the fact that development or poverty eradication in our context also means addressing climate change.*

Lead country/Point person for Issue: Solomon Islands may wish to take the lead on this issue.

Co-lead: Micronesia may wish to co-lead this issue

---

<sup>3</sup> The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention notes that the convening of an expert group has financial implications and is therefore subject to a decision by the Conference of the Parties.

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.2. Revised Strategic Plan, biodiversity target and indicator</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p>
<p><b>Relevant papers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft decision taken from paragraph 4 of recommendation XIV/9 of the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/3) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 15</li> <li>• UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/10</li> <li>• Updated technical rationale for the proposed goals and targets of the Strategic Plan (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/9)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In line with decision IX/9, the Conference of the Parties at its tenth meeting is expected to consider for adoption a revised and updated Strategic Plan for the Convention, on the basis of a recommendation from the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention at its third meeting.</li> <li>• At its fourteenth meeting, SBSSTA conducted an examination of the outcome-oriented goals and targets (and associated indicators) and their possible adjustment for the period beyond 2010 on the basis of document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/10</li> <li>• The Conference of the Parties may wish to refer to updated and revised Strategic Plan of the Convention 2011-2020 as "the Aichi Nagoya Strategic Plan".</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>A new Strategic Plan should give greater attention to the issues of concern to PICs.</p>	<p>The current Strategic Plan includes indicators for Island Biodiversity nevertheless there are particular concerns for the Pacific that warrant elaboration. These include: protection of island, protection of agrobiodiversity, loss of ethnobiodiversity, impacts of climate change on coral reefs, loss of island forest ecosystems, loss of endemic biodiversity, invasive species.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <p>Consistent with the PIC Meeting Statement, PICs may wish to note the importance of reviewing the Strategic Plan and strengthening financial support for the implementation of the Plan</p> <p>The current draft decision states:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii)3. Agrees to:</p> <p>(c) <i>Complement these global headline indicators with additional indicators which are suitable for monitoring progress towards those targets for which suitable indicators have not yet been identified, in particular in relation to the economics of biodiversity and ecosystem services and the benefits to people derived from these services;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to add a specific reference to island biodiversity.</i></li> </ul>	

The Decision also states:

5. *Requests the Executive Secretary, pending the availability of the necessary financial resources, to convene a meeting, at the earliest opportunity, of an Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group<sup>4</sup> on Indicators for the Strategic Plan 2011-2020*

- *PICs may wish to ensure that a representative from the Pacific is included in this AHTEGISP*

In the Strategic goal A. Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 23) there is reference to planning process.

Target 2: By 2020, at the latest, the values of biodiversity are integrated into [national accounts], national and local development and poverty reduction and climate strategies and planning processes.

- *PICs may wish to add a reference to climate in Target 2 (suggestion by CI) and delete the bracket around the words "national accounts" (suggestion by IUCN)*

In the Strategic goal A there is reference to incentives.

*Target 3: By 2020, at the latest incentives, [including subsidies,] harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, [consistent with relevant international obligations].*

- *PICs may wish to add a reference to positive incentives as suggested above (suggested by CI IUCN has proposed similar language)*

In the Strategic Goals and the 2020 Headline Targets there is Strategic goal B. Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use there is reference to loss of habitats. (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2 page 24), More clarity in referring to human induced loss and not selecting any particular habitats may be useful.

*Target 5: By 2020, the gross human-induced loss and degradation and fragmentation of natural habitats, [including forests], is reduced by at least half.*

- *PICs may wish to refer to gross human-induced, a deletion of the reference to forests (as marine ecosystems are equally important) and a realistic reduction of half as suggested above (suggested by CI although they suggest specific reference to terrestrial, inland water and marine habitats. Note IUCN and GPI prefer the target to brought close to zero. GPI also suggest the inclusion of the term peatlands)*

There are two options for Target 6 relating to overfishing:

*Target 6: [By 2020, overfishing is ended, destructive fishing practices are eliminated, and all fisheries are managed sustainably.] or*

*[By 2020, all exploited fish stocks and other living marine and aquatic resources are harvested sustainably [and restored], and the impact of fisheries on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems are within safe ecological limits]*

- *PICs may wish to support the second option as it is more likely to be achieved. (Note IUCN uses*

<sup>4</sup> SBSTTA notes that the convening of an AHTEG has financial implications and is therefore subject to a decision by the Conference of the Parties. SBSTTA also wishes to refer to a list of all recommendations that have financial implications prepared by the Secretariat in accordance with paragraphs 11 and 12 of decision VIII/10.



*language referring to harvest being sustainable, legal and traceable. Note GPI prefers the first option)*

(Note GPI suggests additional milestones on IUU fishing with respect to fishing mortality, and sanctions (see GPI brief)

Target 7: on agriculture, aquaculture, and forestry

Note GPI suggests additional milestones with respect to synthetic fertilizers and pesticides and targets for sectors or commodities (see GPI brief)

There is also brackets around part of Target 10:

*Target 10: By [2020][2015], to have minimized the multiple pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning.*

- *PICs may wish to support the 2015 to indicate the urgency need to address the pressures on coral reefs, noting that sufficient funding would be required to achieve this target. (Note IUNC prefers the 2020 date and prefers ending goal with the words " increase the resilience of biodiversity and ecosystem services)*

In relation to strategic goal C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity there are option for percentages (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 24):

*Target 11: By 2020, at least 25% of terrestrial, inland- water and 15% of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through comprehensive, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of effectively managed protected areas and other means, **designed to facilitate adaptation to climate change impacts and integrated into the wider land- and seascape.***

- PICs may wish to suggest the percentages as indicated in bold and suggest additional text as indicated in bold relating to climate change impacts (IUCN proposes these percentages, Note GPI suggests a 2015 target year and a reference to **vulnerable marine ecosystems**. PICs may wish to add this term)

In relation to improvement in conservation status there is brackets around a percentage (page 24)

*Target 12: By 2020 the extinction and decline of known threatened species has been prevented and improvement in the conservation status **[for at least 10% of them]** has been achieved.*

- *PICs may wish to suggest the removal of the brackets (suggestion by CI and IUCN)*

In the section on strategic goal D: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services a more appropriate reference to climate change could be considered:

*Target 15: By 2020, the ability of ecosystems to adapt ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to **climate change mitigation and adaptation** ~~carbon stocks~~ has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15% of degraded ecosystems. ~~thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.~~*

- PICs may wish to suggest alternative text which better links climate change to ecosystem resilience as suggested above (suggestion by CI) or they may wish to consider GPI text

*referring to terrestrial, freshwater and marine biodiversity that provide critical ecosystem services (see GPI brief)*

In the section on Strategic goal E. Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building

**Target 16** By 2020, at the latest, the international regime on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) is in force and operational, sustainable access to genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources is enhanced, and equitable benefits are shared consistent with the international regime on ABS.

- *PICs may wish to support simplified text as above (proposed by IUCN) (Note that GPI suggests that this target should be achieved by 2015)*

**Target 17:** *By 2020, each Party in coordination with all relevant ministries and planning processes has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and implemented, an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan contributing to the achievement of the objectives of the 2020 targets.*

- *PICs may wish to add a reference to coordination among ministries and a contribution to the 2020 targets as suggested by bold text above (suggested by CI) (Note GPI suggests inclusion of language referring to legislation, and relevant international and regional organizations (see GPI brief on target 16 not 17)*

Another Target relevant to PICs is Target 18:

**Target 18:** *By [2020], [[have [sui generis legal] systems in place to protect] traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities that are relevant to biodiversity and their customary sustainable use of biodiversity are respected, preserved and maintained, and their contribution to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity is recognized and enhanced.] [The traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use relevant to biodiversity of indigenous and local communities are fully recognized and mainstreamed in the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, its programmes of work and cross-cutting issues, at all levels.]*

- *PICs may wish to remove all brackets from this paragraph in support of legal systems to protect traditional knowledge and to support wider programmes for the recognition of traditional knowledge (Note IUCN suggests a more simplified text without reference to sui generis legal systems)*

With respect to human resources and financing it may be appropriate to relate capacity increase to the Convention and 2020 targets:

**Target 20:** *By 2020, capacity (human resources and financing) for implementing the Convention has increased to sufficient levels to achieve the Conventions objectives and specifically the 2020 targets, at least [tenfold].*

- *PICs may wish to highlight significant national commitments and contributions to biodiversity conservations such as the Micronesia Challenge, Phoenix Island Protected Area, Locally Managed Marine Areas and other regional initiatives and to note the need for increased technical and financial support from the international donor communities to fully implement the convention through these innovative initiatives.*

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

- *PICs may wish to support a tenfold increase in human resources and international financing and a reference to the Convention and 2020 targets. (suggested by CI) The burden should not be placed on national governments, particularly LDC and SIDs. (Note IUCN suggests a one hundred fold increase)*

Lead country/Point person for Issue: The Cook Islands may wish to take the lead on this issue

Co-lead: Papua New Guinea may wish to co-lead this issue

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.3. (part 1)</b></p> <p><b>Operations of the Convention, including programme of work for the period 2011-2022 and periodicity of meetings of the Conference of the Parties</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.3(a)</b></p> <p><b>The multi-year programme of work of the Convention for the period 2011-2020 and periodicity of meetings and organization of work of the Conference of the Parties</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COP 11 will take place in 2012 and it is proposed that a number of issues will be addressed in the COP. These are included in <i>recommendation 3/6 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention</i>.</li> <li>• There are some unresolved issues. One of these relates to cooperation among international biodiversity-related organizations taking into account, inter alia, proposals for: a United Nations Decade on Biodiversity; possible options for cooperation among the Rio conventions.</li> <li>• There are some legal complications in linking the three Rio Conventions as not all countries are Party to each of these agreements. Therefore mandates or decisions arising from one Convention may not naturally flow to another.</li> <li>• Nevertheless the linkage particularly between climate change and biodiversity is a significant issue for island nations as noted in the PIC COP10 Preparatory Meeting Statement and the Pacific Islands Round Table for Nature Conservation Meeting Statement.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers:</b></p> <p>Recommendation 3/6 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 30</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> Pacific Regional CBD COP10 Preparatory Meeting Statement; Pacific Round Table Meeting Outcome Statement 2010</p>	<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>The linkage between the loss of biodiversity and the impacts of climate change are a particular concern for PICs</p>
<p><b>Possible Position :</b></p> <p>The draft decision on agenda item 4.3a states:</p> <p><i>(a)(v) Cooperation among international biodiversity-related organizations taking into account, inter alia, proposals for: a United Nations Decade on Biodiversity; possible options for cooperation among the Rio conventions[, including the preparation of a possible joint work programme; and the convening of a joint high-level segment or joint extraordinary Conference of the Parties of the three Rio conventions];</i></p> <p>Logistically and legally this element of the decision may be extremely difficult. Getting all Parties to each of the 3 Rio Conventions in the one place at the one time would be near impossible.</p>	

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

- *PICs may wish to support establishment of a joint working group of experts on the 3 Rio conventions. The purpose of this group would be to develop policy recommendations for each of the Convention to enhance synergies. This group would meet intersessionally. It may also be possible to convene an intersessional high level meeting of Ministers to discuss and propose policies on the synergies between the 3 Conventions.*

Lead country/Point person for Issue: The Cook Islands may wish to lead.

Co-lead: Tonga may wish to co-lead this issue

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue: \</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.3. (part 2) Operations of the Convention, including programme of work for the period 2011-2022 and periodicity of meetings of the Conference of the Parties</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.3(a) The multi-year programme of work of the Convention for the period 2011-2020 and periodicity of meetings and organization of work of the Conference of the Parties</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COP 11 will take place in 2012 and it is proposed that a number of issues will be addressed in the COP. These are included in recommendation 3/6 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention.</li> <li>• One of the recommended agenda items for COP 11 is an in-depth review of the programme of work on island biodiversity;</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers:</b></p> <p>Recommendation 3/6 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 30</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>The Programme of Work on Island Biodiversity is extremely important for the Pacific.</p>	<p>The Pacific took a lead in the development of the Programme of Work. A review of implementation should highlight areas where additional action and new financing and capacity building is required.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>The draft decision on the agenda for COP 11 states:</p> <p><i>(a)(viii) The in-depth review of the programme of work on island biodiversity;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support an in-depth review of the programme of work on island biodiversity and suggest that an ad hoc working group be established ahead of COP 11 to facilitate a review process and to make recommendation to the COP.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Based on past work on this agenda item Palau may wish to take the lead on this issue.</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b></p> <p><b>Partners backup support:</b> SPREP, GLISPA</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.3(b)</b></p> <p><b>National reporting: review of experience and proposals for the fifth national report</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fifth national report would be due in time for consideration by COP 12</li> <li>• The reporting burden of preparing the next report will require additional financial support</li> <li>• The draft decision makes special reference to the needs of SIDS</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>Recommendation 3/7 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 33</p>	<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preparing national reports provides an opportunity for PICs to (i) highlight issues of particular concern to island nations and island biodiversity; and (ii) update national biodiversity information</li> <li>2. Funding availability to assist with the preparation of national reports to the CBD have helped PICs to prepare reports</li> <li>3. The national reporting process is one of the effective ways for the PICs to engage in the convention.</li> </ol> <p>Fourth national reports were due in March 2009 however, not many PICs met this deadline. In April 2010, the CBD Secretariat in collaborations with SPREP through a capacity building workshop on the 4<sup>th</sup> National Reports which provided technical support and guidance to the PICs. As of August 2010, a total of 7 PICs have submitted their 4<sup>th</sup> National Reports to the CBD Secretariat. It is important to note that this is probably the first time a good number of national reports have been completed and submitted by PIC parties.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>The draft decision on national reporting states:</p> <p><i>9. Invites other donors, Governments and multilateral and bilateral agencies to provide financial and technical support to developing countries, particularly the least developed countries and small island developing States amongst them, and countries with economies in transition, for preparing their national reports;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to ensure that this paragraph is retained. It may be useful to delete the words “amongst them” as this would intend to imply that only SIDS that are also LDCs are given special consideration. The use of the term “amongst them” is not used in some other draft decisions.</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support enhanced funding arrangements for the preparation of 5<sup>th</sup> national reports (see also agenda item 4.1 on GEF STAR funding).</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to acknowledge and request continued capacity building support from the CBD Secretariat in collaborations with SPREP to support the preparations of national reports.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> A number of PICs identified an interest in following funding issues at the</p>	

## **PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief**

Nadi pre-COP workshop. These included FSM, RMI, Palau, Tuvalu and Tonga. One of these countries may wish to take the lead on this issue.

**Co-lead:**

**Partners backup support:** SPREP, IUCN



<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.3(e)</b></p> <p><b>New and emerging issues</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current draft decision on New and Emerging issues notes that ocean acidification is not a new issue.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>Recommendation XIV/16 of the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/3) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 39</p>	<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Ocean acidification is a very serious concern for PICs</p> <p>Ocean acidification due to increase dissolved CO<sub>2</sub> in the ocean weakens coral and shellfish and could have very serious economic implications for PICs</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <p>The current draft decision on New Issues states that ocean acidification is not a new issue (see draft decision below). The political implications of this statement are not clear.</p> <p><i>(a) Consider the impacts of ocean acidification on marine biodiversity and habitats as part of the ongoing activities under the programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity, in accordance with the provision in paragraph 4 of decision IX/20;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>PICs may wish to monitor consideration of this agenda item to ensure that the issue of ocean acidification is not swept under the table. PICs may wish to seek an assurance when this agenda item comes up that ocean acidification will be properly considered within the work of marine and coastal biological diversity.</i></li> <li><i>PICs may wish to highlight the seriousness of ocean acidification and seek proper consideration of the issue within the agenda on marine and coastal biodiversity.</i></li> <li><i>PICs may wish to insert a call to regional organisations to assist in an assessment of ocean acidification in the Pacific</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Palau may wish to take the lead on this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Marshall Islands may wish to co-lead</p> <p><b>Partner support backup:</b> SPREP, WWF and WCS may wish to provide support on this issue</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b> Item 4.4: <b>Strategy for resource mobilization (Part 1)</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Strategy for resource mobilization in support of the Convention's three objectives for the period 2008-2015 (decision IX/11 B) was adopted at COP 9.</li> <li>• Under this agenda item, the COP is invited to consider for finalization and adoption the recommendations which are contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2:</li> <li>• The draft decision invites Parties to create a "resource mobilization focal point"</li> <li>• It also invites the GEF to provide timely and adequate financial support to update NBSAPs</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b> Recommendation 3/8 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 43</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> GEF-PAS and GEF-PAS Update Report (SPREP)</p>	<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b> This agenda item two key elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One useful for PICs</li> <li>• One burdensome for PICs</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New funding for updating NBSAPs is important.</li> <li>• Creating new administrative burdens by establishing a resource mobilization focal point may not be helpful for PICs with limited staff levels.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Possible Position</b> PICs may wish to consider this draft decision carefully. Two key elements of the draft decision are:</p> <p><i>1. Invites Parties that have not done so to appoint a "resource mobilization focal point" to facilitate national implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization;</i></p> <p><i>4. Requests the Global Environment Facility to provide timely and adequate financial support to updating national biodiversity strategies and action plans, which may include the development of country-specific resource mobilization strategies;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to consider whether the establishment of resource mobilization focal points is an added burden on reporting requirements under the Convention.</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to ensure that the text referring to the GEF and "timely and adequate financial support" is preserved. They may wish to insert the words "based on simplified funding request procedures" after support to speed up the process of accessing GEF funding.</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support expedited funding by the GEF but may wish to note capacity limitations in establishing resource mobilization focal points and suggest that this is not a viable proposition for small island developing States.</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to highlight the need include as an integral part of the funding for updating NBSAPs the need for establishing proper monitoring systems to support monitoring activities and assist with policy, planning and reporting requirements.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> FSM may wish to take the lead on this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Samoa may wish to co-lead this issue</p>	

Partner Support Backup: SPREP, IUCN

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.4: (Part 2)</b></p> <p><b>Policy options concerning innovative financial mechanisms</b></p> <p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation 3/9 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 45</li> <li>• Report of the proceedings of the International Workshop on Innovative Financial Mechanisms (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/INF/5) (see link &lt; <a href="http://www.cbd.int/wgri3/meeting/Documents.shtml">http://www.cbd.int/wgri3/meeting/Documents.shtml</a>&gt;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This agenda item recognizes the persistent and critical shortage of financial resources available to support ecosystem services and underlying biodiversity, and that the achievement of the 2020 biodiversity target, to a large extent, will depend upon the level of available funding in all relevant sectors and at all levels.</li> <li>• <i>The draft decision for this agenda item encourages Parties to take an active part in ongoing processes to enhance innovative financing, such as the LifeWeb initiative</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>While PICs have been very successful in finding innovative finances to support the establishment of marine protected areas, the ongoing maintenance of these areas creates a significant financial burden.</p>	<p>Some PICs have created innovative financial mechanism to support ongoing conservation efforts. For example the Micronesia Challenge and the Palau tourist levy. These innovations should be showcased.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to highlight innovative financial mechanism already established in the region</i></li> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to suggest an additional phrase to the current draft decision</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Invites relevant international and regional organizations and initiatives to, where relevant, cooperate with the Executive Secretary, to:</i></p> <p><u>4(a) Cooperate on the development of innovative financial mechanisms, as appropriate; including the development of National and Regional Biodiversity Trust Funds to provide long-term and predictable funding for activities under the Convention.</u></p>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Palau may wish to take the lead on innovative mechanisms. Tuvalu may wish to suggest the trust fund concept.</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Tuvalu may wish to co-lead this issue</p> <p><b>Partner Support Backup:</b> SPREP, CI</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.4 (part 3)</b></p> <p><b>Strengthening existing financial mechanisms</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New and addition funding is necessary to allow countries, particularly LDCs and SIDS to implement the new strategic plan.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p><i>Draft decision on the resource mobilization strategy on the basis of document UNEP/CBD/COP/13 found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 49</i></p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>New and additional funding is necessary for PICs to implement the Strategic Plan and provide the necessary security</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>(iii) A draft decision on the resource mobilization strategy on the basis of document UNEP/CBD/COP/13 was prepared by the Executive Secretary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>PICs may wish to strongly support the following paragraph in the draft decision</i></li> </ul> <p><i>16. Invites Parties and relevant organizations to continue to examine the need and modalities for new and additional funding programmes through voluntary contributions to support the three objectives of the Convention, and provide elaborated proposals in this regard for consideration by the fourth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention;</i></p>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> FSM may wish to take the lead on this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead(s):</b> RMI, Palau, Tuvalu and Tonga may wish to co-lead</p> <p><b>Partner Support Backup:</b> SPREP</p>	

Agenda Item and Issue	Brief background
<p><b>Item 4.7.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Global Strategy for Plant Conservation</li> <li>• Proposals for a consolidated update of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (decision VI/9, annex) was adopted in 2002 with the ultimate goal to halt the current and continuing loss of plant diversity.</li> <li>• In decision IX/3, the Conference of the Parties decided to consider the further development and implementation of the Strategy beyond 2010, including an update of the current targets within the broader context of and consistent with the new Strategic Plan beyond 2010,</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p><i>Recommendation XIV/8 of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 60</i></p> <p><i>Updated technical rationale for the targets of the Strategy in document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/19.</i></p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Certain aspects of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation are particularly important for PICs. These relate to plants important for island agriculture and those related to traditional use, as well as to the conservation of island endemic species</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to give strong support to the following paragraph in the draft decisions including removal of brackets around reference to financial mechanism</i></li> </ul> <p><i>3. Emphasizes the need for capacity-building, particularly in developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States <u>among them</u>, and Parties with economies in transition, to facilitate implementation of the Strategy;</i></p> <p><i>5. Invites Parties, other Governments, [the financial mechanism], and funding organizations to provide adequate, timely and sustainable support to the implementation of the Strategy, especially by developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States <u>among them</u>, and Parties with economies in transition;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may also wish to strongly support the following target with the support of the term “protected”</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Target 9: 70 per cent of the genetic diversity of crops including their wild relatives and other socio-economically valuable plant species conserved, and associated indigenous and local knowledge respected, [preserved][protected] and maintained. (see UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 65)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to give strong support for capacity building and additional financial resources to support LDCs and SIDs. It may be useful to remove the words “among them” in paragraph 3 and 5</i></li> </ul>	

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

*(see underlined text).*

- *PICs may also wish to emphasize the importance of plant genetic resources related to indigenous and local knowledge.*

**Lead country for Issue:** Fiji may wish to take the lead on this issue.

**Co-lead:** Vanuatu may wish to co-lead this issue

**Partner Support/Backup:** SPC may wish to provide support on this issue

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p>Item 4.8.</p> <p><b>Communication, Education and Public Awareness and the International Year of Biodiversity</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In its decision IX/32, the Conference of the Parties welcomed the contributions of Parties and of the Executive Secretary to the implementation of the programme of work on communication, education and public awareness (CEPA).</li> <li>• Under this agenda item, the Conference of the Parties is invited to consider for review and adoption the recommendations developed by the Executive Secretary on the basis of document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/16</li> <li>• The key element of the decision appears to be related to the development of new indicators.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p><i>Draft decision by the Executive Secretary on the basis of document UNEP/CBC/COP/10/16 found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 67</i></p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Communication, education and public awareness is a crucial issue in the Pacific.</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>The key element of this draft decision states:</p> <p><i>2. Requests the Executive Secretary to work with Parties and relevant organizations to develop indicators and guidelines for survey methodologies that support achievement of the targets and goals for CEPA contained in the revised Strategic Plan.</i></p> <p>It seems a pity that the development of indicators is seen as a major outcome of the COP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to add an additional paragraph calling for regional and subregional workshops to strengthen efforts on communication, education and public awareness on biodiversity issues.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> The Cook Island may wish to take the lead on this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Fiji may wish to co-lead this issue</p> <p><b>Partner Support/ Backup:</b> SPREP, WWF</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue:</b></p> <p><b>Item 4.10</b></p> <p><b>Financial mechanism: fourth review of effectiveness and guidance</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The agenda item reviews all past decisions made in relation to the Financial Mechanism</li> <li>• The four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities as related to utilization of Global Environment Facility resources for biodiversity for the period from 2010 to 2014 is contained in the annex to decision IX/31 B<sup>5</sup>.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers:</b></p> <p>Recommendation 3/10 of the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/4)</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Special funding requirements for PICs are very important. The high vulnerability and high biodiversity makes SIDS a special case</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <p>The COP 9 Decision IX/31 invites the GEF to <i>address capacity constraints in developing countries Parties, especially Small Island developing States and least developed countries, as well as countries with economies in transition with regard to the implementation of the Resource Allocation Framework</i>. Despite this invitation, it appears that the GEF has not properly addressed the capacity constraints of SIDS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to highlight the particular circumstances of SIDS including high biodiversity and high vulnerability. PICs may wish to call for a special funding window for SIDS</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> FSM may wish to take the lead on this issue.</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Samoa may wish to co-lead this issue</p> <p><b>Partner Support/Backup:</b> SPREP</p>	

<sup>5</sup> See <http://www.cbd.int/decision/cop/?id=11674>



Agenda Item and Issue	Brief background
<p><b>Item 5.2.</b></p> <p><b>Marine and Coastal Biodiversity (part 1)</b></p> <p><b>Relevant papers:</b></p> <p>UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/4</p> <p>UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2 page 102</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> The Vava'u Declaration on Fisheries Resources 2007</p> <p><b>Other relevant papers</b></p> <p>WWF – Position Paper</p> <p>IUCN – Position Paper</p> <p>CI – Position Paper</p> <p>Greenpeace Marine Priorities – SBSTTA 14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The in-depth review of the programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity was considered by SBSTTA on the basis of documents UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/4</li> <li>• COP is invited to consider SBSTTA recommendation XIV/3 (In-depth review of the implementation of the programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity),</li> <li>• Recommendation XIV/3, contains sections on: the identification of ecologically or biologically significant areas and scientific and technical aspects relevant to environmental impact assessment in marine areas; impacts of destructive fishing practices, unsustainable fishing, and IUU fishing; the impacts of ocean fertilization; the impacts of ocean acidification; and the impacts of unsustainable human activities.</li> <li>• Recommendation XIV/3 includes paragraphs still within brackets. These include:</li> <li>• The relationship between the CBD and the UNFCCC (para 8)</li> <li>• The precautionary principle or approach (para 14)</li> <li>• Other issues related to marine biodiversity beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (discussed in next section)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>The programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity is a critical issue for PICs</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On the relationship between climate change and biodiversity the three options are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Option 1. [In accordance with the recommendation XIV/5, on biodiversity and climate change, requests the Executive Secretary to include the interaction between oceans and climate change in future collaboration between the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), in particular with regard to the development of a joint work programme between the three Rio conventions:]</i></li> <li><i>Option 2. [Requests the Executive Secretary to convene an expert workshop on oceans biodiversity and climate change with a view of assessing the potential impacts of climate change on ocean biodiversity and propose options for mitigating such impacts. Such a workshop should ideally involve the participation of the</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

*Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC):]*

*Option 3. [Requests the Executive Secretary to invite the Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) to jointly convene an expert workshop on oceans and climate change with a view of promoting better understanding of issues of common interest to the two Rio conventions;]*

- *PICs may wish to support the second workshop. Please note that WWF in its briefing note recommends option 1 (see attached WWF briefing note). It is highly unlikely that a joint work programme would be achieved as this would need the approval of 3 COPs. The second option is more feasible.*
- *On the precautionary [principle][approach] (paragraph 14) PICs may wish to support the use of the term precautionary principle as this is more consistent with Agenda 21 and is more formal in nature. Note this view is supported by WWF. Note precautionary approach was consistently used in Decisions in COP 9*

Lead country/Point person for Issue: Marshall Islands may wish to lead this issue

Co-leads: Fiji and Tuvalu may wish to co-lead this issue

Partners backup/support: SPREP, WWF, IUCN, CI, FFA, Greenpeace

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 5.2.</b></p> <p><b>Marine and Coastal Biodiversity (part 2) (Identification of ecologically or biologically significant areas (EBSAs) and scientific and technical aspects relevant to environmental impact assessment in marine areas</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COP is invited to consider SBSTTA recommendation XIV/3 (In-depth review of the implementation of the programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity)</li> <li>• There is a debate whether the CBD has jurisdictional authority in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.</li> <li>• Some suggest that consideration of this issue should be made by the UN General Assembly and the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. Others say that the CBD has a role as.</li> <li>• The UNGA Resolution 64/71 paragraph 154 (second part) states: .....notes with satisfaction that the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its ninth meeting adopted scientific criteria for identifying ecologically or biologically significant marine areas in need of protection in open-ocean waters and deep-sea habitats and the scientific guidance for selecting areas to establish representative networks of marine protected areas, including in open-ocean waters and deep-sea habitats, and took note of the four initial steps to be considered in the development of representative networks of marine protected areas;66</li> <li>• Text remaining in brackets includes:</li> <li>• Ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs) beyond national jurisdiction (para 19)</li> <li>• Marine protected areas beyond limits of national jurisdiction (para 24)</li> <li>• Funding for capacity building for LDCs and SIDS (para 30)</li> <li>• Bottom fishing on high seas (para 43)</li> <li>• Environmental impact assessments (EIAs) and strategic environmental assessments (SEAs), (para (d) of Annex I)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/4</p> <p>UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2 page 102</p> <p>UN GA Resolution: 64/71. Oceans and the law of the sea (see footnote for hyperlink <sup>6</sup>)</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Policy and Framework for Integrated Strategic Action; Framework for Pacific Oceanscape</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>The protection of marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction is important for protecting migratory fish stocks of significance to PICs</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p>	

<sup>6</sup> <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N09/466/09/PDF/N0946609.pdf?OpenElement>

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

On the relationship between the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea and the CBD and designation of ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs) beyond national jurisdiction (paragraph 19), there are two options. WWF suggests combining the options. This would mean that the UNGA and UNCLOS would be responsible for designating marine protected areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction while the CBD would play a role in identifying ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs).

- ***PICs may wish to support this view as it appears both legally and politically sound. (In their brief, GPI also makes reference to vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs), PICs may wish to consider adding this term)***

On the work of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Informal Working Group established by UNGA there are brackets around a [*on a process towards the designation of marine protected areas in areas beyond national jurisdiction*] (paragraph 24)

- ***PICs may wish to support the removal of the brackets so work on the designation of MPAs in expedited. (This view is supported by WWF and GPI. GPI also suggest setting up a formal process to develop an agreement which addresses the current gaps in high seas governance, including a mechanism for establishing marine protected areas in areas beyond national jurisdiction.)***

Note GPI has additional text proposals including on: preventing the destructive impacts of deep-sea fisheries on marine biodiversity and vulnerable marine ecosystems in areas beyond national jurisdiction; UN Fish Stocks Agreement; ratifying the FAO agreement on Port States measures to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU fishing; a centralised global record of fishing vessels (see GPI brief).

- ***PICs may wish to give due consideration to proposing these additional elements in the decision on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity***

A reference to inviting the Global Environment Facility to extend support for capacity-building to developing countries, small island developing States, least developed countries, and countries with economies in transition, in order to identify ecologically or biologically significant and/or vulnerable marine areas in need of protection, ... (paragraph 32) is currently in brackets.

- ***PICs may wish to support the removal of these brackets and hence support additional funding for SIDS. Note that the words "amongst them" are not used in this formulation.***

On environmental impact assessments (EIAs) and strategic environmental assessments (SEAs), (para (d) of Annex I), there are two options, the first is broader and refers to marine protected areas and representative networks of marine protected areas but does not refer to the concept of ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs). This is found in the second option. A reference to EBSAs may give more formal recognition of the concept and the role of the CBD.

- ***PICs may wish to combine both options with a reference to MPAs and EBSAs. (Note WWF suggests deleting the reference to EBSAs)***

**Lead country/Point person for Issue:** Marshall Islands may wish to lead this issue

**Co-lead:** Fiji and Tuvalu may wish to co-lead this issue

Partners backup/support: SPREP, WWF, IUCN, CI, FFA, Greenpeace

Agenda Item and Issue	Brief background
<p><b>Item 5.4.</b></p> <p><b>Protected areas</b></p> <p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation XIV/4 of the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/3) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2 (page 120)</li> <li>• Reporting framework on national implementation of the programme of work contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2 (page 127)</li> </ul> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers: Action Strategy for Nature Conservation 2008-2012</b></p> <p><b>Other relevant papers:</b></p> <p>WWF position paper</p> <p>Fiji Position Paper</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The programme of work on protected areas was adopted in 2004, in decision VII/28. In paragraph 28 of this decision, the Conference of the Parties decided to assess progress in the implementation of the programme of work at each of its meetings until 2010.</li> <li>• SBSTTA 14 reviewed the implementation of the programme of work on the basis of documents UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/5 and Add.1</li> <li>• The COP will be invited to recommendations made by SBSTA and the reporting framework prepared by the Secretariat</li> <li>• The remaining contentious issues (found in brackets) relate to GEF finance and one on MPA beyond limits of national jurisdiction</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b> The establishment and management of protected areas was recognized as an important issue in the Nadi pre-COP workshop.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traditional systems of management are a key element of protected areas in the Pacific</li> <li>• It is important to ensure that long-term, expedited and predictable financing is provided to assist PICs manage their protected areas</li> </ul>
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>There are bracket around an entire paragraph which invites other Governments and international financial institutions including the Global Environment Facility, the regional development banks, and other multilateral financial institutions to provide the adequate, predictable and timely financial support for protected areas (para 9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to remove the brackets around this paragraph as financing is essential. The WWF briefing note on protected areas supports this view.</i></li> </ul> <p>There are brackets around an entire paragraph referring to timely and appropriately use the GEF-5 for protected-area biodiversity allocations (para 10(b))</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to remove the brackets around this paragraph and support time finances from the GEF</i></li> </ul> <p>There are brackets around an entire paragraph on streamlining deliver of finances from the GEF and</p>	

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

Implementing Agencies (para 13)

- *PICs may wish to remove the brackets around this paragraph and support expedited finance.*

In the section on Marine Protected areas there is brackets around the reference to a process towards designation of marine protected areas in areas beyond national jurisdiction (para 20)

- *PICs may wish to support the deletion of these brackets so as to support an expedited process for designating MPA in the high seas.* (This view is supported by WWF).

Note, WWF has a number of textual proposals with respect to protected areas. PICs may wish to give consideration to these proposals. (see WWF briefing).

- *PICs may wish to support an additional reference to traditional and indigenous knowledge (para 13 (b)).*
- *PICs may wish to apply caution to the text proposal relating to the use of climate finance to support protected areas. While this may be appropriate in the context of adaptation finance it may be problematic in the context of carbon markets and offsetting mechanisms (para 15).*
- *PICs may wish to support a new text proposal by WWF on ecosystem-based adaptation (para 15 bis)*

Lead country/Point person for Issue: Fiji may wish to co-lead this issue

Co-lead: Palau may wish to co-lead this issue

Partners backup/support: SPREP, WCS, WWF, CI, IUCN

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 5.6</b></p> <p><b>Biodiversity and Climate Change</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBSTTA adopted recommendation XIV/5 which, <i>inter alia</i>, welcomed the report of the second ad hoc technical expert group on biodiversity and climate change and made a number of recommendations based on its findings on the following topics: assessing impacts of climate change; reducing impacts; ecosystem-based approaches for adaptation; ecosystem-based approaches for mitigation; reducing impacts of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures, valuation and incentive measures.</li> <li>• There are a number of paragraphs in the SBSTTA recommendations that remain in brackets. These primarily relate to financial issues and include references to the LifeWeb Initiative.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>SBSTTA recommendation XIV/5 (<i>In-depth review of the work on biodiversity and climate change</i>), contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, (page 141)</p> <p>Outcome of the consultations on possible joint activities (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/23);</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> Pacific Islands Framework of Action for Climate Change (PIFACC); Action Strategy for Nature Conservation 2008-2012; SPREP Strategic Action Plan 2011-2015</p>	<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>The impacts of climate change on biodiversity within the Pacific are extremely significant. The potential survival of some PICs and their respective biodiversity may be threatened by the impacts of climate change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actions to use an ecosystem based approach to addressing the impacts of climate change are consistent with traditional coping practices in the Pacific</li> <li>• Issues relating to the protection of coral reefs and forests are vital issues in the Pacific</li> </ul>
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>Four paragraphs relating to finance including reference to the GEF and the LifeWeb Initiative remain in brackets (paras 3-6). Financing particularly related to biodiversity and the impacts of climate change are important issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>PICs may wish to support the removal of brackets around these paragraphs. This view is supported by WWF.</i></b></li> </ul> <p>A paragraph referring to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) and considering land ownership and land tenure, respecting, preserving and maintaining the knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity remains in brackets (para 7q)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>PICs may wish to support the removal of the brackets and to lend strong support to the importance of maintaining the knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities.</i></b></li> </ul> <p>A paragraph relating to the exclusion of ocean fertilization and other forms of geo-engineering activities until there is an adequate scientific basis is currently in brackets (para 7 (w))</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>PICs may wish to support the removal of the brackets around this paragraph as geo-engineering activities aimed at addressing climate change are unproven and have the potential to have a serious negative impact on marine biodiversity.</i></b></li> </ul> <p>There are two options for a paragraph on monitoring the biodiversity impacts of REDD activities.(para 9 (g). The</p>	

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

first makes reference to a discussion on biodiversity safeguards, the second refers to consultation with Parties in order to avoid any possible negative impacts.

- *PICs may wish to combine the two paragraphs so that the concepts of Party consultations and biodiversity safeguards are combined. Note WWF prefers the first option.*

There are two options for a paragraph relating to a joint work programme between the 3 Rio Conventions. While the idea of convening joint meetings of the 3 Conventions has merit, the logistics and legal complications of having Parties attend who not party to all of the Conventions may make such a process difficult.

- *PICs may wish to support the second option which refers to joint programmes. This language could be improved by including elements from the first option. WWF prefers the first option.*

WWF has a number of other textual proposals relating to the work on climate change and biodiversity. Some of these suggest end dates for work.

- *PICs may wish to support adding end dates for work under this theme.*
- *PICs may wish to apply caution to a WWF recommendation to include a paragraph on the accounting of degradation and restoration of peatlands as mandatory under LULUCF regulations. The IPCC have not developed detailed methodologies for accounting for emissions and removals from peatlands and this may open the door for incorrect or exaggerated accounting by some Kyoto Party countries.*

Possible recommendation:

**Lead country/Point person for Issue:** Tuvalu and PNG may wish to co-lead this issue

**Co-lead:** Fiji and Solomon Islands may wish to support this issue

**Partners backup/support:** SPREP, USP – PACE-SD, IUCN, WCS, CI



<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 6.1</b></p> <p><b>Agricultural biodiversity</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>SBSTTA recommendation XIV/10 A (Agricultural biodiversity, follow up to the requests of the Conference of the Parties in decision IX/1), contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2 (page 149)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBSTTA adopted recommendation XIV/10 A concerning, <i>inter alia</i>, the areas of cooperation between the Convention, FAO and its Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, as well as the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.</li> <li>• The COP will be invited to consider the SBSTTA recommendations</li> <li>• There are brackets within the text of the SBSTTA recommendations. Some of these relate to intellectual property, land security, restoration of agricultural landscapes,</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Agricultural biodiversity in the Pacific is the foundation for food and nutrition, food security and contributes to wider ecosystem functions such as the maintenance of water quality and carbon sequestration and providing incentives for conservation areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traditional agricultural knowledge is an important part of the culture of the Pacific</li> <li>• Modern agricultural practices are destroying traditional practices and also destroying important habitats for biodiversity.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>A paragraph calling for a study on the trends of patents and intellectual property is currently in brackets. Understanding any trends in patenting and potential loss of traditional knowledge would be an important issue for the Pacific (para 6d, p150)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around this paragraph.</i></li> </ul> <p>A paragraph referring to minimizing, or avoiding, negative impacts of biofuels on biodiversity, including .....[as well as impacts on land security] has a reference to land security in brackets (para 6f, p151). Land security and land tenure is an important issue in the Pacific. Any impacts on land security should be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around the reference to land security.</i></li> </ul> <p>There three options for a paragraph referring to: [Promoting the conservation, [restoration] and the sustainable management of [biodiversity-rich] agricultural landscapes....] (para 6(i), p151). The main point of content is whether the actions to promote sustainable management of agricultural landscapes are consistent with the CBD. It would seem logical that a connection is made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support Option 2 as it makes a connection to the CBD and is slightly less complicated than Option 3.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Vanuatu may wish to take the lead on this issue.</p>	
<p><b>Co-lead:</b> Tonga may wish to co-lead this issue</p>	
<p><b>Partner Support/Backup:</b> SPC, SPREP, USP</p>	

Agenda Item and Issue	Brief background
<p><b>Item 6.3</b></p> <p><b>Forest Biodiversity</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Executive Secretary prepared a note on collaboration with the United Nations Forum on Forests and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/14).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/14</li> <li>SBSTTA recommendation XIV12 (<i>Forest biodiversity: Collaboration with the secretariat of the United Nations Forum on Forests and report on cooperation on the monitoring of forest biodiversity and on clarifying the definitions of forest and forest types</i>), contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 157</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SBSTTA 14 adopted recommendation XIV/12 on matters related to forest biodiversity</li> <li>COP 10 is invited to consider SBSTTA recommendation XIV12</li> <li>The SBSTTA recommendations contain two options relating to the development of biodiversity safeguards and mechanisms to monitor impacts on biodiversity.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b> A number of PICs have extensive forest biodiversity with high levels of endemism</p>	<p>Establishing effective mechanisms to sustainably manage the forests of the Pacific is an important goal for the region</p>
<p><b>Possible Position:</b> The paragraph (para 12, page 151) relating to biodiversity safeguards (and containing two options) is similar to the paragraph on Biodiversity and Climate Change (Agenda Item5.6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>PICs may wish to combine the two paragraphs so that the concepts of Party consultations and biodiversity safeguards are combined.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Solomon Islands may wish to lead this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Vanuatu and Papua New Guinea may wish to co-lead this issue</p> <p><b>Partners backup/support:</b> SPREP, SPC</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 6.4.</b></p> <p><b>Biofuels and biodiversity</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COP 9 adopted decision IX/2, on agricultural biodiversity: biofuels and biodiversity, in which it encouraged the sharing of information related to monitoring the effects of biofuels on biodiversity and on promoting the positive and minimizing the negative impacts of biofuels on biodiversity</li> <li>• COP 10 is invited to consider SBSTTA recommendation XIV/10B</li> <li>• On many aspects of the recommendation, it was not possible to reach consensus and many options remain in the recommendation for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b> SBSTTA recommendation XIV/10 B (<i>Biofuels and biodiversity: Consideration of ways and means to promote the positive and minimize the negative impacts of the production and use of biofuels on biodiversity</i>), contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 160</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Biofuels may have potential for mitigating climate change, their production may have adverse effects on biodiversity through loss of species diversity, destruction of natural ecosystems and introduction of invasive species. (Nadi Meeting Statement)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biofuels, particularly ethanol production from sugar cane and coconuts have the potential to be a significant new revenue source for some PICs</li> <li>• Other biofuels, for instance, palm oil is having a serious impact on biodiversity in some parts of the Pacific region</li> <li>• The precautionary approach needs to be applied, including application of robust risk assessment and risk management systems within an ecosystem-based management framework.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>The first preambular paragraph on the potential intended and unintended impacts of biofuels on biodiversity and impacts remains in brackets (first preamble, page 160). It may be important to highlight this concern.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around the first preambular paragraph</i></li> </ul> <p>The second preambular paragraph on improved monitoring, scientific assessment, open and transparent consultation is also in brackets (page 160). Improved monitoring seems logical.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around the second preambular paragraph</i></li> </ul> <p>A paragraph on scientific assessments of the impacts of biofuel production is in brackets (para 3, page 160). It seems logical to have scientific assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around the third paragraph</i></li> </ul> <p>There are two options on a paragraph on tools or toolkit to assess direct and indirect effects and impacts on biodiversity of the production and use of biofuels (para 4, page 161). Both options are reasonable. The second option makes reference to an Asia- Pacific workshop.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the second option for paragraph 4, although either option appears acceptable.</i></li> </ul> <p>There are brackets around a paragraph requesting the Executive Secretary to contribute to ongoing work of relevant partner organizations and processes to promote the positive and minimise the negative impacts of [the</p>	

## PACIFIC CBD COP 10 Brief

production and use of biofuels] (para 6, page 161). This seems logical.

- *PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 6.*

There are brackets around a paragraph inviting Parties develop inventories and] undertake as appropriate adequate bio-conservation measures of areas of high biodiversity value [, critical ecosystems,]...(para 10(a)). This seems logical

- *PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 10(a)*

There are brackets around a paragraph which urges donor countries and agencies and relevant organizations to provide technical and financial support to developing countries, in particular LDC, SIDS and EITS to develop policy frameworks for the sustainable production and use of biofuels (para 12, page 162). Financial support is important.

- *PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 12*

There are brackets around a paragraph which decides to establish an ad-hoc technical expert group on synthetic biotechnologies to assess their impacts on biodiversity is in brackets. (para 14, page 163). A footnote suggests that there are financial implications in establishing such a group and a question on the need.

- *PICs may wish to consider what other less costly alternatives could be established to make an assessment of synthetic biotechnologies and propose text this effect.*

There are brackets around a paragraph that invites Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to address both direct and indirect impacts that the production and use of biofuels might have on biodiversity, in particular inland waters biodiversity. (para 15, page 163). This seems logical.

- *PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 15*

There are brackets around a paragraph that urges Parties and other Governments, in accordance with the precautionary approach, to ensure that living organisms produced by synthetic biology are not released into the environment until there is an adequate scientific basis (para 16, page 163). This seems logical.

- *PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 16*

There are two options for a paragraph recognizing the threats to biodiversity from the use of invasive alien species in biofuels production and applying the precautionary approach (para 18, page 164). The first option is more straightforward.

- *PICs may wish to support the first option for paragraph 18 with the replacement of the word precautionary "approach" with "principle" in consistency with a previous agenda item proposal*

**Lead country/Point person for Issue:** Solomon Islands may wish to lead this issue

**Co-lead:** Vanuatu and Fiji may wish to co-lead

**Partners backup/support:** SPREP, SPC

Agenda Item and Issue	Brief background
<p><b>Item 6.5</b></p> <p><b>Invasive alien species</b></p> <p><b>A. Invasive alien species introduced as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, and as live bait and live food</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBSTTA 14 considered the issue of invasive alien species introduced as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, as live bait and live food</li> <li>• COP 9 conducted an in depth review of its work on invasive alien species requested the Executive Secretary : (i) to conduct a systematic analysis of resources and opportunities to meet the capacity needs, and (ii) to report on implementation of this decision, and decision VIII/27.</li> <li>• Financing to support the establishment of an Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on invasive alien species introduced as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, as live bait and live food seems to be the only point of contention.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b>                      Recommendation XIV/13A of SBSTTA 14 (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/3) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 164.</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> Regional Invasive Guidelines (SPREP)</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>IAS is a serious threat to island biodiversity, which is exacerbated by climate change and the limited human, technical and financial resources in PICs.</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position</b>                      There are brackets around a paragraph referring to financing for meetings of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (para 3(b), page 164). Holding meetings of this group is important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 3(b)</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Kiribati may wish to lead this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> FSM, Palau, Samoa and Tonga may wish to co-lead this issue</p> <p><b>Partners backup/support:</b> SPREP, GISP, GLISPA</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 6.5</b></p> <p><b>Invasive alien species</b></p> <p><b>B. Other matters related to invasive alien species</b></p> <p><b>C: Recommendations developed by the Executive Secretary</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The COP welcomes the report of the workshop “Helping Islands Adapt: A Workshop on Regional Action to Combat Invasive Alien Species on Islands to Preserve Biodiversity and Adapt to Climate Change” held in Auckland, 2010.</li> <li>• The only contentious issues refer to the risks of IAS used as biofuel crops and for carbon sequestration.</li> <li>• The further elements from the Executive Secretary are not controversial</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBSTTA recommendation XIV/13 B (Other matters related to invasive alien species) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 164</li> <li>• Further recommendations developed by the Executive Secretary on the basis of the progress report on cross-cutting issues (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/21) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 164</li> </ul> <p><b>Other relevant papers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helping Islands Adapt Synopsis</li> <li>• Helping Islands Adapt Proceedings</li> <li>• GISP Islands and Invasive Alien Species Briefing Paper</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b> The introduction of alien invasive species is very serious concern for PICs, particularly with the introduction of new varieties of plants as biofuels</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>There are brackets around a paragraph referring to risks of IAS used as biofuel crops and for carbon sequestration (para 3, page 165). These risks are serious and should be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 3</i></li> </ul> <p>Para 2. Parties acknowledge the report of the workshop held in New Zealand ‘Helping Islands Adapt’, which was attended by many PICs. The PICs may wish to strengthen the outcomes of this workshop by suggesting the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PICs may wish to add an additional sentence in paragraph 2 inviting parties to assist with the implementation of key recommendations from the Workshop.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Kiribati may wish to lead this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> FSM, Palau, and Niue may wish to co-lead</p> <p><b>Partners backup/support:</b> SPREP, GISP, GLISPA, NZ</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 6.6</b></p> <p><b>Global Taxonomy Initiative</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In decision IX/22, the COP a set of outcome-oriented deliverables for each of the planned activities of the programme of work on the Global Taxonomy Initiative.</li> <li>• The Executive Secretary was also requested to develop planned activities on island biodiversity and protected areas in consultation with the Coordination Mechanism of the Global Taxonomy Initiative.</li> <li>• The only controversial issues relate to the exchange of taxonomic voucher specimens and financial matters.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>SBSTTA recommendation XIV/14 (<i>The Global Taxonomy Initiative: results and lessons learned from regional taxonomic needs assessments and identification of priorities</i>), contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 168</p>	<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b> The GTI has a special programme on Island Biodiversity.</p> <p>The importance of taxonomy in the implementation of the CBD objectives encourages Governments and partners to ensure that taxonomy is reflected in the CBD Strategic Plan.</p>
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>There are brackets around a paragraph referring to exchange of taxonomic voucher specimens and a link to the ABS regime (para 10, page 169). It would seem logical to retain this paragraph.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 10</i></li> </ul> <p>There are brackets around a paragraph requesting the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and <i>inviting</i> other donors to put higher priority for funding to GTI proposals (para 12, page 169). Additional financing to support the GTI seems warranted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around paragraph 12, and replace the term “put high priority for funding” with “increase funding for the GTI”. (As priorities for funding should be country driven)</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Cook Islands may wish to co-lead this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Fiji may wish to co-lead this</p> <p><b>Partners backup/support:</b> SPREP, <a href="#">BioNET-International</a>, BioNET-PACINET, USP, SPC</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 6.7</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Article 8(j) and related provisions</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Mechanisms to promote the effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the work of the Convention</b></p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and related provisions held its sixth meeting, in Montreal from 2 to 6 November 2009</li> <li>The Working Group finalized a recommendation (6/1) on mechanisms to promote the effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the work of the Convention.</li> <li>The decision has three key elements:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity-building efforts</li> <li>Development of communications, mechanisms and tools to facilitate the effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the work of the Convention</li> <li>Participation of indigenous and local communities in the work of the Convention, including through the Voluntary Fund for Facilitating the Participation of Indigenous and Local Communities in the Convention Process</li> </ul> </li> <li>There are no paragraphs in brackets</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers:</b></p> <p>Recommendation 6/1 (Mechanisms to promote the effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the work of the Convention); found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 171</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b> Due to the strong cultural heritage of the Pacific, issues relating to Article 8j and related provisions are an integral in how the Pacific approaches its response to the CBD</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>PICs may wish to strongly support all elements of the decision on 8j and related provisions</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Cook Islands may wish to lead this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Samoa may wish to co-lead this issue</p> <p><b>Partners backup/support:</b> SPREP, Neva Collings</p>	



<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 6.7</b></p> <p><b>Article 8(j) and related provisions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Elements of sui generis systems for the protection of traditional knowledge</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and related provisions finalized a recommendation (6/2) on elements of <i>sui generis</i> systems for the protection of traditional knowledge.</li> <li>• There is no bracketed text in this element</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>Recommendation 6/2 (<i>Elements of sui generis systems for the protection of traditional knowledge</i>) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 173</p> <p>Updated note by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/WG8J/6/5)</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b> Protecting Pacific cultural heritage through innovative legal measures (<i>sui generis</i>) is crucial if the region is to ensuring the survival of traditional practices.</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to strongly support all elements of the decision on sui generis systems for the protection of traditional knowledge</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Niue may wish to lead this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Samoa may wish to co-lead this issue</p> <p><b>Partners backup/support:</b> SPREP, SPC, USP</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 6.7</b></p> <p><b>Article 8(j) and related provisions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Elements of a code of ethical conduct to ensure respect for the cultural and intellectual heritage of indigenous and local communities</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Relevant papers</b>          Recommendation 6/3 (<i>Elements of a code of ethical conduct to ensure respect for the cultural and intellectual heritage of indigenous and local communities</i>) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 175</p> <p><b>Relevant regional documents and papers:</b> Regional Framework for the Protection of Traditional Knowledge and Expression of Culture (SPC)</p>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and related provisions advanced elements of a code of ethical conduct to ensure respect for the cultural and intellectual heritage of indigenous and local communities relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.</li> <li>• Elements of the Code of Ethical Conduct remain in brackets. These relate to:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ lands and waters traditionally occupied or used by indigenous and local communities</li> <li>○ prior informed consent</li> <li>○ Access to traditional resources</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b>          Respect for traditional knowledge is a very important issue in the Pacific</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position</b></p> <p>There are brackets within a preambular paragraph of the Code of Ethical Conduct referring to lands and waters [traditionally occupied or used by indigenous and local communities], ... (eighth preambular para, page 176 ). Traditional use is important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets around the reference to traditionally occupied or used by indigenous and local communities in the preamble.</i></li> </ul> <p>There is brackets within a paragraph referring to [approval and involvement] [prior informed consent] (para 9, page 179). The use of the term prior informed consent is more formal and respectful of traditional knowledge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>PICs may wish to delete the words “approval and involvement” and retain the reference to prior informed consent.</i></li> </ul> <p>There is brackets within a paragraph referring to [Indigenous and local communities ought to determine for themselves, the nature and scope of their respective traditional resource regime(s) according to their customary law(s)] (para 16, page 180). It may be more respectful to allow indigenous and local communities to determine traditional resource regimes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>.PICs may wish to support the deletion of brackets within para 16</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Niue may wish to lead this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Samoa and Cook Islands may wish to co-lead</p> <p><b>Partners backup/support:</b> SPREP, SPC</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item and Issue</b></p> <p><b>Item 6.7</b></p> <p><b>Article 8(j) and related provisions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Multi-year programme of work on the implementation of Article 8(j) and related provisions</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Brief background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and related provisions developed a multi-year programme of work which revised the programme of work to include a new major focus on Article 10(c) (Customary sustainable use); and also decided that meetings of the Working Group would include in-depth dialogues on thematic areas and other cross-cutting issues.</li> <li>There is only one element of the programme of work which remains to be resolved and this relates to whether to have an in-depth dialogue at its seventh meeting on one of the following theme: [Benefit-sharing modalities / Protected areas / Biodiversity and climate change];</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevant papers</b></p> <p>Recommendation 6/4 (Multi-year programme of work on the implementation of Article 8(j) and related provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity) found in UNEP/CBD/COP/10/1/Add.2, page 183</p>	
<p><b>Why the issue is important to the Pacific:</b></p> <p>Due to the strong cultural heritage of the Pacific, a multi-year programme of work relating to Article 8j and related provisions is a key element of the Pacific's response to the CBD.</p>	
<p><b>Possible Position:</b></p> <p>There are brackets within a paragraph relating to an in-depth dialogue at its seventh meeting on one of the following theme: [Benefit-sharing modalities / Protected areas / Biodiversity and climate change] (para 30, page 135). Each of these themes is valid. Perhaps from a Pacific perspective a focus on biodiversity and climate change may be appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>PICs may wish to support a reference to biodiversity and climate change within paragraph</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead country/Point person for Issue:</b> Niue may wish to lead this issue</p> <p><b>Co-lead:</b> Samoa and Cook Islands may wish to co-lead</p> <p><b>Partners backup/support:</b> SPREP, SPC</p>	