



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/ICNP2/Bur/2012/1/2
5 March 2012

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

BUREAU OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL
COMMITTEE FOR THE NAGOYA
PROTOCOL ON ACCESS AND BENEFIT-
SHARING
Teleconference, 1 March 2012

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ICNP BUREAU HELD VIA TELECONFERENCE ON 1 MARCH 2012

INTRODUCTION

1. The Bureau of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing held a meeting via teleconference on Thursday, 1 March 2012 from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. (Montreal time). The meeting was chaired by the Co-Chairs of the Intergovernmental Committee, Mr. Fernando Casas (Colombia) and Ms. Janet Lowe (New Zealand) both of whom attended the meeting in person at the Secretariat.
2. The following Bureau members attended the meeting: Mr. M. F. Farooqui (India), Mr. David Hafashimana (Uganda) and Ms. Ines Verleye (Belgium) in person at the Secretariat, and Mr. Samuel Dieme (Senegal), Ms. Leina Al-Awadhi (Kuwait), Ms. Dubravka Stepic (Croatia), Mr. Sergiy Gubar (Ukraine), Ms. Monica Rosell Medina (Peru), Ms. Anita James (St-Lucia), and Mr. Benjamin Phillips (Australia) by telephone
3. The Secretariat was represented by Mr. Olivier Jalbert (Principal Officer), Ms. Valerie Normand (Senior Programme Officer) and Ms. Sonia Gautreau (Programme Assistant).

ITEM 1: OPENING OF THE MEETING

4. The Co-chairs of the ICNP opened the meeting. Mr. Casas informed the participants that the main purpose of the meeting was to discuss the preparations for the second meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee (ICNP-2) to be held from 2-6 July 2012 in New Delhi, India.
5. Mr. Casas then provided details on the reasons why ICNP-2 had been postponed to 2-6 July 2012. He explained that this decision was taken due mainly to the lack of funds in the voluntary fund for the participation of developing countries and countries with economies in transition. Hopefully, the additional time will ensure that sufficient funds are available to ensure adequate representation of all regional groups.

6. Additional constraints relating to the selection of new dates for the meeting were the need to avoid overlap with other major environmental meetings, the availability of the venue and the availability of the team of interpreters. The combination of these factors had led to the new dates selected.

7. Mr. Jalbert informed members of the Bureau that Japan, Norway and Switzerland had pledged funds for developing country participation and that he was confident that more countries would provide support in order to ensure adequate representation of all regions at the meeting. However, he stressed that more funds are needed and urged Bureau members to consult countries within their regions on this matter.

8. The Bureau members thanked Mr Casas and the Secretariat for the explanation, and given the difficult circumstances, agreed to the new dates and undertook to enlist the support of their regions to try and secure more funds given the importance of adequate representation from all regions.

ITEM 2: ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

9. The Bureau reviewed and adopted the provisional agenda as circulated prior to the meeting.

ITEM 3: DOCUMENTATION FOR THE SECOND MEETING OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE

10. Ms. Normand provided an update on the preparations of the documentation for ICNP-2. She reminded Bureau members that the documents were prepared following the guidance provided by the work plan for the ICNP as set out in Annex II of Decision X/1 of the Conference of the Parties. The list of all documents being prepared can be found in the annotated agenda posted on the meeting webpage at: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=ICNP-02>. She informed the Bureau that a number of documents were already posted on the meeting webpage and that many more would be posted soon and no later than six weeks prior to the date of meeting. The deadline for all documents would therefore be the 15 of May 2012.

11. Ms. Verleye pointed out that the discussions to be held on Resource Mobilization at ICNP-2 should take into consideration that ABS is already considered under the resource mobilization strategy of the Convention and that this item will be discussed at the 4th meeting of the WGRI (7-11 May 2012) as well as at the eleventh meeting of the COP. She stressed the importance of not duplicating the work on this matter and to ensure that the discussions to be held at the ICNP are not disconnected from the ongoing process under the COP, in particular given that the WGRI4 is now taking place before ICNP2.

12. Ms. Verleye also noted that she had a few more procedural points regarding the agenda for the first COP-MOP and the Rules of Procedures for the COP-MOP to be addressed by the ICNP. These would be provided to the Secretariat with a view to avoiding unnecessary and lengthy discussions on procedural matters at the ICNP. These were not confidential or controversial and would be circulated to the Bureau in advance in order to allow for adequate preparation. Ms. Verleye indicated that it would be of interest if possible other procedural points, identified by the other Bureau members, could equally be circulated before ICNP2 to facilitate the preparations.

ITEM 4: ORGANIZATION OF WORK OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE

13. The Co-Chairs highlighted that the agenda for ICNP-2 was very heavy and that it may be necessary to have parallel contact groups as well as evening sessions to deal with the work load. They stressed that sessions would be held in plenary as much as possible to take advantage of the interpretation available and, should there be parallel sessions, interpreters would be used for one of the contact groups whenever possible. They noted the need to be well prepared and organized prior to the meeting. In this

regard, they informed the Bureau that they were working on the preparation of a work plan to ensure that things ran as smoothly and efficiently as possible.

14. Mr. Hafashimana raised the concern that many African delegates do not speak English and that interpretation should be available as much as possible. He also stressed the need for good time management during the meeting.

15. The Secretariat informed the Bureau members that the budget allowed for interpretation for two plenary sessions per day. These were normally limited to formal sessions but should two contact groups meet in parallel, the Secretariat confirmed that interpreters could be used for one of them if the ICNP so decided.

ITEM 5: PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS OF DATE OF ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL ON FUTURE WORK

16. Based on a note by the Secretariat circulated in advance, the Secretariat presented the following two possible scenarios with regard to the entry into force of the Protocol and how each could affect the work of the ICNP and COP:

- 1) Entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol prior to the opening of COP-11- (8 October 2012)
- 2) Entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol post COP-11.

Entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol prior to the opening of COP-11

17. Under the first scenario, the first COP/MOP would be held concurrently with COP-11 and would consider the reports of the two meetings of the Intergovernmental Committee and its recommendations on all the issues addressed by the ICNP.

Entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol post COP-11

18. Under the second scenario, the first COP-MOP would not be held concurrently with COP-11. In accordance with Article 26 of the Protocol, which provides that the first meeting of the COP-MOP shall be held concurrently with the first meeting of the COP that is scheduled after the date of entry into force of the Protocol, the first meeting of the COP-MOP would be held concurrently with COP-12 in 2014 assuming the Protocol had entered into force by then.

19. Under this scenario, access and benefit-sharing would be one of the agenda items at COP-11 and the Co-Chairs would be invited to report to the COP on the outcomes of the two ICNP meetings mandated by COP-10. The COP could decide to establish a contact group on ABS during COP-11 in order to discuss certain issues, including: whether the mandate of the ICNP should be extended, budgetary considerations, and guidance to the financial mechanism (Global Environment Facility) on access and benefit-sharing.

20. The issue of having the COP-MOP held concurrently with the COP was also discussed. With reference to the negotiations of the Protocol, the Secretariat recalled that the word “concurrently” had been used as meaning that COP-MOP would overlap with COP. In other words, COP-MOP would be held “within” the COP. This had been motivated by a desire to ensure that the ABS discussions would not be disconnected from the discussions being held at the COP due to the intimate link between the Nagoya Protocol and the Convention. This was less the case with the Cartagena Protocol.

21. Ms. Verleye suggested exploring the UNFCCC as a model since its subsidiary bodies and Protocols meet at the same time as the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties. On this issue, the Secretariat pointed out some of the logistical difficulties of organizing several meetings at the same time, notably related to interpretation, but acknowledged that this approach could be accommodated. It was noted that this was the case during COP-10 when the ABS Working Group was held concurrently with the COP.

22. Mr. Hafashimana highlighted the need to ensure adequate representation of developing country Parties at the COP-MOP and the COP and stressed that at least two participants per eligible country would have to be supported to cover respectively the COP-MOP and the COP. Ms. Anita James and Ms. Dubravic also indicated that the Caribbean and CEE regions would also be interested in the outcome of this discussion. It was mentioned that new procedures for the funding of participants may be needed since the Protocol creates a new situation under the Convention which the COP may wish to consider given that the two meetings would be happening at the same time.

ITEM 6: OTHER MATTERS

23. The Secretariat provided information on the status of ratifications and informed the Bureau members that many countries were working on ratifying. The Bureau members and Co-Chairs agreed that it was important to maintain momentum to ensure entry into force of the Protocol as soon as possible.

ITEM 7: CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

24. After an exchange of courtesies, the meeting was closed at 10 a.m.
