



CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WS-StratPlan/2
23 May 2001

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

WORKSHOP ON THE STRATEGIC PLAN OF THE
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
Port Glaud, Seychelles, 28-30 May 2001
Item 2.3 of the provisional agenda

STRATEGIC PLAN OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Compilation of views on the Strategic Plan received
from Parties, Governments, and relevant organizations

Note by the Executive Secretary

1. The Executive Secretary is pleased to circulate herewith a compilation of views on the Strategic Plan received from Parties, Governments and relevant organizations.
2. These views were submitted in response, first, to a notification circulated by the Executive Secretary in October 2000, calling for general views on the Strategic Plan, and secondly, to a request made by the Executive Secretary in March 2001 for Parties and other stakeholders to provide written comments on the note on the Strategic Plan dated 13 March 2001, which was introduced at a workshop held during the sixth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice. That note is being circulated without change as a document for the current workshop.
3. The views are reproduced in the present document as they were received by the Secretariat and without formal editing.

/...

BELARUS

25 January 2001

The Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Belarus together with the National Academy of Science of the Republic of Belarus has considered the information about the Decision V/20 of the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Convention on Biological Diversity and supports the trends and parameters of forming the Convention Strategy Plan, proposed by the Secretariat.

DENMARK

May 2001

We have some minor comments presently and we may or may not come back later with few other comments:

- 1) the notion of “periodic review” in para 54 c(i) and in the annex under art. 6(a) should be developed or spelled out in a more concrete manner.
- 2) “land tenure” (para 17-art. 8(j)) should not be included – other fora are more appropriate

(to this should be added the two points I mentioned as a pan-European input but those two points will hopefully be transmitted to you through UNEP (PEBLDS)).

NETHERLANDS

21 March 2001

General remarks

The Netherlands supports the rationale, objectives and focus for the Strategic Plan, as worked out in the note of the Executive Secretary (dated 13 March 2001). The Strategic Plan will be an essential tool for guiding the work within the framework of the CBD over the next decade. It is important to set as clear targets as possible, in particular to encourage increased and focused co-operation among international institutions and to enhance implementation of the CBD objectives at the national level.

We believe that for strategic planning the process of preparing the plan is of equal importance as the contents of the final document. We therefore agree with the note that this process will have to be as transparent as possible, with ample opportunity for all stakeholders to contribute. The requests for contributions, the anticipated workshop and the intersessional meeting on the Strategic Plan in November together will provide for such a participatory planning process. As indicated in Decision V/20 the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties has a central role in guiding the preparations of the Strategic Plan.

Specific remark

Given the opportunities we will have to further exchange views with Parties and other stakeholders, the Netherlands at this stage would like to focus on three major elements:

/...

- 1) *Retirement of decisions*: we believe it is essential to evaluate the more than 100 decisions taken by the five COP's. There is a need to clearly indicate which elements of these decisions – or decisions as a whole – can be retired, given that they have been implemented, have been incorporated in other decisions or are no longer relevant for other reasons. This has to be analysed in parallel with the development of the Strategic Plan.
We would like to invite the CBD Secretariat to identify ways and means for such a process, making use of experiences in other conventions. We also would like to ask the CBD Secretariat to start identifying a list of (elements of) decisions, which are clearly eligible for retirement. We propose that this matter will be taken up at the intersessional meeting on the Strategic Plan, National Reporting and the Operations of the Convention scheduled for November 2001.
- 2) *Ambition of the Strategic Plan*: the importance of the CBD for biodiversity and sustainable development should be reflected in the plan. Targets should be formulated for the objectives of the CBD itself, as well as for the process of furthering the implementation of the convention. As such, it is should be endeavoured to define operational goals for each of the three objectives of the convention, preferably in a quantitative manner. For conservation of biodiversity this could include goals for the quality and quantity of (categories of) species and habitats. Sustainable use could be further defined in terms of ecosystem functioning, resilience and securing economic production. For the equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources the plan could identify goals for technology co-operation, information sharing, capacity building, and, if feasible, financial resources.
The plan should also encourage further work in identifying such goals at the global, regional and national level, based on the work programme for indicators, monitoring and assessment.
- 3) *Structure of the Strategic Plan*: given the need for the Strategic Plan to be concise the Netherlands proposes to limit the number of themes around which the plan will be constructed. It is proposed to use themes intermediate to the existing work programmes and the articles of the convention. A logical package and order of such themes could be based on familiar and well-tested elements of policy planning:
 - a) mission and objectives;
 - b) policy, targets and the ecosystem approach;
 - c) instruments and tools for implementation;
 - d) financial resources; and
 - e) co-operation and outreach.

These themes can be elaborated by regrouping the 16 elements for the Strategic Plan as contained in paragraph 54 of the fore mentioned note in the following manner:

- a) mission and objectives – paragraphs a (mission statement), j (Biosafety Protocol) and o (membership);
- b) policy, targets and the ecosystem approach – paragraphs c (national action), d (mainstreaming), f (indicators) and n (ecosystem approach);
- c) instruments and tools for implementation – paragraph d(iii) (economic incentives), paragraphs e (taxonomy), g (access and benefit sharing; 8(j); R&D), and l (other elements);
- d) financial resources – paragraph k (resources); and
- e) co-operation and outreach – paragraph b (international co-operation), h (education/awareness), i (scientific co-operation and the CHM), m (scientific inputs) and p (participation). Under this theme the plan could also identify how the elaboration and implementation of the previous themes is dealt with in the framework of the CBD, while clearly identifying ways and means for furthering co-operation with other conventions (biodiversity-related agreements, UNFCCC, CCD) and organisations (i.a. UNEP, FAO, UNESCO, WTO, WIPO, UNCTAD, etc).

In summary the proposed core structure of themes for the Strategic Plan could be as follows:

NEW ZEALAND

6 December 2000

/...

Addressing The Overall Approach to CBD Work

Need for Articulation of an Overall Approach

NZ believes that a significant role for a SP will be to articulate an overall context and approach to the work of the Convention. The SP should clearly state this overall strategic approach to the Convention's work, and the reasons for it, and set out the work that will be done to further refine and clarify the overall approach.

Limited Applicability of Binding Rules

The Convention is an unusual international instrument. It is very broad in its mandate, rather than being focused on a specific area of work (cf CITES or Ramsar). The implementation of the intent of the Convention lies largely at the national level, or among small groups of countries, and relates to national resources and issues. This contrasts strongly with conventions concerned with international issues (e.g. UNCLOS) or cross-border issues (e.g. the IPPC).

As a result, for most issues under the Convention, nations need to set their own priorities and approaches to implementation. Those priorities and approaches need to be tailored to the particular national or regional situation. While guidance can be given by the COP in relation to matters to be considered, options for implementation, and desirable outcomes, it would be inappropriate for COP to seek to dictate the exact priorities and solutions that will be used.

NZ therefore believes that developing binding rules should be used only for a very few issues where standard approaches are necessary for cross-border issues, or where internationally administered resources are affected. In addition, even if there is a case for developing rules, we consider that the Convention should always consider carefully whether such rules would best be developed by another convention/body (e.g. ballast water rules by the IMO). The SP should clearly state this approach.

Need for Direction on Options for Supporting National/Regional Implementation

The SP should then provide clear directions for how the Convention will make a difference for biodiversity implementation, in the absence of a focus on setting international rules and standards. The key role for the Convention will be to encourage, inspire, and support national/multi-lateral actions that are chosen and tailored by the relevant Parties to fit their particular circumstances.

There are few precedents for this type of international work, and NZ believes that the Convention needs to focus on developing effective ways to do this. This is the key implementation need, and should be addressed in the ISOC in 2001.

Some progress has already been made in the thinking on this issue. The work of the alien species Liaison Group, and subsequent work by the Secretariat, has begun to explore a wide range of options for work to support national/regional implementation. The SBSTTA 6 consideration of this issue will provide an important opportunity to explore these issues further, and provide some valuable information to the ISOC.

It is also essential that the Convention process recognises that full implementation will not be achieved rapidly. Progressive building of capacity, and effective prioritisation processes, will be essential parts of any national or regional programme. NBSAPs obviously have a key role in the process of setting these priorities, and must be seen as a primary mechanism to be encouraged. The SP should clearly address this issue.

Role of National Reporting and Assessment Processes

An important issue to be addressed in the SP is the way in which mechanisms such as national reports are used to encourage countries to identify and address their implementation levels, given that the Parties have clearly signalled that they do not wish to see compulsory assessments and compliance regimes. A problem for the CBD is the low rate of reporting to date.

General Objectives

The SP should include some general objectives which will guide the work under the Convention. Objectives that could be included and addressed are:

- To ensure that the work of COP is focused on those areas that represent the greatest need; and where the CBD can provide valuable assistance to meet that need.
- To enhance participation by Parties in the formulation of COP guidance, including through regional preparatory processes, and other approaches that do not require attendance at meetings.
- To ensure that the work of COP is supported by adequate information and quality analysis, and is scientifically and technically robust.
- To ensure that the guidance provided is clear and user friendly, and addresses the key needs of Parties at the level they require.
- To ensure that the work of the COP, and work to support COP, is efficient.

Priorities, Focus and Resources

The scope of the Convention is extremely broad, and priorities will vary significantly between countries. It is therefore difficult to prioritise the Convention's work without leaving some Parties feeling unsupported in relation to an issue of particular significance to them. COP has found prioritising and focusing its work extremely difficult.

The resulting range of work addressed by COP has had negative flow-on effects for the work of SBSTTA and the Secretariat, which have both been subject to unreasonable proposed work programmes. In addition, some Parties have expressed concern about being overwhelmed by demands to act on issues.

The Convention therefore faces a difficult dilemma: how to address the full scope of issues under the Convention and provide support on all the issues which are important to Parties, and at the same time not create an overwhelming burden for SBSTTA, the Secretariat and the Parties which destroys their ability to achieve implementation. The SP will need to address this issue.

Prioritising

As stated in the earlier section, NZ believes that priorities for implementation should to a significant extent be determined nationally and regionally. NBSAPs and similar multi-lateral strategies should be seen as the primary tool for doing that. The SP should confirm the importance of NBSAPs and address the way in which the Convention will support their preparation and implementation.

Notwithstanding this, the COP should provide some clear guidance on how priorities should be set in NBSAPs. This will include providing guidance on the important causes of biodiversity loss, guidance on issues which should be considered in setting priorities, and so on. The SP needs to address the issue of how COP will develop and give this guidance.

In addition, the CBD needs to set clear priorities for its own work. The SP should articulate these priorities, including addressing the appropriate balance between preparatory (i.e. development of initial

guidance on issues) and implementation support work. It should also articulate the overall priorities for the financial mechanism.

Resources

The SP should clearly address the issue of resources, including identifying the type and scale of resources to which access is needed. It should also address possible options for gaining increased resources and making better use of those already available.

Clearly one solution to the problem of overwork is to identify additional resources to devote to the issue. NZ believes that the CBD has not yet begun to fully exploit the potential to do so, and in particular the potential to make better use of existing capacity by developing partnerships with other organisations and with the Parties themselves.

We recognise, however, that creating partnerships is far from simple, and partnerships can generate new problems.

Partnerships and Linkages

The Convention is a broad instrument that overlaps significantly with the work of a wide range of international and regional instruments. Appropriate integration with those other instruments will therefore be important in the work of the CBD. In addition, at a national level countries will need to integrate their work to implement the CBD with their work in relation to other instruments. This issue has been highlighted in the work on alien species, for example, where integration between the sectors is essential for successful implementation of Article 8(h).

NZ believes that this issue should be clearly addressed in the SP. This could potentially be divided into the following key issues:

The role of the Convention in Relation to Other UN Conventions

This would include an outline of the relative role. It should also set out the approach that will be used to transmit biodiversity imperatives to other conventions which are better placed to achieve action (e.g. UNFCCC on climate change effects).

Partnerships for COP Work

The work on alien species implementation has clearly identified partnerships as a key approach to carrying out the CBD work. The SP needs to address the way in which partnerships will be developed and operated.

Some issues to consider are:

- How to choose an appropriate partner.
- Cost effectiveness of partnership arrangements.
- Authorities and accountabilities.
- How to deal with non-performance by the partner.

Involving Other Bodies in Supporting Implementation by Parties and Regions

The SP needs to address the issue of maximising the effort going into biodiversity from all possible sources, including the private sector.

Making Better Use of Internal Mechanisms and Resources

The SP should address issues relating to the effective use of important bodies and mechanisms, such as SBSTTA and the Secretariat.

Guidelines for the Key Mechanisms

NZ believes that the Convention needs to develop clearer guidance on the key standard mechanisms for undertaking its work, including SBSTTA, AHTEGs, rosters, etc. That guidance would go beyond the present *modus operandi* rules, providing analysis on choosing the right mechanism, and making best use of the mechanisms. We do not believe that this guidance should be within the SP (as it would make it too long).

The SP should, however, contain a summary of the analysis, with cross-referencing to more detailed documents. It should also identify any additional mechanisms which need to be developed, or any work to refine the use of the existing mechanisms.

For example, COP V recognised the need to enhance regional and sub-regional processes. NZ believes that these processes should:

- Involve groupings of countries and other bodies appropriate to the issue.
- Provide a mechanism for generating and sharing information, generating ideas and encouraging innovative approaches, enhancing participation by those Parties who are unable to attend CBD meetings.
- Be designed to meet the identified needs of the participants.

We believe that key issues to address in the period of the strategic plan are:

- How to facilitate the creation, adaptation or better use of regional processes.
- How to generate financial support for participation in regional processes.
- How to ensure that the results of regional processes are fully considered in COP work.

Another example is SBSTTA. COP II reaffirmed “that under Article 25 the SBSTTA is the only scientific, technical and technological authority under the Convention to provide advice to the COP.”

In our view, some key issues for SBSTTA operations over the period of the plan are:

- There is a need for better guidance from the COP to SBSTTA, to ensure the highest priority issues are identified, to allow the development of a coherent and realistic programme of work, and to clearly identify the expected outcomes of the work.
- SBSTTA needs to respond to the call from COP for improvement in the quality of the scientific, technical and technological advice provided to the COP.
- Further improvements are needed to increase the efficiency of the work of SBSTTA.
- Further improvements are needed to increase the ability for Parties to participate in the work of SBSTTA.

The work NZ is doing in the establishment of the MPA AHTEG is also identifying a number of aspects of the operation of such groups, and the way they can be used to explore scientific and technical issues, that warrant further attention.

NZ would be very willing to assist the Secretariat in work on these issues.

Development of the Secretariat

The SP should address strategic issues relating to the operation of the Secretariat. These would include issues such as

- The key roles of the Secretariat
- Achieving continuity of funding for key Secretariat positions
- Overall size and form of the Secretariat
- Accountability and authority issues.

Implementation

As you will recall, the work at COP V was unable to resolve an optimal approach to achieving improved implementation. However, agreement was reached on a way forward, in response to a compromise proposal from NZ. We are obviously anxious to ensure that this issue is fully addressed in the ISOC and the SP, and that the Convention identifies effective and efficient means to enhance implementation.

NZ considers that good implementation results are going to arise from the following factors:

1. Getting good guidance from COP.
2. Having good NBSAPs and regional strategies to provide clear priorities and approaches at the national/regional level for national/regional implementation.
3. Developing the necessary information, tools and techniques to allow issues to be tackled.
4. Building capacity to use those tools and techniques (training, money, institutional arrangements, development of domestic commitment, public awareness, etc).
5. Providing the necessary international instruments for issues which cross-borders or involve internationally administered resources.

In addition, a significant issue in this area is the review of progress in national implementation, through issue assessments, voluntary country assessments, national reports, etc.

Long Term Workplan

NZ believes that the SP should provide a long term work plan. This should clearly indicate the key achievements in each time period, considering issues being produced outside meetings as well as meeting agendas.

Operational Goals

Decision V/20 identifies the need for the SP to contain operational goals.

In looking at this part of the SP, NZ believes that preparatory work and implementation work should be clearly distinguished.

The preparatory work sections would cover all the work that leads up to a decision by COP that provides guidance on what implementation activities should be undertaken by Parties, the financial mechanism, and other bodies.

The implementation work sections would cover the actions which the Convention would undertake to support implementation efforts by Parties etc.

NEW ZEALAND

(second submission)

7 May 2001

First let me congratulate you and your staff on the document. While we have a number of comments on the detail of the document, overall we consider that the analysis in the document is excellent, and that the material provided will be an excellent basis for discussions in the May workshop. We were also very pleased with the very realistic and practical approach taken in the document. As it states, “strategic planning is making choices among limitless possibilities”, and it is vital that we make choices that will allow the Convention to make a real and practical contribution to slowing biodiversity loss.

Status of Biodiversity

On this issue, the document is slightly internally contradictory. In paragraph 21 it states that “all biodiversity is important”, but then in paragraph 22 it talks about “identifying important species and biomes” and in Part VII proposes the development of Annex I to the Convention, which provides a list of important ecosystems, habitats, species, communities, genomes and genes. This apparent contradiction is not surprising, as it is an inherent problem in all biodiversity work. We recognise that all biodiversity is important, but in the absence of adequate capacity we must make choices about which elements will be given priority attention. A key need in this situation is to ensure that deciding that something is not a high priority does not imply that it is not important. So the way we use language becomes critical.

A key issue the strategic planning process should address, is whether the Convention should identify priority biodiversity directly and, if so, what actions will be taken in response to that identification.

I was asked during the preparatory stage for COP IV (by another New Zealander who was primarily involved in other related international processes), to prepare some thoughts on the potential form and usefulness of an international reserve network system. I concluded that one possible role for an international reserve system was if it allowed the identification of “biodiversity hotspots”, with subsequent capacity assistance (the carrot) and political pressure (the stick) to encourage protection by the relevant government. The Convention could, as a natural extension of the idea of “assessments” identify key biodiversity protection needs in individual countries. However, the COP has always shied away from direct criticism of countries’ implementation efforts. Even the idea of voluntary country studies, discussed in the contact group on the operations of the Convention at COP V, was viewed with extreme caution by many delegates.

Nevertheless, we believe that the option of the Convention identifying priority biodiversity needs within countries and directly advising the country on how to address those needs should be considered seriously as a potential mechanism for the Convention as we move into the implementation stage. Having said that, I would note that New Zealand at this stage considers that it is more appropriate for the CBD to focus on supporting the national identification of priorities (through NBSAPs). But is important that the relative merits of these two approaches is fully explored in the strategic plan process.

With a focus on national direction, a role for the Convention would be to provide the tools to allow the identification of priority areas by countries themselves. Two questions then arise:

1. at what level and by whom should such identification be undertaken; and

/...

2. how much do we need to know in order to achieve positive results, and how do we deal with the absence of full information.

In general, New Zealand would strongly question the value of global or macro-regional assessments. With some exceptions (e.g. climate change), it is doubtful that assessments at that scale provide meaningful information to drive decisions, given that:

1. The forces that are driving biodiversity loss, or the actions to manage those forces, are not operating at that scale.
2. The institutions which are responsible for making the critical management decisions do not operate at that scale.
3. The assessments at that scale tend to be too general and crude to provide effective input into the crucial decisions that affect biodiversity loss rates.

As the document states (paragraph 20), we know that biodiversity loss is increasing. Should we be measuring more precisely this loss, or focusing on addressing it? We would argue that assessments are only a cost-effective activity where they are designed to provide information which is needed for a decision that somebody is in a position to make. Knowing that country A has a deforestation rate of 200,000 hectares/annum is just a depressing fact unless that information directly affects the forest management decisions of that country, or allows some other body to take actions that will directly affect the management decisions of the country (e.g. through international condemnation, changes in aid, or changes in the market for forest products). Knowing that there is a high deforestation rate, based on general anecdotal evidence, without knowing the precise figure, may be adequate for the decisions being taken.

In relation to paragraph 21. New Zealand has questioned for some time the idea of primarily dividing the Convention's work by ecosystem. In general, we consider that there are some basic principles that apply to all ecosystem types, which should be developed (through cross-cutting work) as a first priority. Ecosystem-based work can then be useful to address those circumstances in which:

1. the nature of the ecosystem means that the general approach is not applicable or optimal;
2. there are particular issues that need to be tackled (e.g. desertification in relation to drylands, or coral bleaching); and/or
3. to provide specific scientific and technical advice on how to translate those principles for the particular ecosystem (e.g. how to design protected areas in the marine environment), or to deal with particular partners.

We would welcome a discussion of this issue within the workshop, and in particular an examination of the relative priority of "finishing" the ecosystems work versus addressing key cross-cutting issues.

GTI

In relation to paragraph 23 and the GTI, we support the importance of providing better access to information, and encouraging the development of new information. But we also believe that a critical need is to provide assistance for carrying out biodiversity management in the absence of taxonomic and distributional information. We are simply not going to be able to fill the information gaps in the short term.

CHM and information technology

We strongly agree with the statement in paragraph 23 that the new technological developments will provide useful tools for generating and managing information. But as well as resources and political commitment to their use and application, Parties will need assistance to determine how to make optimal

use of the tools, and to assess the limitations of the results of using the tools. Too often those who develop and promote these tools are unable to effectively communicate with biodiversity managers who are not technologically-literate, or are inclined to sell their tools as the answer to all problems, without explicitly identifying their limitations. The CHM should take a role in addressing this issue.

We also strongly endorse the need for the CHM to become focused on facilitating scientific and technical co-operation. I presented papers to the last IAC meeting on this issue. We do not, however, believe that implementing the CHM strategic plan will necessarily achieve this, and agree with some other members of the IAC that a review of the strategic plan is probably warranted.

Co-operation with other bodies

We agree that co-operation with other bodies will be central to making progress. We are not sure, however, why certain partnerships have been particularly highlighted. For example, the joint work programme with Ramsar would surely be as much worthy of mention as the Man and the Biosphere programme work. I would note in this context that NZ has deliberately chosen not to join MAB, because we do not consider that the approach they promote is strongly relevant to our cultural context, and we do not see any value in adding a “MAB” label to parts of our protected area network.

Overall, we would prefer to see an emphasis on the development of a wide range of partnerships, with the CBD taking a leadership role and then seeking partners to support implementation of work programmes, NBSAPs and policies. We believe that the proposals put forward by the Liaison Group on Alien Species is a good model for this.

Streamlining of reporting

NZ has never considered that streamlining of reporting between conventions is an important issue. It is, in our view, much more important to ensure that the reporting required by the CBD is well designed and easy to respond to, that the results are actively used for important purposes (e.g. identifying priorities for future work, allowing the effectiveness of past work to be assessed), and that reporting rates are significantly increased. The one exception to this would be where there is a joint work plan or some equivalent with another convention.

Biotechnology

We do not disagree that the biotechnology sector might provide a mechanism for generating low impact economic benefits from biodiversity (paragraph 27). We are surprised, however, at the way the Biosafety protocol role in this is portrayed in paragraph 39. That paragraph implies that the Biosafety Protocol will directly support technology transfer in the biotechnology area. This is certainly not an objective of the Protocol, and it does not currently have mechanisms to achieve this (although some of the material on the CHM may be of some value to countries). NZ would not wish to see this vision for the Protocol promoted, and expectations raised. The Protocol is clearly focused on developing regulatory controls over the transboundary movement of living modified organisms in order to protect biodiversity from potential adverse effects of biotechnology.

Achievements

We would agree that the NBSAPs and the GEF are two achievements of the Convention. It would be worth the strategic planning process considering the question: why have NBSAPs and the GEF been of value and what can we learn from that?

In our view, the value of NBSAPs and GEF funded projects is that they are country-driven and implemented at the national or sub-regional levels. We believe that a key to making progress in implementation is to base much of our work on supporting the implementation of NBSAPs, or on providing policy guidance specifically targeted to enhance NBSAPs and other national and sub-regional strategies and plans. There are, of course, exceptions (e.g. where we are providing guidance to international or regional activities), but in general biodiversity management is a local activity that needs to be designed to fit with local conditions.

We note, however, that there are problems with the GEF. We have become aware of significant problems in both the selection of projects, and the implementation of projects (i.e. the work of the implementing bodies). We believe that improving the efficiency and targeting of the GEF funding is a critical area for the period of the Strategic Plan. In particular, we would like to see:

1. the funding more directly tied to the priorities identified in NBSAPs; and
2. more efficient empowering accountability arrangements.

In relation to paragraph 35, we would question the effectiveness of much of the policy which has been developed. Has it truly affected biodiversity management on the ground? An assessment of effectiveness would be useful.

Longer term workplan

We would strongly endorse the retention of a longer term work plan. We would like, however, to see it state not only the issue that will be addressed, but also a brief indication of the focus of consideration of the issue.

Mainstreaming

Another possible mechanism is through inclusion of biodiversity matters in policies (e.g. national development policies) and legislation.

Protected areas

In paragraph 48, we would prefer the wording to read "...protected areas should not always be seen as biodiversity sanctuaries removed from the wider economic and social context." Some of our protected areas (nature and scientific reserves, including some of our most important offshore islands) are clearly sanctuaries, with visitation strictly limited to managers/scientists. Our society is very happy with that approach, and we would not wish to have it watered down. You may recall the unfortunate, and (in my view) unnecessary, debate on the issue of intrinsic values at the end of SBSTTA 5. It is important that the CBD does not accidentally question very legitimate and effective approaches taken by some countries, simply because other countries do not wish to use the same approach. For islands, with their very fragile and unique environments, the sanctuary approach is highly effective. It is also very strongly supported by the NZ public, who believe that they have a responsibility to maintain intrinsic values, even where this has a net cost to them. We know of SIDS who also take that approach.

Regions

An issue of concern to NZ is the way “regional” is often defined within the CBD. Too often, the focus is on the UN regions. From a biodiversity perspective these are often sub-optimal or irrelevant. We have little in common with most JUSCANZ countries from a biodiversity management perspective, and have increasingly focused our biodiversity dialogues and co-operation work with countries in the southern ocean, the Pacific, and those that are “Gondwanan” in origin.

In our view, “regional” preparatory meetings and networks will be most effective if they involve natural groupings of countries. For example, the SPREP and AOSIS processes have been highly effective because there is a clear common interest between the participants.

The problem with the Forests Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group illustrates perfectly the dangers of using UN regions as the basis for our thinking about technical work and implementation work. The group is not regionally balanced from a biodiversity perspective. The complete lack of representation from experts working in southern temperate forests makes the exercise highly questionable. New Zealand’s forests are very different to the boreal system, and an expert working in the northern hemisphere (e.g. Canada and Japan) cannot possibly represent our interests.

We would note that CITES does not use the UN regional groupings for its work, and in that convention New Zealand is within an Oceania group.

With that problem fixed, we would very strongly endorse the further development and use of regional processes as proposed in the document.

Principal Goals

In (b) we would prefer instead:

- (b) Develop networks of partners for policy development and implementation on key issues, particularly:
 - i alien species (including in particular the GISP and IPPC);
 - ii inland waters (particularly Ramsar);
 - iii forests biodiversity;
 - iv dry lands
 - v protected areas
 - vi marine and coastal
 - vii climate change (UNFCCC)
 - viii effects of global trade on biodiversity (particularly in the context of the WTO Agreement on Agriculture)
 - ix taking an effective role in the UN General Assembly and Rio+10
 - x developing or supporting regional networks.

In relation to (c), we strongly endorse the focus on NBSAPs as the primary mechanism for prioritising and directing implementation work, and we believe that the development of ways to support their review and progressive strengthening is vital. We would note, however, that given the current approach to national reports, reviewing these does not provide an effective review of the NBSAPs. In undertaking the analysis of the alien species reports for the Secretariat, it became clear from the answers that there were at least some problems with the way NBSAPs addressed the issue. The information included in the reports did not, however, allow the identification of the exact nature of the problems, how widespread they were, the reason for the problems, etc.

In paragraph 33 the document states that “More than 100 Parties have begun to implement their obligation to develop a national biodiversity strategy and action plan.” This is a surprisingly low number. We had understood that most countries had completed draft strategies. If this is the case, then it would be appropriate to add to (c) something relating to supporting the development of NBSAPs.

In (e) (ii) we would like to see reference to regional networks as well as to multi-sector networks. For example, we are examining the potential for formal networks in the Gondwanan and Pacific regions to pool efforts and improve the effectiveness of taxonomic work, building from the informal networks already in place.

We are not sure what is meant in (f) by “development of Annex I”.

In (g) (iii) we would like to see more specificity of what would be promoted. The third objective has very wide scope.

In (h) we believe that publicity should also promote the incorporation of biodiversity into national identity. This has been very successful in New Zealand, and is being increasingly used as an approach in other countries. We continue to believe that for many biodiversity issues, ethics/social attitudes are more powerful incentives than economics (cf. our case study on incentives).

In relation to (i), see the note above about the strategic plan for the CHM.

In relation to (k), we would prefer to see this read:

Improve capacity building support, by improving existing funding mechanisms, and generating new sources of assistance, including:

- (i) improve the effectiveness of the GEF
- (ii) development of guidance to other significant donors increased private sector support.

We are unclear on the potential significance of the DAC reporting requirements.

Products

As discussed above, there is a potential role for the Convention in making direct assessment of biodiversity management needs within countries, and for providing a mechanism to review the effectiveness of NBSAPs. The products of this sort of work should be added to the list of possible products.

Another product that should be recognised is capacity building support or the facilitation of this, e.g. through the GEF, CHM, rosters of experts and other mechanisms.

SEYCHELLES

11 December 2000

Obviously Seychelles supports the objects of decision V/20 with regard to the development of a Strategic Plan for the Convention and we look forward to discussing this concept at a future SBSTTA.

However, at this point and with regard to your enquiry, this proposal also does imply the development of a certain rigidity for the future working of the Convention. Whilst Seychelles recognizes the benefit of a strategic framework within which the convention can work and measure progress by, this

/...

might also serve to limit the Convention's capacity to respond to new unforeseen developments; an example of such might be the severe coral bleaching event of 1998.

As such, Seychelles would like to see clear scope for periodic revision built in to the Strategic Plan, such that it become a living/evolving document, and furthermore that it explicitly allow for the incorporation of emergency programmes/measures that may be necessary to meet unforeseen developments.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

(First submission)

29 December 2000

1. Thank you for the invitation to contribute views on the development of a strategic plan for the Convention. These UK views were compiled in part at a recent brainstorming session held in London, where we were grateful for the participation of a member of the Secretariat.

General comments

2. The UK remains convinced of the importance of the Convention adopting a strategic plan. This will assist all of us in prioritising activity within the Convention's broad scope; provide a route map guiding work over the next ten years; and help inform activity at the national level. It will also have various other benefits, such as facilitating work with other biodiversity-related agreements, and helping to raise the profile of biodiversity in general and the Convention in particular.

3. It is important for the strategic plan to be short and focussed, if it is to be used by everyone involved in implementation of the Convention. It should be seen as a working tool, subject to regular review and adjustment in the light of events. We should avoid the over-ambitious creation of a detailed, lengthy document which would run the risk of being ignored once adopted. Agreement of a plan by COP6 in April 2002 is a demanding task, but achievable with focussed and realistic ambitions.

Focus

4. While recognising the need to give the Secretariat a clear role, and to involve other actors, agreements and processes, the strategic plan should aim above all to support and facilitate implementation by the Parties. Crucial to its success will be the perception that it is capable of assisting national implementation, primarily through national biodiversity strategies and action plans. It should identify those areas of implementation that are most in need of co-ordination, support and collective endeavour, and address the priorities within them. The plan should also provide a framework within which the Parties can act collectively, for example through the Conference of the Parties, including by identifying the major strategic challenges for the Convention to address in the years ahead.

Coverage

5. The plan should be broadly comprehensive in its coverage. Given the wide range of the Convention, and the variety of interests among its Parties, we agree with New Zealand on the need to avoid too prescriptive a strategic plan. Instead, it is suggested that, within broad priority themes, we aim to converge around a menu of options, within which Parties can exercise the necessary room to manoeuvre in the light of their circumstances. The plan should be genuinely strategic, with more detailed supporting activity left to the Convention's work programmes and above all action by Parties themselves. If successful the plan will, over time, gradually result in the convergence of Convention and Party activity around agreed, more detailed collective objectives.

Overall objective

/...

6. A crucial element of the strategic plan will be the overall objective and how to reach it. What is the Convention's vision for 2010, and what route(s) should we take in order to get there? What would we like to have achieved in ten years' time, including in relation to the state of biodiversity on the ground, and how will we know if we have done so? It is worth taking time to debate and agree the answers to such questions, rather than getting too immersed too soon in the detail of the plan.

Nature of the strategic plan

7. The strategic plan should be as short as possible, ideally no more than a few pages. The 12-line programme of work for COPs 5, 6 and 7, adopted at COP4 (and which should incidentally be subsumed into the strategic plan), is guiding work during a 6-year period and shows what can be achieved by a minimal approach. To the extent that it is not already present in the Convention's work programmes, the detail can be developed separately, and if necessary summarised in supporting documents. The national reporting process adopted at COP5 relies on a detailed, across-the-board review of all Convention obligations, which is another reason not to attempt to include such detail in the strategic plan itself. The plan should however set out reporting requirements on Parties for the period up to 2010.

Review

8. The strategic plan should include measurable targets and indicators, to allow progress to be assessed and adjustments made as circumstances change. We share the Seychelles' view that we should avoid adoption of too inflexible a plan: while COP6 should have full confidence in the strategic plan it adopts, we should recognise that any successful long term planning process allows for its own revision. The first few years of the plan might be more detailed than its later stages.

Other related agreements and processes

9. The Convention should learn from the strategic planning experience of other biodiversity-related agreements, while allowing for the different natures and purpose of each agreement. The CBD strategic plan should also aim to encourage collaboration between the Convention and other agreements.

Preparation of the plan

10. To maximise the chances of adoption of a strategic plan at COP6, it will be important to consult widely and gradually build consensus. We should not rush into preparation of the plan itself, but rather take time to ensure we agree the way ahead. Amongst others civil society should be involved, including NGOs with their ability to see issues from a trans-national perspective.

11. The UK is ready to play a full part in work towards adoption of a strategic plan at COP6 in 2002, both directly through our own contribution and by supporting the participation of others. There may, for example, be a role for discussions in addition to those in the Convention's current programme of meetings, provided these include a representative range of countries and are thus most likely to produce an outcome commanding wider support.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

(Second submission)

30 April 2001

We have already made one submission, on 29 December, the points in which still stand. In particular we remain committed to the need for the plan to be visionary, capable of adjustment over time, relatively brief and focussed on some key priorities. But in addition we would like to add the following:

- Definitions should be clearly established for some of the main terminology in the strategic plan, to allow common understanding of what we are trying to achieve. A first step might be for the

/...

Secretariat to prepare a draft glossary of terms;

- The aim of keeping the plan short might be assisted by reducing some of the introductory text in the Secretariat note to a few key bullet points;
- While the period to 2010 should be the main focus of the plan, as agreed in decision V/20, it should also look beyond, albeit briefly, to set its provisions in a longer timescale, subject of course to future decisions on longer term plans for the Convention;
- The regular review and updating of the plan might involve a monitoring and review process at each COP. This should help everyone to have confidence in the plan process, and obtain reassurance that all the objectives in the Convention will sooner or later be addressed under it;
- The most important part of the strategic plan is the key targets, which more than any other section enshrine its essence. These will require careful consideration. The current draft's "slow the rate of biodiversity loss by 2015" is a step in the right direction, but will be criticised by many as insufficiently ambitious. I would welcome ideas from others, but suggest we be more bold, for example by drawing on the language in the International Development Target for the environment ("There should be a current national strategy for sustainable development in the process of implementation, in every country by 2005, so as **to ensure that current trends in the loss of environmental resources are effectively reversed at both global and national levels by 2015**");
- We will only know if we have made progress towards such targets if the plan also includes performance review criteria;
- If the remaining elements of the Annex are retained, we would like to see more emphasis on substantive outputs, and not only process targets;
- The plan should cover implementation of paragraph 4 of COP decision V/20 ("*Decides to review its previous decisions periodically in order to assess their status of implementation*"). While not detailing this process within the plan itself, the issue should at least be flagged as a priority task given that editing down obsolete decisions would support our wider efforts to streamline the Convention's activities and help efforts to focus on a smaller range of key priorities. Over the longer term perhaps this is something that could be done in the context of particular substantive agenda items at each COP. We agree with the Netherlands that this issue might profitably be addressed at the intersessional meeting in November;
- The plan should also guide our efforts on outreach (eg to raise awareness of the Convention and widen participation in its activities) and "mainstreaming" (critical to achieving the Convention's objectives), and draw also on whatever the second national reports tell us about common priorities.

Finally the UK welcomes the COP Bureau's decision to make the strategic plan a priority for COP6. In preparation of the plan, we support the intention to have as many preparatory stages as possible, involving Parties, other stakeholders and other related agreements in an inclusive and transparent manner, to maximise ownership of the emerging draft plan and the chances of its agreement at COP6 and implementation thereafter.

ARAB ORGANIZATION FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

21 December 2000

(translated from Arabic)

The Arab Organization for Agricultural Development Work Plan includes main programs and sub-programs repartitioned on agricultural development projects in the Arab Countries. These programs have the aim of ensuring the self-sufficiency and nutritional security within a framework of a sustained environmental developmental balance, stressing the maintenance of the biological diversity and developing the natural resources which are the principal basis for the agricultural production.

It is worth noting that the work of the Organization during the seventies and eighties focused on developing agricultural development bases in the Arab Countries, and building a database concerning the potentials and principles of Arab agriculture, whose aspects have all been studied. These studies resulted in the knowledge of the situations and developments of the various elements of agricultural production in its plant and animal divisions. They also resulted in the knowledge of obstacles and problems facing the modernization and development of agricultural sector in the Arab World. This resulted in testing the correct channels which lead to this principal aim and in introducing suitable technological practices that transformed the Arab agriculture into a sector that plays a lead role in the economies of the Arab States on the one hand, and on the other, in guiding most of the agricultural practices and the use of the natural resources whether water, land, forest or grazing resource, in order to enable the continued maintaining the natural capacities of production and protecting the rich biological diversity at the level of the Arab States.

Upon developing the Arab principles of agricultural development, it was obvious and necessary that the Organization's strategy for the nineties would focus on maintaining the environment and developing the natural resource, and enlarging the scope of the natural reserves in order to maintain the biological diversity. In addition to strengthening the role of rural agglomerations and local organizations in the management and use of such resources. This is in order to achieve the sustained resource development and to protect the natural environment, wild species, and animal and plant resources.

Since the Organization developed new strategies for the decade 2001 – 2010, which coincides with the expected strategic plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity, which generally covers the same period, and in order to synergize the efforts between the two plans, the views of the Organization, concerning the work that could be achieved within the framework of that convention, have focused upon introducing projects that the Organization have adopted in the scope of maintaining the biological diversity and developing the natural forests, grazing, water and land resources.

The Organization considers that developing and strengthening the role of natural reserves in conserving the biodiversity is very important, vis-à-vis the protection of genetic progenies on which agricultural and animal production depends. Furthermore, the natural reserves participate in the environmental stability through sustaining the ecosystems for the continuation of life and preserving the human being and other living creatures as well as strengthening the natural resources base.

Regarding natural pastures, which are facing significant reduction on the level of the Arab countries, the grazing area which represents a large habitat for plant and animal biological diversity, requires to be given the priority in the programs that are limited through the sustained development plans of the natural resources. This is because the pastures in the Arab countries, which were subject of a number of studies prepared by the Organization, were mostly degraded, around 68% of the total pasture land. Therefore, pastures need an urgent remedy by means that are beyond the Arab countries capabilities, and need one organization working on many facets to achieve the sustained environmental development and the nutritional stability in the Arab world. This is why it is suggested to included the subject of pastures in the framework of fields addressed through the Convention on Biological Diversity Strategic Plan, with the aim to retrofit the deteriorated natural pastures in the Arab world.

/...

The following are suggested projects to be included in the programs and projects for the conservation of the biological diversity in the Arab World, and which will be included in a strategic plan of that convention.

First: Development and Strengthening of the Role of the natural reserves in protecting biological Diversity:

- 1-1 Project of developing the management of natural reserves in the Arab World.
- 1-2 Project of activating the role of popular participation in the conservation and management of natural reserves.
- 1-3 Project of Study for establishing an Arab Institute for fungal life sciences and natural reserves management.

Second: Retrofit of deteriorated natural pastures in the Arab World:

- 2-1 Project for Reclamation, retrofit and development of deteriorated pasture land through cooperative pasture reserves in the Arab World.
- 2-2 Project for water distribution and replanting of deteriorated pastures in the cooperative pasture reserves, and maintaining the biodiversity in the Arab World
- 2-3 Project for developing the Institutional frameworks for pasture management in the Arab World.

It is to be noted that the Arab Organization for Agricultural Development is ready to submit its suggestions in the proper time in the form of cards for the above-mentioned projects, and in the manner required, based on the results of studies that were prepared in the fields of such projects.

AKPABUYO BAKASSI GREEN MOVEMENT (ABGREMO)

14 December 2000

Feedback**:

- 10. Accepted
- 11. Accepted, but before adopting a long-term prog, a test run of about 2 years should be implemented.
- 12. Accepted, but subject to review after 2010
- 13. Accepted
- 14. Accepted
- 15. Agreed
- 16. Agreed, but let the Executive Secretary not handle it alone, volunteers should support him in drafting the plan. Also, in the sixth meeting funds should be made available to support, interested organizations especially the ones that have responded to this feedback to enable them attend the sixth meeting. Date, venue/country of the sixth meeting should be made known on time.

BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL

(First Submission)

22 December 2000

BirdLife International is of the opinion that a Strategic Plan (SP) would be extremely helpful for strengthening and streamlining the efforts of the bodies of and the Parties to the Convention. We regard

* The numbers that follow refer to the paragraphs of Decision V/20.

the SP mainly as a tool to support Parties' measures on implementation; but it should provide clear guidance to all the actors identified.

We especially appreciate the approach with operational goals decision V/20 has chosen. Identifying actors, resources, timeframes etc for each operational goal will be crucial. The COP should regularly review the progress in achieving the operational goals.

Operational goals should be established for each work programme and cross-cutting issue. A gap analysis – which major areas has the Convention not been able to cover yet – would be helpful. This may include a review of the articles of the Convention; e.g. article 9 (*ex situ* conservation) has not been dealt with in detail by the COP or SBSTTA. Perhaps a list of cross-cutting issues the Convention would need to cover within the period of the SP could be established, issues such as gender, participation of civil society and the private sector. However, issues should be prioritised, given the limited financial and human resources, which could be devoted to the Convention.

Some attention to trends and driving forces outside the Convention itself but which impact upon it (global trade, democratisation, climate change, human rights, etc) would be worth attention.

The operational goal should allow creating a **vision** for the Convention: Where do we want the implementation process as well as the operations of the Convention to be at the end of the period the SP is covering? We would urge that the SP include specific targets for each of the strategic issues it addresses, with timeframes, those responsible for delivery and the consequences of a failure to deliver clearly set out.

There are a number of operational issues, which are crucial to the success of the Convention. These should be covered by the SP – perhaps not in detail but the SP could direct the COP and SBSTTA/ISOC to (further) deal with them accordingly.

Reporting

National reporting is a core issue in the implementation process. The matrix, which was discussed and endorsed at COP 5, will hopefully help to link reporting closer to the articles of the Convention and the decisions of the COP. We would appreciate for each round of reports a synthesis and the drawing of lessons learned as has been carried out by the Secretariat in conclusion of the first round of reports.

The SP should outline the reporting requirements for Parties up to 2010, with a list of special reporting on items for in-depth discussion at COPs, enabling parties to prepare the information and to start the consultative process with stakeholders well in advance. A system of performance indicators, monitored and reported through national reports, would be worth considering. These should be based on the strategic objectives in the Plan itself. A 'top level'/synthesis expression of them should also be devised to provide a yardstick for gauging performance of the Convention as a whole.

The Convention to Combat Desertification has developed an interesting modus for reviewing national reports, which might be useful to the CBD as well. An Ad Hoc Working Group which is meeting at the COP and in future perhaps in between COPs is discussing the individual reports which are introduced by the respective country, followed by the opportunity for Parties and observers to comment. This is a very time consuming exercise, but perhaps a more detailed synthesis of reports for each region or subregion could be discussed at a Working Group, meeting in parallel to other sessions at COPs or meetings of SBSTTA and ISOC.

Strategic goals for the CBD's stake in the UNEP-led initiative on harmonised reporting between environmental conventions should be included in the SP.

Cooperation with other conventions and institutions

The SP should outline progress and future steps for cooperation with other conventions and institutions. What is the status of the existing Memoranda of Understanding and joint working programmes? Has a good working relationship been developed with the other Rio and biodiversity-related conventions and relevant institutions? What are the gaps that need to be filled? What are the priorities for the future and how will they be addressed?

A regular exchange of experience should be established with the other conventions, and systems established for joint problem-solving as well as joint planning.

Participation of civil society and public awareness

Participation of civil society and an increased public awareness of biodiversity issues are crucial for the long-term success of the Convention. The SP could help to promote these aims. How could the Convention promote full access to its information and the decision-making process? This links to the further development of the Clearing-House Mechanism and the regional and national processes.

More than simply passive provision of access to information is required, active efforts to raise the public awareness of the Convention and its objectives are also important. What could be done to get local communities and the media more interested? Of course, this is an issue the cooperation with UNESCO is dealing with already, but in our view it needs some coverage by the SP as well.

Compliance

The SP should also envisage the establishment of an appropriate compliance system for the Convention. How could the COP deal with significant cases of non-compliance with the Conventions' provisions? Giving civil society the option to seek legal support in cases of violation of the provisions of the Convention is one area worth considering. A model to be looked at could be the European Court of Justice, which allows individuals to seek legal action against European countries in human rights issues.

Regional and subregional processes

Parties have expressed their commitment to regional and subregional processes as promoters of the implementation of the Convention. We believe that the SP could help to direct regional and subregional activities. What are the issues that need to be reviewed at these levels? Examples might be the development of regional/subregional biodiversity indicators, a regional approach to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity 'hotspots', or the development of regional/subregional reporting.

Fundraising

The COP has identified the GEF as its (preliminary) financial mechanism. The COP has also regularly reviewed the effectiveness of the financial mechanism and has stressed the need to identify additional sources of funding for the implementation of the Convention. In our view, the SP should ensure that the COP continues doing so. Gaps in recent funding should be clearly identified and cooperation with additional funding sources should be established. A strong focus of funding should be the building of national capacity to implement the Convention.

Recruitment

The SP should outline a strategy for the COP to find appropriate ways to address the gaps in geographical coverage of the Convention. How could countries, which are not yet party to the Convention, be invited to accede? Which are the priorities, what are the current obstacles and how might they be best tackled? What targets will be set for the plan period?

BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL

(Second submission)

May 2001

1. We are grateful for having the opportunity to comment on the note by the Executive Secretary from 13 March 2001 on the Strategic Plan for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). We believe that the note is a significant tool for achieving consensus amongst parties and stakeholders on the implementation of COP decision V/20, chapter II.
2. With these comments, we are building on our earlier submission from 22 December 2000 on the development of the Strategic Plan.
3. We are pleased to see the note by the Executive Secretary focusing on the status of biological diversity – which is the main indicator for assessing the success of the Convention – and from there and the institutional and social context moving to the effectiveness of the Convention. Taking globalisation into account is important for understanding the limitations and opportunities for the Convention in many of its areas of work. The approach of developing the operational goals along the Convention's objectives, its articles and work programmes, with the background of the analysis developed in chapters IV, V and VI, is in our view a very appropriate one.
4. The note makes a number of significant observations which we would like to support as they are, in our view, crucial for a successful process of developing the Strategic Plan. They are:
 - There is a need for agreement on the operational goals (the note is using some different terms, which we believe all refer to the operational goals as of decision V/20, para 13: overall/principal goals, overall/operational objectives).
 - The process of developing the Strategic Plan should continue to be a transparent one, seeking to taking into account the views of all parties and relevant stakeholders.
 - The aim should indeed be to adopt the SP at the 6th meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 2002. The conclusion of the SP would send a clear signal especially to the review of the Rio process at the World Summit on Sustainable Development on the ability of the Convention to develop its tools for effectively implementing its agenda.
 - The SP should be seen as a 'working tool' (para 13), which is to be reviewed regularly and amended as necessary by the Conference of the Parties.
 - The main purpose of the SP should be to support the implementation of the Convention.
5. We would suggest to lump the vision for the Convention (para 51) and the overall objectives (para 53). This would refer to the proposed overall objective in para 53 a), while b) to e) might better be moved to the operational goals as they describe specific (though significant) goals. The operational goals should then be developed in relation to the relevant articles of the Convention (including the cross-cutting issues as dealt with by the COP), the thematic work programmes and other issues (such as universal membership of the Convention), as outlined in the annex.
6. The vision must not necessarily be restricted to the period up to 2010. It could serve as a guiding aspiration, which helps to define targets to achieve up to and after 2010.
7. A vision (or overall objective) for the Convention could be: *Due to programmes dedicated to biodiversity conservation and also to biodiversity aims being given their due in other sectoral and cross-sectoral policy-making and decision-making systems; ecosystems, species and gene-pools have gained and/or are maintained at a favourable conservation status, with use being sustainable and the benefits arising out of the use of genetic resources being fairly and equitably distributed; all as a*

demonstrable consequence of national action and international cooperation stimulated and coordinated by the Convention.

8. It might be worth considering to include in the SP some wording about the specific niche of the Convention – what is distinctive about the concept of biological diversity – in particular in relation to cooperation with the other biodiversity-related and ‘Rio conventions’.
9. The list of operational goals in para 54 and the annex is very comprehensive. As outlined in para 55, the annex is not aimed to be complete, but is rather giving examples of how the operational objectives of para 54 and the related activities, products, timeframe, actors, main mechanisms and resources should look like (in reference to para 15 of COP decision V/20, main mechanisms and resources would need to be added).
10. We would prefer to see the operational goals as in para 54 listed in the order of and explicitly linked to the articles of the Convention, followed by the thematic work programmes one by one and other issues, an approach that has been chosen by the annex.
11. A few additional comments on the operational goals:
 - Para 54 b): It might be useful to outline the biodiversity-related conventions and processes, building on the Memoranda of Understanding and the activities of the Secretariat as reported back to COPs. Additionally, the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification should be included.
 - 54 c): Additional points iii) and iv) could be ‘Parties to finish development phase’ (as in the annex) and ‘Parties to implement identified actions’.
 - 54 d): Being different mechanisms, EIA procedures and indicators should be separated as points ii) and iii), with what is now iii) becoming iv).
 - 54 h): The issues listed under i) to iv) should be regarded as examples and room be given to develop further public relation materials.
 - 54 k) An additional point iii) could be ‘Encouragement of bilateral support’.
 - 54 p) This should include the strengthening of regional processes.
12. Some possible operational goals, which are not sufficiently considered in para 54 (though some of them are listed in the annex):
 - Article 7 b: Develop monitoring systems for the components of biological diversity.
 - Article 8 a and b: Promote and develop strategically coherent systems of protected areas.
 - Article 8 h: Establish global, regional and national mechanism to implement article 8h.
 - Article 8 k: Develop species conservation legislation.
 - Article 12: Develop training modules for biodiversity managers.
 - Article 26: Develop measures to support effective reporting by parties to the COP (including, as an activity, support to the UNEP-led harmonised reporting process of environmental conventions).
13. Operational goals for the thematic work programmes could be extracted directly from the work programmes. For example, the objectives of the work programme on forest biological diversity (annex to decision IV/7, para 3) could be taken as operational goals and the elements of the work programme (ibid, para 10 +) as activities.
14. As additional operational goals, besides implementing the ecosystem approach, achieving universal membership and ensuring adequate participation of parties in the process, we would propose:
 - Strengthening the involvement of the private sector in the process of the Convention.
 - Strengthening the involvement of civil society in the process of the Convention.

- Developing an adequate compliance or performance-assurance system through looking at compliance mechanisms of related conventions and drawing lessons.

GREENPEACE

16 May 2001

General Remarks

- The Strategic Plan of the CBD should be **short, clear, and concise**. Every step of the Strategic Plan should contribute to making an identifiable difference on the ground.
- The strategic plan should focus on developing the following three areas:
 1. Develop the international biodiversity regime
 2. Implement the CBD at the national level
 3. Improve national reporting, enforcement and compliance

Develop the international biodiversity regime

1. A strategic plan is a critical pathway to achieve agreed objectives. The objectives of the CBD in Article 1 of the Convention are too general to allow for strategic planning. Rather, they provide a grand vision towards arriving at the end of the tunnel of biodiversity destruction. The operational provisions of the Convention (Art. 3 – 19) concretise the objectives of the CBD in a logical manner¹, but are still too general. They need to be broken down in measurable sub-objectives. The strategic plan should help the COP to **prioritise its work, identify operational goals and concrete targets, and agree on baselines to allow for measuring progress under each article of the Convention**. This is an objective in itself for which the strategic plan should provide the pathway.
2. The crucial question is: How to prioritise, identify concrete targets and agree on baselines in a world of interests as diverse as biodiversity itself? The COP developed various work programmes in the five biome-based themes and the cross-cutting issues. Such a thematic approach might be well suited for implementing agencies and operational organisations. The CBD is, however, an instrument of law and its first and foremost role is to specify and concretise its provisions and strive for their implementation. The strategic plan should be guided by an “articles approach”.
3. Using an **articles approach** to structure the future work of the Convention and to develop the international biodiversity regime would have the following advantages:
 - (1) It could help to **implement the Ecosystem Approach**. The Ecosystem Approach, as endorsed at COP 5, recognises that the term “ecosystem” ... can refer to any functioning unit at any scale. Indeed, the scale of analysis and action should be determined by the problem being addressed“ (decision V/6, Annex, Section A, para 3). An article driven, rather than a thematic and cross-cutting approach as currently chosen, would simplify and clarify the work ahead of the COP and its subsidiary bodies.
 - (2) It would allow for **setting priorities** for governments and their societies, while still enabling common priorities to be agreed at the international level. Due to geographic differences, for

¹ NBSAP, including cross-sectoral integration, monitoring and assessment, conservation, sustainable use, access and benefit-sharing.

example, some countries have more interest in and need for completing their system of protected areas with a marine and coastal biodiversity focus, whilst others might have more of an emphasis on forest biodiversity with a need to establish biosphere reserves and other management structures for their forests. In focusing on the implementation of Art. 8 a - d rather than on the various work programmes, countries could choose their priorities within Article 8 and would still implement the CBD. In focusing on implementing Art. 11, Parties could identify those areas where perverse subsidies in their countries are predominant, instead of having to assess all thematic areas at once, which can become confusing given the various overlapping programmes of work.

- (3) It would **simplify synergies with other biodiversity-related conventions**. Instead of looking, for example, at protected areas at one COP and, then at thematic areas at another COP, without much meaningful linkage between the two discussions, COP could, for example, cooperate under Article 8 with the World Heritage Convention on the completion of the World Heritage System as one operational goal. The different thematic areas would be considered in their entirety under the aspect of their world heritage aspects. Wetlands nominated to the Ramsar Convention could be considered as part of the system of protected areas.
- (4) It could help to **overcome the sectoral divide**. The biggest challenge that the Convention faces for its implementation is **overcoming sectoral thinking** at all levels of governmental activity (see also below). Designed carefully, the Articles Approach could provide an incentive to different units, departments and ministries to work on a joint task, and in doing so will overcome thematic divides and sectoral thinking.
For example: To identify perverse and positive incentives under Article 11 could become a joint activity of all relevant ministries under the lead of the head of government.

Implementation at the national level

4. Implementation on the national level faces two problems: 1. **sectoral and compartmental thinking** and 2. **lack of capacity** and understanding to enforce national (regional and local) policy and law.
5. The first step towards national implementation are National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAP) and integration of biodiversity considerations into all relevant sectors. However, there is a high risk that NBSAP are not implemented, but wither on the shelf, or are even contradicted and superseded by more “fashionable” new general or sectoral plans such as sustainable development plans and national forest programmes.
6. Sectoral thinking exists everywhere, in international organisations, local governments, between national ministries and even within NGOs. Ministries for agriculture and forestry tend to push environmental ministries aside and ministries of economics and finance reign above all of them. Sectoral thinking prevents the involvement of key stakeholders responsible for biodiversity destruction who need to be turned into mainstreamers of biodiversity if the CBD wants to be successful.
7. How to overcome sectoral thinking? The strategic plan should structure issues and tasks that discourage sectoral thinking and provide incentives to work together on joint projects. Compartments tend to be overcome when they are managed together on equal terms by a higher authority. The strategic plan could build in momentum to explicitly ask specific ministries to attend COPs, to organise ministerial roundtables and to encourage participation. It could also request specific activities on the national level for development of joint implementation. The strategic plan could make provisions for this to happen (e.g. all relevant ministries, agencies and departments should be called upon by the Strategic Plan and every decision; (National Focal Points would submit the

relevant ministries and agencies to the COP and the Secretariat). The Secretariat would follow-up directly with the relevant institutions, e.g. by inviting several Ministries for roundtable discussions at COPs).

8. **International funding agencies**, such as the World Bank, regional development banks, bilateral donor agencies, and export credit agencies have a huge responsibility for national implementation. The strategic plan should ensure their participation in implementation, e.g. by including specific reporting requirements of these agencies; by addressing governments specifically as the governors of these institutions.

National Reporting

9. National Reporting is currently the only instrument to monitor implementation. It should be a key priority of the strategic plan to develop this instrument further. A first step would be to make more use of national reports and discuss them in a separate forum, e.g. a working group reporting to the COP. Such discussions should allow for ample input by NGOs, including proposing solutions for shortcomings that the National Report reveals. The process should be designed in a way that the discussion of National Reports is seen as an opportunity to gain support for realistic solutions rather than an instrument for reproach.
10. Implementation of the CBD and enforcement of national biodiversity law should be encouraged through incentives. E.g., funding could be “tranché” and payment conditioned to the achievement of certain steps. Ways and means for encouraging developed countries’ enforcement should be equally developed in the Strategic Plan.

FINAL REMARK: Ride the horse.

11. The strategic plan should be **focused** and **action oriented**. If you want to ride a horse, it is not necessary to examine the components of the horse’s blood cells nor to analyse its skeleton. Rather, one would take a step back and look at the horse in its entirety, as a living organism which needs water and fodder and some care in order to deliver and function. There is a lot of knowledge already existing on ecosystems and there is a general agreement on the importance of biodiversity and its distribution. The Millenium Ecosystem Assessment will most likely add considerable additional scientific information. It is not necessary to know all species in a given area and to understand ecosystem functioning in depth in order to be able to achieve the objectives of the Convention. Governments should not hide behind more studies, more analysis, more paper work because they are torn apart by petit interests. They should be decisive and courageous. The strategic plan means saddling the horse. It should lead to action. It should channel resources and use common sense. There is no time for further delay.

WORLD WILDLIFE FUND (WWF)

20 March 2001

Thanks for organising the meeting on the CBD strategy. You received a lot of useful comments but I would like to add just a few more.

- 1) Who implements what? At present it is not at all clear to me who is meant to do what and I fear that you may end up with everyone assuming that someone else is responsible! Will you be able to define responsibilities including those of Industry? I would certainly like to see them included such as:

/...

Pharmaceuticals:

Food Industry:

Tourism etc:

However to get them on board you will need to include them in the process and I suspect they have been omitted so far. Don't hold up the process but consider getting them in. After all the document will never be finished, not should it. All you will have is a series of milestone which need to be monitored and updated and to which new ones can always be added.

2) On strategy structures I think the Ramsar one deserves some attention. It too has allocated responsibilities including to NGOs, but then it has recognised "Partner" NGOs with which it works closely. I'm not suggesting you follow the same path, I suspect the CBD is too broad, but there may be another approach you could adopt. NGOs will not want to be seen to be part of a strategy if they are a substitute for Government action and liable to monitoring by Governments in that context. However some way of minimising duplication and sharing priorities might help!

3) Targets: I'm sure that you are aware of the homilies on targets: SMART for example: Specific; measurable; ambitious (achievable?); relevant (realistic); time bound. Also who are they for: Governments? The Secretariat or even what the world actually needs?

4) The current document seems very light on economics, biodiversity/ ecosystem services etc. Mangroves and erosion protection, sewage filtration and fisheries nurseries. Montane forests for catchment protection, flood prevention. Non-timber forest products and local livelihoods, important as they are almost always omitted from national accounting processes leading to flawed decision making.

5) Monitoring, feedback to implementation and evaluation appear light.

6) Dispute resolution is ignored. It shouldn't be. The Cartagena Protocol will raise issues with WTO and these should be resolved in the CBD. Equally issues of indigenous rights, Intellectual Property Rights, Access and benefit sharing disputes will all arise and the CBD should be preparing to play its role.

7) And finally if the strategy/ plan is to play a central role consideration should be given to developing a formal relationship between it and COP decisions. This should include a mechanism for aligning decisions and checking funding.
