



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/EM-SSC/2/4  
23 June, 2010

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

### SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION ON BIODIVERSITY FOR DEVELOPMENT

Second expert meeting  
Nairobi, 29-30 May 2010

### REPORT OF THE MEETING

#### INTRODUCTION

1. At its ninth meeting, in May 2008, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity noted the initiative of developing countries to prepare, in collaboration with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, a Multi-Year Plan of Action (MYPA) for South-South Cooperation on Biodiversity for Development, and requested the Executive Secretary to report on its preparation at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP-10) in Nagoya, Japan, in October 2010 (decision IX/25).

2. The process to develop the Multi-Year Plan of Action is built on three previous meetings held at the request of the Group of 77 and China (G-77) under the successive chairmanships of South Africa, Antigua and Barbuda, Sudan and Yemen, and organized in partnership with the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity: (i) a brainstorming meeting held in November 2006 during which participants discussed elements of a Plan of Action to enhance implementation of the three objectives of the Convention and recommendations for the process of developing the Multi-Year Plan of Action; (ii) in November 2008, an expert meeting in which participants reviewed the draft framework for South-South Cooperation for full integration into the G-77 Development Platform for the South and identified activities for inclusion in the Multi-Year Plan of Action, and during which a Steering Committee was proposed comprising the former and current Chairs of the G-77 involved in the production of the Multi-Year Plan of Action and the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA); and (iii) the first Meeting of the Steering Committee on 29 October 2009, in Montreal. At this meeting, a draft Multi-Year Plan of Action prepared by the G-77 in collaboration with the Secretariat was reviewed and revised, and a roadmap for its further development was outlined. The Steering Committee also called for a Second Expert Meeting to finalize the Multi-Year Plan of Action. More information is available on the official South-South Cooperation page of the website of the Convention at <http://www.cbd.int/cooperation/SouthSouthcooperation.shtml>.

3. In partnership with the Chairman of the G-77 and the Executive Secretary of the G-77, the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity convened the Second Expert Meeting for South-South Cooperation on Biodiversity for Development on 29 and 30 May in Nairobi. The main objectives of the meeting were to:

(a) Review and adopt the draft Multi-Year Plan of Action, with a specific focus on the proposed modalities for implementation of the Plan of Action; and

(b) Outline a roadmap for submission to the Conference of the Parties at its tenth meeting (under agenda item 4.9 on cooperation with other conventions and other organizations, and as part of the Executive Secretary's report requested in paragraph 6 of decision IX/25).

4. This Second Expert Meeting was convened with the generous financial support of the Global Environment Facility (GEF). It was attended by experts representing Antigua and Barbuda, Benin, Cuba, Egypt, Guinea-Bissau, Grenada, Haiti, Kiribati, Malawi, Mexico, Philippines, Saint Lucia, South Africa, Sudan, Thailand, Uganda, and Yemen, as well as staff of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Secretariat of the G-77 and the UNDP Special Unit for South-South Cooperation (a detailed list of participants is available in the annex).

## **ITEMS 1 AND 2. OPENING OF THE MEETING AND ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS**

5. The meeting was opened at 9 a.m. on Saturday 29 May 2010 at the UNEP Headquarters in Nairobi. In his opening statements, Mr. Awsan Al-Aud, representative of Yemen as the Chair of G-77, referred to the process starting with the Brainstorm Meeting on South-South cooperation in Montreal in 2006, the first Expert Meeting in 2008, the first meeting of the Steering Committee in 2009, and the development of the Multi-Year Plan of Action. He outlined a process for the submission of the revised Multi-Year Plan of Action to the ministerial meeting of the G-77 on 28 September 2010 in New York. This would be followed by the South-South Forum on Biodiversity for Development on 18 October 2010 in Nagoya, Japan, and the consideration of the Multi-Year Plan of Action by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at their tenth meeting to be held from 18–29 October 2010. He concluded this opening statement by saying that he looked forward to working with the experts over the next two days in revising the draft Multi-Year Plan of Action.

6. Dr. Ahmed Djoghlaif, Executive Secretary of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, welcomed participants and thanked them for their three weeks of hard work during the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the third meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-Ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention. He congratulated the G-77 Secretariat, Yemen as chair of the G-77, Malawi as Bureau member, and Grenada as Chair of SBSTTA for the outstanding results in the development of the Multi-Year Plan of Action. He also welcomed participants coming from New York. He noted that the draft Multi-Year Plan of Action was a result of four years of consultations, and acknowledged the valuable contribution of past chairs of the G-77: South Africa, Antigua and Barbuda, and Sudan. He commended the CEO of the GEF, Ms. Monique Barbut, for her financial and strategic support. He highlighted South-South cooperation as a major tool to implement the ambitious Convention on Biological Diversity Strategic Plan for the period 2011–2020, particularly with the support of emerging economies such as China, Brazil, India and South Africa, and he called attention to the technologies and experiences developed by Cuba and Kenya in wildlife management. He thanked South Korea for offering the secondment of a staff member on South-South cooperation, and paid tribute to Japan for the upcoming Biodiversity Trust Fund to implement decisions from the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, including South-South cooperation, over ten years. He mentioned that the Convention on Biological Diversity was the first MEA to adopt a decision on South-South cooperation on biodiversity for development. He also thanked UNDP for its technical assistance, and mentioned that on 19 July, a meeting with high level officers of UNDP would include South-South cooperation as an area of common interest.

7. Dr. Spencer Thomas, chair of SBSTTA-14, expressed the support of SBSTTA delegates to develop the Plan of Action, highlighting the importance of South-South cooperation as a tool for the implementation of the Convention and for many cross-cutting issues and several thematic programmes of

work, such as islands, protected areas, and invasive alien species. South-South cooperation was equally relevant for articles of the Convention on Biological Diversity related to capacity-building, finance, and communication, education, and public awareness (CEPA). He reiterated his thanks to the “South-South cooperation pioneers,” and noted that the Multi-Year Plan of Action was consistent with the findings of GBO-3, as well as the draft Strategic Plan just discussed at WGRI-3. He further noted that he felt honoured to have the G-77 lead the process, stressing that its voice had to be louder in this Convention as it was in UNFCCC. The regime on Access and Benefit-sharing that was currently under negotiation required the support of the G-77, particularly to reverse trends such as diminishing financial support and lack of technology transfer.

8. Professor James Seyani, representing Malawi and Bureau member of the Conference of the Parties, thanked the Executive Secretary and stressed that he felt lucky to have the G-77 and China to strengthen the links between biodiversity and development at the international level. Insofar as much of the world’s biodiversity resided in the South, the Multi-Year Plan of Action was an instrument to mainstream biodiversity. Given the importance of biodiversity for human well-being and sustainable development, he welcomed the fact that the United Nations General Assembly would have biodiversity on the high level agenda in September for the first time. He requested the G-77 for assistance in ensuring the Party representatives at the United Nations headquarters in New York were aware of progress achieved under the Convention on Biological Diversity. As New York-based representatives were usually from each Party’s Foreign Affairs ministries, it was important that the message to the United Nations General Assembly clearly highlighted biodiversity as a driver of healthy economies. He finished by thanking Yemen, as the chair of the G-77, for contributing to this meeting.

9. Ambassador Conrod Hunte of Antigua and Barbuda and former chair of the G-77 thanked the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity for the invitation to contribute to this Expert Meeting, and for the draft Multi-Year Plan of Action. He agreed with Professor Seyani that developing countries had to take biodiversity concerns seriously, noting that biodiversity unfortunately often took a back seat to climate change negotiations. He thanked Yemen for continuing to raise awareness of New York-based Ambassadors on the economic importance of biodiversity. Finally, he emphasized the relevance of biodiversity to the upcoming Rio + 20 meeting, as well as to the discussion on the establishment of green economies. He concluded his remarks by hoping that the Multi-Year Plan of Action would have a smooth and straight path towards the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in October.

10. Following opening remarks, participants elected Mr. Al-Aud, representing Yemen and the Chairman of the G-77, as the Chair of the meeting.

11. The Group considered the proposed agenda (UNEP/CBD/EM-SSC/2/1/Add1) and organization of work for the meeting. It was decided to move the country presentations to Sunday 30 May to provide the group with the opportunity to focus on reviewing the draft Multi-Year Plan of Action, including its structure and components, on the first day of the meeting.

12. The meeting was conducted in English.

### **ITEM 3. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

#### ***3.1. Overview of the Multi-Year Plan of Action and Outcome of WGRI-3***

13. Under this agenda item, Mr. Oliver Hillel, representing the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, provided an overview of the context and history of the development of the Multi-Year Plan of Action. Additionally, his presentation outlined key elements of the Multi-Year Plan of Action. The presentation is available at <http://www.cbd.int/cooperation/SouthSouthcooperation.shtml>.

14. Following this introductory presentation, the participants provided general comments and feedback on the current draft Multi-Year Plan of Action. They shared related experience from both national and regional levels, highlighting key issues that should be considered within the draft. The following comments were made:

*Content and structure*

(a) There is a need to consolidate the current document. Additionally, it is important to be very strategic in the way activities are highlighted. It is necessary to show the specific role of the Multi-Year Plan of Action within the Convention on Biological Diversity as a whole. This specificity will assist in mobilizing resources;

(b) Not only is it important to recognize cooperation at regional and subregional levels, but also it is particularly relevant to stress the value of exchanging experiences on biodiversity-related issues between regions. The chair of SBSTTA, St. Lucia and Kiribati highlighted the recent Workshop “Helping Islands Adapt” (on replicating results of the Pacific Invasives Initiative), which was convened in April 2010, in New Zealand, as an excellent example of such interregional exchanges. They argued that this event supported South-South cooperation and knowledge transfer, noting that the most important output of this workshop was the opportunity to share information on actions undertaken by other regions and on the management and mitigation mechanisms developed within the different regions. This opportunity for knowledge sharing between regions should be highlighted in the Multi-Year Plan of Action;

(c) Several participants noted that the most important issue was to foster political support for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. Communication was critical and therefore it was important to create a short message that could be understood quickly by policy and decision-makers. This was relevant to the MYPA’s Vision and Mission statements;

(d) It is necessary to include some figures from GBO-3, and on the economics of ecosystems and biodiversity, on the seriousness of biodiversity loss to development in order to “shock” the politicians into action;

(e) It is important to highlight that the Multi-Year Plan of Action is linked to decisions of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. An annex to the Multi-Year Plan of Action should include a list of decisions from the Conference of the Parties that reference South-South cooperation. It was recommended to include this information in an annex rather than within the body of the draft Multi-Year Plan of Action so that the main text of the Multi-Year Plan of Action can be kept as concise and focused as possible;

(f) This Multi-Year Plan of Action on South-South cooperation must not be seen as a new initiative nor a new programme of work. This Multi-Year Plan of Action supports existing Convention on Biological Diversity programmes of work as a catalyst for their implementation. The purpose is to enhance and encourage national Governments to implement specific programmes of work in developing countries;

(g) Biodiversity mainstreaming into sectoral and cross-sectoral plans, programmes, and strategies has a major impact on addressing poverty. Indeed, until the issue of poverty is fully addressed, biodiversity will continue to suffer. Therefore, organizations such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) have an important role in supporting the mainstreaming of biodiversity concerns. During the recent third meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation, India provided examples of creating green jobs that are targeted towards improving the environment. These examples were considered to be very relevant to the Multi-Year Plan of Action;

(h) The issue of desertification, and links to the Rio conventions are important and should be referenced in the Multi-Year Plan of Action. A major focus of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) is poverty reduction. Therefore it is important to find a way to build a linkage to the activities of the UNCCD on poverty reduction. Additionally, it is important to consider how this link can be action-oriented;

*Building political buy-in*

(i) It is important to raise the profile of this Multi-Year Plan of Action and ensure that regional organizations such as CARICOM are informed and committed to the Multi-Year Plan of Action at the highest political level. Input and support from these organizations will be vital to the success of the Multi-Year Plan of Action. Therefore, the participants suggested that the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity could write to the Secretary General of CARICOM, as well as the heads of other relevant regional organizations, regarding the Multi-Year Plan of Action and the importance of South-South cooperation in implementing the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity;

(j) There are often conflicts in approach between environment and finance ministries, with finance limiting environmental action. Additionally, Ministries of Foreign Affairs are particularly important to this process. Therefore support is needed from the highest political level for the implementation of the Multi-Year Plan of Action;

(k) There is also a communication gap between policy-makers in New York at the United Nations and at the national level. All G-77 Parties are represented in the missions to the United Nations in New York, where South-South cooperation is extensively discussed. However the issue of biodiversity has rarely been considered in their previous and extensive work on South-South cooperation. Therefore there is a gap between the focal points of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the New York-based “political” focal points. It is necessary to be proactive in raising awareness of the dialogues that are happening in both spheres, especially as these could relate to enhancing the implementation of the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity;

(l) It was suggested that the draft Multi-Year Plan of Action, revised with inputs from this Expert Meeting, should be circulated to the regional preparatory meetings of the Conference of the Parties. The participants also discussed the importance of circulating the draft to both the Convention on Biological Diversity “technical” focal points as well as the G-77 “political” focal points;

*Engagement of stakeholders and partnerships*

(m) The Multi-Year Plan of Action should make use of other relevant initiatives that are very closely linked to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, such as the Nile Basin initiative. Linking with relevant initiatives could be more cost effective;

(n) Both the Caribbean Biological Corridor and the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor were discussed in their capacity as platforms for South-South and triangular cooperation on issues such as land degradation, poverty eradication, sustainable livelihoods, and biodiversity conservation. The latter has a US \$ 80 million fund to conduct many supporting activities. These biological corridors offer concrete examples of the exchange of technical expertise resulting in capacity-building. Additionally, the agreements at ministerial levels that have arisen from these transboundary biological corridors are very relevant and further enhance South-South cooperation. These biological corridors offer excellent examples of how to catalyze action on biodiversity issues at the regional level, including improving sustainability of different productive sectors;

(o) It could be useful to include within the Multi-Year Plan of Action a list of successful regional South-South cooperation initiatives such as the two biological corridors mentioned. Additionally, the Southern African Botanical network built a lot of capacity in the region. Such a list would be best placed in an Annex.

### *Implementation*

(p) It is necessary to highlight the importance of capacity-building at national levels and indicate how South-South cooperation can support such capacity-building in the biodiversity field.

15. In closing the discussion on item 3, Mr. Alberto Vega from the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity provided a brief overview of recommendations from the third meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention regarding negotiations on the integration of biodiversity into poverty eradication and development. He reminded participants that a number of recent decisions of the Conference of the Parties had emphasized the importance of mainstreaming biodiversity into and across sectors as well as into national development planning. Additionally, the recent WGRI-3 recommendation on the integration of biodiversity into poverty eradication and development noted the potential usefulness of regional organizations as nodes for South-South and North-South cooperation on mainstreaming biodiversity concerns. Finally he noted that the Executive Secretary had been requested to convene an expert group on biodiversity for development and poverty eradication.

## **ITEM 4. PRESENTATIONS ON REGIONAL SSC AND TRIANGULAR EXPERIENCES**

### ***4.1 Examples of regional initiatives***

16. Most of the country presentations were rescheduled to the second day of the meeting in order to allow participants to focus on the structure and content of the Multi-Year Plan of Action during Saturday 29 May. Representatives of Benin, Cuba, Grenada, Guinea Bissau, Kiribati, Malawi, the Philippines, Thailand, Saint Lucia, Uganda, Yemen and UNDP's South-South Cooperation Unit delivered presentations on national and regional experiences in South-South cooperation on biodiversity. Presentations are available at <http://www.cbd.int/cooperation/SouthSouthcooperation.shtml>.

17. Mr. Jimmy Blas thanked the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity for his efforts to improve global awareness of biodiversity. He also paid tribute to Yemen for their leadership in the revision of the Multi-Year Plan of Action. Finally, he thanked Mr. Ahmia, the Executive Secretary of the G-77, for his leadership. Mr. Blas provided an overview of South-South cooperation on biodiversity in the ASEAN region, highlighting two key examples. In his presentation on the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity he provided information on the establishment of the ASEAN Biodiversity Fund based on voluntary contributions. He also discussed the Coral Triangular Initiative which included high-level political commitments and was supported by Governments, civil society, and the private sector. Finally, he discussed the Philippines experience with cooperation among the Group of Like-Minded Megadiverse Countries.

18. Ms. Patama Domrongphol, representing Thailand, thanked Mr. Al-Aud for his leadership in chairing the Expert Meeting. Turning to the national experience of Thailand, she provided a summary of the country's major Forest Complexes and several national-level biodiversity projects. Additionally, she discussed Thailand's experience with engaging the private sector in biodiversity conservation. With regards to cooperation on a regional level, she described the coordinated effort of ten countries in combating the illegal wildlife trade and providing capacity-building on wildlife-related legislation through the ASEAN-WEN network. Ms. Domrongphol also discussed the Mekong River Commission and its role in facilitating South-South cooperation and regional coordination on water resources. She outlined some examples of cooperation on sustainable development of marine and coastal environments,

coral reefs, and marine protected areas under the ASEAN Working Group on Coastal and Marine Environment and the ASEAN Environment Ministers. She discussed the Roadmap for the ASEAN Community 2009 – 2015, in which one of the main goals was the promotion of sustainable management and biodiversity conservation. Ms. Domrongphol identified the Satoyama Initiative and Life Web as windows through which South-South cooperation may be enhanced further. Finally, she stressed that communication, education, and public awareness (CEPA) tools should be employed in further promoting South-South cooperation on biodiversity. Following her presentation, other participants reiterated the importance of CEPA in the future implementation of the Multi-Year Plan of Action.

19. Mr. Gaspard Michel Andrew, representing Saint Lucia, shared the country's extensive experience with South-South cooperation in the Caribbean region. Saint Lucia had assisted the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) member countries on developing ABS and biosafety framework legislation. Additionally, experience related to revising the country's NBSAP and mainstreaming the NBSAP at operational levels had been shared with neighbouring countries. Approximately 90 per cent of the NBSAP was reported to be implemented, and activities were incorporated annually into national budgets. Saint Lucia was ready to share this experience with other countries as this could contribute to capacity-building throughout the region. Moreover, Saint Lucia had extensive experience in developing a comprehensive system plan of protected areas, and this process also had been shared with other countries in the South. Mr. Andrews also provided examples of South-South knowledge exchange on the successful Saint Lucia Parrot conservation initiative, including its major education and public awareness component. Turning to regional initiatives, Mr. Andrew reported on a Saint Lucia PES system (payments for ecosystem services) project under the regional Integrated Watershed and Coastal Area Management (IWCAM) project. Outcomes such as improved management of inland waters and wetlands, collaboration with local farmers, rehabilitation of water catchments, agro-forestry initiatives, and public awareness campaigns had been shared with other participating countries. Finally, he highlighted several regional initiatives that had strong South-South cooperation components, including the Caribbean Environment Programme (one of UNEP's Regional Seas Programmes), the Caribbean Forests Network, the Caribbean Association of Sustainable Tourism, the biodiversity programme under development at the University of the West Indies, the Ridge to Reef watershed project, and the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute's (CANARI) capacity-building initiatives. In the case of CANARI, the regional exchange of case-studies and best practices took a central role in the operations of the NGO, and annual meetings were held focusing on emerging issues for the region. Mr. Andrew's concluded his presentation in highlighting how South-South approaches could benefit the biodiversity agenda in the Caribbean. Current initiatives as well as future opportunities and priorities for enhanced South-South cooperation included:

- (a) Training on sustainable use of biodiversity for socio-economic development;
- (b) Sharing experiences in linking biodiversity considerations with climate change activities;
- (c) Placing wetlands conservation onto the political agendas;
- (d) Assisting countries across the region on developing CEPA strategies;
- (e) Capacity-building for the development and implementation of sustainable financing mechanisms for protected areas; and
- (f) Enhanced South-South cooperation in support of building capacity on ABS.

20. Dr. Spencer Thomas shared some experiences on South-South and triangular cooperation within the context of the Global Island Partnership (GLISPA). This multilateral platform, launched during the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and with a Coordination Unit hosted by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), assisted island nations in strengthening partnerships to build long-term capacity for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of island ecosystems. The

Partnership involved governments from both developing and developed countries, United Nations bodies, and NGOs. Dr. Thomas explained how GLISPA had facilitated information sharing between regions on Invasive Alien Species (IAS), protected areas, climate change, the economic valuation of ecosystems and biodiversity, and the direct link between livelihoods and ecosystem goods and services. Regional initiatives such as the Micronesia Challenge, the Caribbean Challenge, the Coral Triangle, and the Western Indian Ocean Challenge had been able to motivate and reinforce each other through this interregional exchange, pushing the envelope for further advancement. He stressed that this dynamic interaction was the greatest benefit of South-South cooperation. Finally, he discussed how GLISPA had leveraged significant financial resources to support these initiatives.

21. Mr. Cosmas Gitta, representing the UNDP Special Unit for South-South Cooperation, discussed the role of the Unit in coordinating and supporting South-South and triangular cooperation across the United Nations system. The Special Unit received its policy directives from the General Assembly High-Level Committee on South-South Cooperation and manages both the United Nations Trust Fund for South-South Cooperation and the Perez-Guerrero Trust Fund. Over the years, the emphasis on South-South cooperation had been in the areas of trade and economic growth. Therefore the Multi-Year Plan of Action on Biodiversity for Development had great potential to raise awareness and galvanize action on this important transnational issue that was central to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. The Special Unit had two regional service centres that supported South-South cooperation in Africa and the Asia-Pacific regions, pooling resources and offering advisory and operational support. Focal points also were present in the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Caribbean, and the East African Community (EAC). However, these focal points were not thematic, and they worked on all areas of South-South cooperation. This again highlighted the added value of the Multi-Year Plan of Action, which would focus specifically on biodiversity issues and provide critical input to parallel South-South cooperation processes. Following his presentation, participants highlighted the importance of building better coordination between the political and technical focal points in parallel South-South cooperation processes, the lack of which currently was a major challenge to cooperation.

22. Mr. Francis Ogwal, representing Uganda, presented on a number of South-South cooperation initiatives in which Uganda was involved. These included the Nile Basin Initiative, transboundary conservation activities between Uganda and Tanzania, management of IAS in coordination with Zambia, and conservation and IAS projects for Lake Victoria. These initiatives had facilitated the signing of agreements with neighbouring countries on transboundary management of shared ecosystems, as well as the development of an action plan on invasive alien species. He stressed that the rationale for developing the Multi-Year Plan of Action, and indeed the reason why this plan of action would greatly support the Convention on Biological Diversity, was that the G-77 included the megadiverse countries. Regional and subregional institutions already existed, implementing agencies were established, and a pool of knowledge and expertise already existed in the South.

23. In terms of priority areas for enhanced South-South cooperation, Mr. Ogwal highlighted:

- (a) Educational and technical training on taxonomy;
- (b) Biotechnology;
- (c) Economic valuation of biodiversity and ecosystems;
- (d) Implementation of the 2020 Biodiversity Targets;
- (e) Biodiversity conservation outside protected areas and community engagement;
- (f) Capacity-building to conduct biodiversity research;



- (g) IAS;
- (h) Emerging issues such as biofuels;
- (i) Incentive measures;
- (j) Mobilization of financial resources; and
- (k) Engagement of the private sector in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.

In conclusion, Mr. Ogwal stressed that for the Multi-Year Plan of Action to be most effective and relevant, it would be necessary to catalyze changes on the ground. Additionally, financial resources were essential so that the Plan of Action did not gather dust. Finally, he noted that the proposed International Decade on Biodiversity would offer a major opportunity for the Multi-Year Plan of Action.

24. Ms. Nenenteiti Teariki-Ruatu, representing Kiribati, reminded participants that marine areas beyond national borders were an area in which enhanced South-South cooperation was needed, as were transboundary fisheries resources. She provided some examples of integrating biodiversity concerns into fisheries legislation in Kiribati.

25. Ms. Matilde da Conceicao Gomes Lopes, representing Guinea Bissau, provided some examples of partnering with Senegalese authorities in creating biological corridors for the protection of wildlife. She also reported on a regional programme for the conservation of marine ecosystems, highlighting that the initiative had a strong environmental education component.

26. Dr. Dalia Maria Salabarría Fernandez, representing Cuba, provided an overview of cooperation with Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Bolivia, Mexico, the Caribbean region, as well as countries in Africa and Asia. Cuba had developed extensive experience in supporting capacity-building in other countries, including through its technical centres and universities. Finally, she discussed the ongoing cooperation with Haiti and the Dominican Republic under the Caribbean Biological Corridor.

27. Mr. Mensah Bienvenu Célestin Bossou, representing Benin, presented on the Programme for South-South Cooperation (PSC) between Benin, Bhutan, and Costa Rica. The programme was established in 2002, with financial support from the Netherlands, to develop a strategic partnership for sustainable development in the three countries. A common structure had been created, with a joint committee, a management board, a Secretariat based at Fundecooperación in Costa Rica, and national mechanisms based in each of the three countries. Conservation and Sustainable use of Biodiversity existed as one of the programme areas. The three countries had shared information on payments for ecosystem services as well as in the field of biodiversity legislation. The latter was credited for informing the Bhutan Biodiversity Act established in 2003. Additional activities had been carried out on agriculture, sustainable tourism, and gender issues. Benin was engaged in fifteen projects. All projects under the PSC had to include activities in two out of the three participating countries.

28. Mr. Abdul Hakim Aulaiah, representing Yemen, provided an overview of activities coordinated under the Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment in the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden. These included regional cooperation on capacity-building and monitoring systems.

29. Mr. James Seyani, representing Malawi, discussed South-South cooperation on plant conservation in Southern and Western Africa. The initiative included educational training and sharing computing facilities, and involved the participation of the National Herbarium in South Africa. Participating countries developed national databases that were published. Additionally, he outlined efforts undertaken by the SADC gene bank in collecting land races of crops and promoting on-farm conservation of underutilized crops with significant genetic diversity. Professor Seyani also discussed

cooperation between Malawi and Mozambique on the conservation of Lake Malawi and the management of its fisheries. The result had been the development of a bilateral management action plan. Similar cooperation between Zambia, Malawi, and Zimbabwe resulted in an Action Plan for the management of threatened wetlands within the Zambezi watershed.

## **ITEM 5. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MULTI-YEAR PLAN OF ACTION**

### ***5.1. Review of the draft Multi-Year Plan of Action***

30. Participants agreed that the revised version of the Multi-Year Plan of Action should be oriented as a Report of the Executive Secretary that considers the results and input of the Second Expert Meeting on South-South Cooperation on Biodiversity for Development. Parties at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties could make additional changes. Participants agreed that the purpose of this Second Expert Meeting was to share their technical expertise in order to strengthen the document and improve the structure.

### ***5.2. Vision and Mission Statements***

31. The participants agreed that the vision should be:

- (a) Catchy and short;
- (b) Something that would engage policy-makers; and
- (c) Should be a “visionary dream” describing the ideal for South-South cooperation on biodiversity.

32. The following represents a compilation of suggestions for the Vision statement:

- (a) South-South and Triangular Cooperation are enhanced to mainstream biodiversity and ecosystem services into poverty eradication and development processes as a means to contribute to the implementation of the Convention and the Millennium Development Goals;
- (b) Biodiversity contributes to development, poverty eradication, and a healthy planet. (Then discuss South-South cooperation in the mission statement which should be action-oriented);
- (c) Biodiversity contributes to development and poverty alleviation;
- (d) Strengthen South-South cooperation for biodiversity and development in order to sustain a healthy planet/life on this Earth. (The vision is to strengthen cooperation for this greater purpose.);
- (e) Strengthen South-South cooperation to contribute to biodiversity concerns to enhance human well-being and poverty alleviation;
- (f) Catalyze strong South-South cooperation in compliment to North-South cooperation for the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and to realize development and poverty alleviation in the South;
- (g) South-South cooperation and triangular cooperation are enhanced for mainstreaming biodiversity into sectoral and cross-sectoral plans, policies, and programmes;
- (h) Include reference to ecosystem services; and

- (i) Integrate the notion of economics of biodiversity into the Vision.

33. The participants did not have any additions for the current text under the Mission Statement. The paragraph that introduced the Mission Statement should read: “Under this overarching Vision, the Mission of the Multi-Year Plan of Action calls for...” rather than “notes.”

34. The list of earlier declarations and important meetings currently in paragraph 7 (k) should be moved to an annex. This would help keep the text of the Multi-Year Plan of Action as short and concise as possible.

### **5.3. Implementation modalities**

#### *Objectives Section*

35. Regarding the objectives section, the participants worked on the text of the original four objectives and suggested the following:

(a) There needs to be a direct correlation between each objective of the Multi-Year Plan of Action and related priority activities;

(b) The language in objective (a) could indicate that the Multi-Year Plan of Action would promote and facilitate the exchange of scientific, technical, and technological knowledge, as well as traditional knowledge, expertise, and appropriate technology, related to lessons learned and best practices for biodiversity conservation, sustainable use, and biodiversity mainstreaming;

(c) The Multi-Year Plan of Action could include four other objectives:

- Encourage collaboration in innovation in technology and policies that are friendly to innovation;
- Encourage member states, which have not already done so, to integrate biodiversity into their national development plans, taking into account national priorities;
- Enhance capacity-building in the South; and
- Make full use of the knowledge and expertise accumulated in the South

(d) The text of objective (c) was changed to “Strengthen, reinforce, and increase South-South cooperation and triangular arrangements in the implementation of the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity, its Bodies, and its revised Strategic Plan for the period 2011 – 2020.”

#### *Implementation*

36. The participants made a number of interventions, including:

(a) The document should reflect and link to United Nations operations at the field level. For instance United Nations Country Teams are very active in advising governments with the design of national development plans, and there should be a mechanism to feed into this operational process at the country level;

(b) Often South-South cooperation occurs on a short-term basis. This Multi-Year Plan of Action has the benefit of proposing a ten-year plan. One option is to specify what objectives and activities are necessary at the different country, regional, and international levels;

(c) There is a need to strengthen the language regarding the integration of biodiversity into national development plans;

(d) It is important to hold annual meetings on South-South cooperation on biodiversity and its link to development;

(e) The goal is not to replicate programmes of work under the Convention on Biological Diversity. Additionally, the purpose is not to create a separate strategy. Rather, the Multi-Year Plan of Action will assist in implementing the Strategic Plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity for the period 2011 – 2020;

(f) Decision IX/25 articulates a clear link to the MDGs. As this will also assist in generating buy-in from the North, it is important to maintain clear language on this linkage.

#### *Themes*

37. The text currently under the subsection on themes should be deleted. Currently it appears as a wish list, and Parties have different priorities for South-South cooperation on biodiversity issues based on national priorities and necessities. There was also concern that the list could continue to grow if it remained in the main text of the Multi-Year Plan of Action. Participants stressed that the Multi-Year Plan of Action should remain general and serve to support the priorities of the Convention of Biological Diversity and its Strategic Plan. Information on themes and programmes of work could be moved to an annex, including a list of decisions of the Conference of the Parties that reference South-South cooperation.

#### *Modalities*

38. The participants felt that the section was too long. Priority activities should be clearly linked with the corresponding objective.

### **5.4. Partnerships and coordination mechanisms**

39. The participants suggested that the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity should coordinate implementation of this plan in partnership with the Chair of the G-77 and the Executive Secretary of the G-77, and that implementation of the Multi-Year Plan of Action would follow the guidance of the member states. Participants noted that the current Steering Committee was created by the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity to advise him on the preparation of the report on South-South cooperation submitted to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. As the MYPA moves forward towards an implementation stage, there may be a need for a coordination body, especially given the requirements of intersessional work. However, at this stage it is premature to identify the exact composition of the coordination body or whether this should be a “Steering Committee.” Furthermore, the participants of the expert meeting stressed that they do not have an official mandate to create such a body or committee. Therefore, they could only make a suggestion with regards to the composition of such a coordination body.

40. The participants suggested that the coordination body or steering committee should:

(a) Include the current Chair of the G-77, and possibly past chairs with significant experience in the development of the Plan;

- (b) Include implementers;
- (c) Have a geographic balance;
- (d) Link to the current Bodies of the Convention on Biological Diversity by including developing country representation of the Chairs of these Bodies;
- (e) Have a balanced representation between Convention on Biological Diversity focal points and New York G-77 representatives; and
- (f) Include representation from the Secretariats of regional organizations.

### **5.5. Funding**

41. After some debate, the participants agreed to include general text in the draft Multi-Year Plan of Action as it was critical to underscore the need for resources, including financial resources. Participants felt it was important to stress the fact that these resources should come from a variety of sources including from national governments. In addition to the considerations currently listed in the draft Multi-Year Plan of Action, the participants suggested the inclusion of human resources and institutional capacity.

42. During the discussion on funding, the participants of the Expert Meeting recognized the importance of contributions provided by Japan and Korea in support of South-South cooperation. Additionally, the meeting recognized the generous contribution of the GEF to this process. Participants suggested inviting GEF to consider establishing a South-South Cooperation on Biodiversity trust fund for the purpose of the Multi-Year Plan of Action and based on voluntary contributions. This fund would be managed jointly by the G-77 and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

### **ITEM 6. PROCESS TOWARDS THE TENTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES AND THE SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION FORUM ON BIODIVERSITY FOR DEVELOPMENT**

43. Under this item, participants reviewed the roadmap for submission of the Multi-Year Plan of Action to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its tenth meeting in Aichi/Nagoya, Japan, in October 2010. Paragraph 6 of decision IX/25 requested the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity to report on the preparation of the Multi-Year Plan of Action to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Furthermore, it was suggested that sending the Multi-Year Plan of Action to member states for official endorsement required a negotiated decision. Participants felt that any negotiation by the General Assembly was premature at this time and should take place after the Multi-Year Plan of Action was considered and hopefully adopted by the Conference of the Parties during their tenth meeting in October 2010.

44. Prior to the meeting in Nagoya, the Multi-Year Plan of Action should be circulated to all G-77 Parties for their “consideration.” One suggestion was that this could be done through the regional Conference of the Parties preparatory meetings. Additionally, prior to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the report of the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity on the Multi-Year Plan of Action could be submitted to the ministers of the G-77 on 28 September in New York for them to endorse the Multi-Year Plan of Action.

45. There was also a discussion on the suggested recommendations currently annexed to the draft Multi-Year Plan of Action. Participants were reminded that the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties would have an agenda item on cooperation. Within that context, Yemen, in its capacity as Chair of the G-77, could introduce a draft decision on South-South Cooperation. For the moment, the draft

decision should remain an internal document and be annexed to the report of the Executive Secretary that will be submitted to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

46. The road map to adoption of the Plan includes four main steps:

(a) Ministers of the G-77 may wish to welcome the Multi-Year Plan of Action at a high-level special event to be held on 28 September 2010, in New York, in conjunction with the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly to mark the International Year of Biodiversity;

(b) As requested by the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity will prepare a report on the preparation of the Multi-Year Plan of Action on South-South cooperation for review by the Conference of the Parties at its tenth meeting in Aichi/Nagoya, Japan, in October 2010;

(c) The report of the Executive Secretary will be circulated to Parties for their consideration. Following the request of the Conference of the Parties in decision IX/25, a South-South Cooperation Forum on Biodiversity for Development will be organized on 18 October 2010, in Aichi/Nagoya, Japan at the opening of the tenth meeting of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. This will provide an important opportunity for G-77 Parties to negotiate and adopt the Multi-Year Plan of Action, and to showcase it as well as relevant regional initiatives supporting South-South cooperation on biodiversity concerns;

(d) At the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, Yemen, as Chair of G-77, will coordinate an official submission of the Multi-Year Plan of Action to the Conference of the Parties in conjunction with a statement to be presented at the Ministerial segment of the Conference.

## **ITEM 7. OTHER MATTERS**

47. There were no other matters.

## **ITEM 8 AND 9. ADOPTION OF CONCLUSIONS AND CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

48. Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaif thanked Yemen for its leadership in this Second Expert Meeting and noted that remarkable achievement on the draft Multi-Year Plan of Action had been accomplished in the last two days. He stated that the adoption of the Multi-Year Plan of Action at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties could be clearly envisioned. He noted that after this approval, the hope was to establish a joint G-77 and Convention on Biological Diversity coordination mechanism to guide the implementation of the Multi-Year Plan of Action. Mr. Djoghlaif gratefully acknowledged Yemen's offer to lead discussions on the Multi-Year Plan of Action during the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly, and noted that this would build the awareness of all Heads of State on this process and the critical role that biodiversity plays in human well-being and in sustaining life on Earth. He thanked all participants for their contributions and hard work, and invited them to attend the South-South Cooperation Forum on Biodiversity for Development to be convened on 18 October in Aichi/Nagoya, Japan. Mr. Djoghlaif concluded his remarks by thanking South Africa, Antigua and Barbuda and Sudan for their leadership as former Chairs of the G-77.

49. Mr. Awsan Al-Aud thanked the participants for their valuable inputs to the draft Multi-Year Plan of Action. He also acknowledged the case-studies and experiences with South-South cooperation on biodiversity that were shared during the course of the meeting. Finally, he thanked the staff of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for their assistance.

50. The meeting was closed at 12.30 p.m. on Sunday, May 30, 2010.

*Annex I***SECOND EXPERT MEETING FOR SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION ON BIODIVERSITY  
FOR DEVELOPMENT: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****CBD Parties****Antigua and Barbuda****1. H.E. Mr. Conrod Hunte**

Ambassador; Program Officer  
 UNCCD Liaison Office in New York  
 Permanent Mission of Antigua and Barbuda to  
 the United Nations  
 305 East 47th Street, Suite 6A  
 New York NY 10017  
 United States of America

**Benin****2. M. Mensah Bienvenu Célestin Bossou****Benin**

Directeur Général Adjoint des Forêts et des  
 Ressources Naturelles  
 Ministère de l'Environnement et de la Protection  
 de la Nature  
 Cotonou 02 BP 268

**Cuba****3. Dr. Dalia Maria Salabarría Fernandez**

Head of Environmental Management  
 Department  
 Information, Management and Education Center  
 Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio  
 Ambiente  
 Calle 20 No. 4103e/41 and 47,  
 Miramar Playa  
 La Habana  
 Cuba

**Egypt****4. Mr. Tamer Shaheen**

Third Secretary  
 Embassy of Egypt in Kenya  
 P.O. Box 30185  
 Nairobi  
 Kenya

**Grenada****5. Dr. Spencer Thomas**

CBD, CPB, SBSTTABM & CHM NFP  
 Biodiversity Coordinator  
 Ministry of Finance & Planning  
 Financial Complex  
 Carenage  
 St. George's  
 Grenada

**Guinea Bissau****6. Ms. Matilde da Conceicao Gomes Lopes**

General Director of Environment  
 Secrétariat de l'Environnement et du  
 Développement Durable  
 Guinea Bissau

**Haiti****7. Mr. Joseph Ronald Toussaint**

CBD National Focal Point  
 Ministère de l'Environnement  
 181, Avenue Jean-Paul II  
 Haut de Turgeau  
 Port-au-Prince  
 Haiti

**Kiribati****8. Mrs. Nenenteiti Teariki-Ruatu**

Deputy Director  
 Environment and Conservation Division  
 Ministry of Environment, Lands and  
 Agricultural Development  
 P.O. Box 234  
 Bikenibeu Tarawa  
 Kiribati

### **Malawi**

**9. Prof. James H. Seyani**

Director General  
National Herbarium and Botanical Gardens of  
Malawi  
P.O. Box 528  
Zomba  
Malawi

### **Mexico**

**10. Mr. Damaso Luna**

Deputy General Director for Global Affairs  
Ministry of Foreign Relations  
Plaza Juarez 20, 14 Floor, Colonia Centro  
Delegacion Cuanhtemoc  
Mexico D.F.  
Mexico

### **Philippines**

**11. Mr. Jimmy Blas**

Permanent Mission of the Philippines to the UN  
556 Fifth Avenue, 5th Floor  
New York NY 10036  
United States of America

### **Saint Lucia**

**12. Mr. Gaspard Michel Andrew**

Chief, Forestry Officer  
Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Fisheries and  
Forestry  
Sir Stanislaus James Building, 5th Floor  
Waterfront  
Castries  
Saint Lucia

### **South Africa**

**13. Ms. Sibongile Mabasa**

Second Secretary; Deputy Permanent  
Representative to UNEP and  
UN Habitat  
South African High Commission  
Roshanmaer Place, Lenana Rd. Kitimani  
P.O. Box 42441  
Nairobi  
Kenya

### **Sudan**

**14. Dr. Abdelbagi Mukhtar Ali Ghanim**

Biosafety Expert  
Higher Council for Environment and Natural  
Resources (HCENR)  
Ministry of Environment & Physical  
Development  
Mik Nimer Street  
P.O. Box 306  
Khartoum  
Sudan

### **Thailand**

**15. Ms. Patama Domrongphol**

Senior Environmental Officer  
Biological Diversity Division  
Office of Natural Resources and Environmental  
Policy and Planning  
60/I Soi Phibul Wattana 7  
Rama VI Road  
Bangkok 10400  
Thailand

### **Uganda**

**16. Mr. Francis Ogwal**

Natural Resources Management Specialist  
(Biodiversity and Rangelands)  
National Environment Management Authority  
NEMA House, Plot 17/19/21 Jinja Road  
P.O. Box 22255  
Kampala  
Uganda

### **Yemen**

**17. Dr. Shawqi Abdulghani A.N.**

3rd Secretary  
Embassy of Yemen in Kenya  
Ngong Road, Off Kabarnet Road  
P.O. Box 44642  
Nairobi 00100  
Kenya

**18. Mr. Abdul-Hakim Aulaiah**

CBD Coordinator, SBSTTA Focal Point  
Environmental Protection Authority (EPA)  
P.O. Box 19719  
Sana, Yemen



**United Nations and Specialized Agencies**

**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**

**19. Mr. Cosmas Gitta**

Chief, Division of Policy, Partnership & Research  
United Nations Development Programme  
One United Nations Plaza  
New York NY 10017  
United States of America

**Inter-Governmental Organizations**

**Group of 77**

**20. Mr. Awsan Al-Aud**

Second Secretary  
Permanent Mission of the Republic of Yemen to the United Nations  
in New York  
Group of 77  
United Nations Headquarters  
Room: NLB-2077  
New York NY 10017  
United States of America

**Observers**

**21. Ms. Camellia Ibrahim**

Observer  
Montreal Quebec  
Canada

**SCBD**

**Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity**

**22. Mr. Didier Babin**

Expert

**23. Mr. Ahmed Djoghla**

Executive Secretary

**24. Mr. Oliver Hillel**

Programme Officer, Island Biodiversity and Sustainable Use &  
Tourism  
Social, Economic and Legal Affairs Division

**25. Alberto Vega**

Programme Officer

-----