



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/Bur/2009/1/3  
19 February 2009

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

BUREAU OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE  
PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON  
BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY  
Nairobi, 13 February 2009

### MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY HELD IN NAIROBI, ON 13 FEBRUARY 2009

#### INTRODUCTION

1. The Bureau of the Conference of the Parties to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity met on 13 February 2009 at the United Nations Office in Nairobi, Kenya, in conjunction with the twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GC/GMEF) of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The meeting was chaired by Mr. Jochen Flasbarth, Director General, Nature Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, Government of Germany, representing the President of the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The following Bureau members attended the meeting:

Ms. Somaly Chan (Cambodia)  
Ms. Tania Temata (Cook Islands)  
Mr. Joseph Ronald Toussaint (Haiti)  
Professor James H. Seyani (Malawi)  
Mr. Damaso Luna (Mexico)  
Ms. Snezana Prokic (Serbia)  
Ms. Åsa Norrman (Sweden)  
Mr. Robert Lamb (Switzerland)  
Dr. Volodymyr Domashlinets (Ukraine)

2. The meeting was also attended by Mr. Masayoshi Mizuno, Director, Global Environment Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, and Mr. Kazuaki Hoshino of the Ministry of Environment of Japan, *ex officio* members of the Bureau as host of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties; Mr. Fernando Casas and Mr. Timothy Hodges, Co-Chairs of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing (WGABS); and Mr. Spencer Thomas, Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA). The Executive Director of UNEP was represented by Mr. Bakary Kante, Director of the Division of Environmental Law and Conventions (DELIC), Ms. Elizabeth Mrema, Senior Legal Officer and Chief, Biodiversity and Land Law and Governance Unit, DELIC, and Mr. Balakrishna Pisupati, DELIC, as well as Ms. Margaret Oduk. The Secretariat was represented by the Executive Secretary of the Convention, Dr. Ahmed Djoghlaif, Mr. Olivier Jalbert, Principal Officer, Ms. Valérie Normand, Programme Officer/ABS, and Ms. Nandhini Krishna, Liaison Officer in New York.

#### ITEM 1 OPENING OF THE MEETING

3. Mr. Flasbarth welcomed participants and thanked the Secretariat for preparations made in support of the meeting.

4. The Deputy Executive Director of UNEP conveyed the regrets of the Executive Director, who was unable to attend. He said that the Executive Director was keen to strengthen the relationship with Convention on Biological Diversity.

/...

5. The Executive Secretary added his voice to that of the President in welcoming the members of the Bureau. He thanked the Presidency for its continued leadership and generosity in convening a third meeting of the Bureau. He thanked UNEP for its continued support and the arrangements made for the Bureau meeting.

## ITEM 2 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

6. The Bureau adopted the following agenda:
1. Opening of the meeting.
  2. Adoption of the agenda.
  3. To-do list emanating from previous Bureau meeting, held on 26-27 November.
  4. Priority list of underfunded activities arising from decisions of the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
  5. Briefing of the President on intersessional activities.
  6. Briefing from the Executive Secretary on recent and forthcoming activities.
  7. Briefing of the Co-Chairs on the implementation of the Bonn mandate on access and benefit-sharing (ABS).
  8. Revision of the strategic plan: status update on the development of the draft to be submitted to the Conference of the Parties at its tenth meeting and preparations regarding the organization of an “eminent persons workshop”.
  9. Any other business.
  10. Closure of the meeting.

## ITEM 3 TO DO LIST, EMANATING FROM BUREAU MEETING 26-27 NOVEMBER

7. The President then reviewed the “to do” list of issues that had been identified for follow up before the third meeting of the Bureau:

(a) **Organization of regional consultations/meetings prior to the seventh meeting of the Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing.** **UNEP was to explore whether it could support this:** *Mr. Kante (UNEP/DELIC) confirmed that UNEP could support for the organization of such regional consultations.*

(b) **Participation of a member of the Bureau in the Meeting of the Group of Legal and Technical Experts on Compliance.** *The representative of Switzerland had attended as an observer.*

(c) **UNEP was to provide information on GEF funding for capacity building on ABS for developing countries:** *The Executive Secretary said that a Project Information Form had been prepared by the Secretariat and sent to UNEP. The representative of UNEP informed the Bureau that consultations had also been undertaken. GEF, however, had indicated that there was no money available for the capacity building workshops.* The President stressed the importance of capacity building workshops. If necessary, his Minister was ready to approach GEF, when the UNEP ED indicated that it would be appropriate. The Director (DELIC) indicated that the Head the UNEP Division of GEF Coordination was ready to brief the Bureau on this issue and make some suggestions on how to assist on this matter. It was agreed that the bureau would return to this issue later.

(d) **COP 10 agenda: At the last meeting it was agreed that further consultations were necessary. Some Bureau members were to consult further within their groups on whether biofuels should be a separate item on the agenda.** *The representative of Sweden indicated that in her view biofuels should be a separate item.* The President indicated that the approach agreed at the second meeting of the Bureau could be retained.

(e) **Finalization and circulation of WGRI agenda: The President queried whether the revised agenda of the third meeting of WGRI had been sent to Parties.** *The Executive Secretary clarified that at the last meeting, the Bureau had agreed that the WGRI agenda was a work*

*in progress. The finalization of the agenda by the Bureau was therefore awaited, before notifications could be sent to Parties. It was agreed that the draft agenda of the third meeting of WGRI will be finalized at the next meeting of the Bureau, on 30 March.*

(f) **Funding for the extended SBSTTA meeting: The President queried whether all issues relating to the funding of the extended SBSTAA meeting had been sorted out.** *The Executive Secretary expressed appreciation to UNEP for the offer of its financial support to host the fourteenth meeting of SBSTTA. He stated if the SBSTTA were to be held over ten days, then an additional US\$ 324,000 were still required. A letter had been sent to all donors so that the shortfall could be made up.* In response to a query by the President, the ES indicated that a decision on duration would have to be taken at least six months before the meeting. Therefore, the decision would need to be taken before the end of 2009. The President summed up the discussion by indicating that the shortfall for a ten-day meeting would need to be resolved. He noted the strong support of the Bureau for a ten-day meeting.

(g) **“Eminent Persons Workshop” (9-10 March 2009):** The President expressed his appreciation for the nominations received from Bureau members and indicated that most of the proposals had been included. The SBSTTA Chair would be invited to attend. The Presidency, ED/UNEP and ES would also participate as observers. If anyone had been missed out suggestions could still be sent in.

(h) **Preparation of a draft letter, for the signature of the President, addressed to the 23 Parties that did not submit credentials at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties or whose credentials were not in order:** *The President confirmed that the draft letters have been prepared and will be signed by the Minister.*

(i) **Tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties: The representative of Japan was to provide feedback on the suggestion from some Bureau members that visas be issued on arrival at the airport.** *The representative of Japan indicated that it might not be possible to issue visas at the airport but all efforts would be made to ensure that all participants would get their visas before arrival in Japan.* The SBSTTA Chair, supported by the Bureau member from Malawi pointed out that the cost of obtaining the visa could be high in some cases because, in the Caribbean, Japan did not have embassies in all countries and therefore there was need to travel to another country to get the visa.

(j) **The President then referred to the request from the SBSTTA Chair for quarterly reports on the progress on the GBO.** *This would be done.*

#### **ITEM 4 PRIORITY LIST OF UNDERFUNDED ACTIVITIES ARISING FROM DECISIONS OF THE NINTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES**

8. The Executive Secretary indicated that letters had been sent to all donors highlighting the shortfall and, additionally, requesting funding in support of the participation of developing countries in the seventh meeting of the Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing.

9. In response to a query by the President, the Executive Secretary indicated that so far the experience was that voluntary contributions did come in but the new factor was the global economic downturn. As a result, voluntary contributions could suffer. There was an urgent need to fund the participation of developing countries for the seventh meeting of the Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing. Spain had generously provided half a million United States dollars to cover the travel of delegates from the least developed countries and small island developing States, but additional financial resources were needed for funding the travel of other eligible countries

10. It was noted that several OECD countries were not cited among the donors to voluntary contributions. Other Bureau members queried whether the Secretariat could do more to cut costs. The Executive Secretary clarified that the figures provided to the Bureau were based on averages. A lot depended on the venue of meetings as well as the number of participants. As for costs related to the participation of developing countries, all travel was by economy class at special rates. There was therefore no further scope to cut travel costs but if the availability of funds was predictable then some savings could be achieved by buying tickets in advance. He also clarified that if voluntary funding became available then activities envisaged at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties for

voluntary funding could go ahead. If not then these activities could be excluded. Whatever could be done to cut costs was being done.

11. On the SBSTTA budget, the Executive Secretary clarified that UNEP had pledged US\$ 250,000 for the meetings of the Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing and SBSTTA. The shortfall related to the decision to extend the SBSTTA session from 8 to 10 days. Letters had been sent to all donors.

12. The **President** summed up the discussion on funding for SBSTTA by suggesting that the Secretariat write to UNEP seeking clarification on what precise costs UNEP was prepared to cover. A ten-day SBSTTA was necessary to ensure a sound scientific base. With respect to funding of activities more generally, the Secretariat should examine whether there was any scope to cut costs. The revised estimates to be provided by the Secretariat could be examined at the next Bureau meeting and decisions could then be made on which activities should be pursued and which activities did not have sufficient funding. Donor flexibility in shifting funding from one activity to another could also be explored. At the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, there was a need to ensure that all activities were well funded.

#### **ITEM 5 BRIEFING OF THE PRESIDENT ON INTERSESSIONAL ACTIVITIES**

13. The **President** indicated that, in consultation with the ES, starting in March it had been decided to appoint a liaison officer of the Secretariat in Bonn to assist in liaison with the CBD Secretariat. Japan, as incoming COP President, had seconded a staff member to the CBD Secretariat in Montreal. CBD and ABS issues were being raised by the Presidency in all bilateral meetings e.g. during the Minister's visit to South Africa and the forthcoming visit of the German State Secretary to Australia, when a Round Table on ABS would be organized. A Roundtable on the post 2010 target was being organized on the margins of the GC. He also stated that a trilateral memorandum would be signed to fund a new protected area in Patagonia, between Chile, the Tompkins and Germany. The Presidency would also be organizing a meeting of private donors interested in sponsoring private initiatives for protected areas. The idea was to showcase best practices and develop some common principles.

14. The representative of **Japan** indicated that Japan recognized the need for closer cooperation between the Japanese Ministry of the Environment and its German counterpart and therefore, through the United Nations, would be seconding a staff member, who would be in place by July, to enhance such cooperation.

#### **ITEM 6 BRIEFING FROM THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY ON RECENT AND FORTHCOMING ACTIVITIES**

15. The **Executive Secretary** indicated that since the second meeting of the Bureau the Secretariat had undertaken, and has been preparing, a number of activities to implement COP-9 decisions and to support the preparation of COP-10. The city of Nagoya had seconded a staff member to assist with the Biodiversity and Cities Initiative. A seconded staff member from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) would join the Secretariat during the first week of March.

#### **ITEM 7 BRIEFING OF THE CO-CHAIRS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BONN MANDATE ON ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING**

16. A detailed discussion on access and benefit-sharing issues took place following the presentations by Ms. Valérie Normand, Programme Officer/ABS and Mr. Balakrishnan Pisupathi, DELC, UNEP.

17. After the presentations the Co Chairs of the Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing, Mr. Fernando Casas and Mr. Timothy Hodges, made some additional points, including:

(a) The conservation community was absent from the discussions on access and benefit-sharing;

(b) Communications were a huge challenge for the Convention as a whole and even more so for access and benefit-sharing;

(c) Even among major stakeholders there is a lack awareness of the major issues involved in access and benefit-sharing;

(d) Prospects have never been better for conclusion and adoption of the access and benefit-sharing regime;

(e) Preparation will be the key, particularly regional and inter regional consultations;

(f) Ministers need to exercise their clout to build and sustain the momentum.

18. **UNEP/DELC** stated that, since the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties was not far away and only three sessions had been provided for negotiation and conclusion of the access and benefit-sharing regime, the time had come to assess what could be realistically accomplished and delivered by that meeting. UNEP could help the process.

19. The importance of visibility, awareness raising and capacity-building was emphasized. It was also necessary to develop specific tools for communication at all levels. It would also be important to make the link to sustainable development. The Nagoya roadmap provided a framework to move forward. The work of the previous sessions of the Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing should be taken into account and built upon. There was a need for regional preparatory meetings. If issues could be identified, Bureau members could help by consulting within their group.

20. The **President** summed up the discussions after the access and benefit-sharing workshop by stating that seventh meeting of the Working Group would indicate whether negotiations were on track. If not, then Bureau might need to intervene and give a clear signal of support. He stressed the German Presidency's strong view that there was no other option but to finalize and adopt the International Regime by 2010.

21. The **Director of the UNEP GEF division** then briefed the Bureau on the possibility of GEF funding for capacity-building for access and benefit-sharing. She indicated that under GEF-4 the scope for funding from GEF for access and benefit-sharing was limited. But the decisions taken at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties had opened up this possibility. She proposed a programmatic approach to access and benefit-sharing. Three regional initiatives on capacity-building had been delayed due to the introduction of RAF. On the first project involving six African countries, GEF comments on the proposal had been received and UNEP was working on this. On the project involving Asia, the revised proposal was due to be sent back to GEF next week. The status of the proposals for Latin America and India was similar. The project for Brazil had slipped from GEF-3 to GEF-4. A revised proposal from Brazil was awaited. The Swiss funding that had already been pledged for capacity building would be considered as co financing for the project on Africa.

22. In response to a query as to whether there was enough funding available in GEF to finance these projects on capacity-building for access and benefit-sharing and when the projects would start, **UNEP** clarified that there was sufficient funding from GEF for the June workshops. After June the situation was still not clear. Funding was expected to become available towards the end of the year. If this happened then UNEP would try to design some proposals. Alternatively then there was GEF-5. **The President** recalled that the representatives of Cook Islands, Haiti, Malawi and Serbia were to act as Bureau focal points on the issue of regional capacity-building workshops on access and benefit-sharing. If therefore there were additional suggestions, these should be brought to his attention. In response to a query on the scope to include capacity building for access and benefit-sharing in the GEF-5 replenishment process, **UNEP** clarified that an independent board was reviewing priorities for GEF-5. STAP was hosted by UNEP and if necessary STAP would fill any gaps in the reflections of the Board on this issue. It was hoped that therefore access and benefit-sharing would have a higher priority in GEF-5. It was pointed out that the Conference of the Parties to the Convention had done considerable work in designing a framework for capacity building on access and benefit-sharing, for example, through the adoption of the Bonn Guidelines. Now the assistance of GEF was required.

23. The Co-Chairs of the Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing then gave a briefing on intersessional activities.

24. **Fernando Casas** outlined the Co-Chairs' activities since the last Bureau meeting. Reporting on the Third ABS Capacity Development Workshop for Africa (24-28 November 2008, Antsiranana, Madagascar).

25. **Timothy Hodges** conveyed his overall impression that the region is making inroads both domestically and regionally, as well as in the context of further preparations for International Regime negotiations. A workshop on communication on access and benefit-sharing would be organized in Nairobi in March 2009 was also noted. This issue was relevant for all regions. He also referred to a meeting he had attended with the participation of South Africa and Namibia on Hoodia, which

illustrated that cross border arrangements had the potential to work to the benefit of all involved. While in Tokyo for the expert meeting on compliance, the Co-Chairs also attended a UNU workshop with several stakeholders and had met informally with the Government of Japan, including MITI and MOFA. Further, during the expert group meeting in Namibia, the Co-Chairs held informal meetings with the Namibian officials, who indicated a willingness to continue to play a leading role in the region on access and benefit-sharing. He also expressed the Co-Chairs' appreciation to Namibia and Japan for not only being excellent hosts and co-chairs for the two expert group meetings respectively, but also having acted as facilitators to ensure useful outcomes. Prior to the seventh meeting of the Working Group, in early March, the Co-Chairs would hold a "retreat" in Montreal followed by consultations with the Secretariat. Casting beyond the seventh meeting of the Working Group, long-awaited meetings with Australia and New Zealand were planned. He indicated that the Co-Chairs also wished to hold meetings with the small island developing States and GRULAC.

26. **Fernando Casas** emphasized that the advice provided by the experts at the Namibia and Tokyo expert meetings were very valuable and would constitute key inputs to the seventh meeting of the Working Group and subsequent Working Group meetings. On 31 March and 1 April in Paris, the Co-Chairs would hold open-ended consultations for all interested delegations, as well as bilateral consultations with individual countries and representatives from regions. A Rapporteur would need to be identified for the Paris meeting. With regard to the organization of work, he thanked the Secretariat for actively exploring arrangements with UNESCO for the seventh meeting of the Working Group. As a result there now appeared to be sufficient flexibility in terms of availability of rooms and other logistical matters. There would be presentations during the seventh meeting of the Working Group on the studies that had been commissioned by the Secretariat in accordance with decision IX/12. There would also be a presentation on economic rent and on the FAO International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.

27. **Timothy Hodges** then referred to the expert group meeting on traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources that was to be held in India, in June. The Co Chairs planned to participate as observers in the meeting. They were also looking forward to the sixth meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions of the Convention, to be held in November 2009, noting the important charge that Working Group is to play on matters related to access and benefit-sharing. He thanked UNEP for its support to the Co-Chairs and stressed the link between capacity building and successful negotiation of the ABS regime. In Nairobi, the Co-Chairs will meet with the ED and UNEP ABS staff. They were also to have meetings with Ministers and some delegations and would seek to raise the profile of ABS issues during the Ministerial dinner, to be held in the margins of the UNEP Governing Council. The Co-Chairs were increasingly aware of the strongly held sentiment among many Parties that the success of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties was dependent on the successful outcome of the negotiations on access and benefit-sharing.

28. With respect to the role of the Bureau, **Timothy Hodges** suggested that a visit by one or two Bureau members, not just those from the given region, to regional meetings prior to Working Group meetings could serve to provide a common message. The President agreed that the Presidency could visit all regional meetings accompanied by one or two Bureau members to send a common message. The representative of **Sweden** stated that the European Union would seek clarifications on some of the pre-session documents for the WGABS-7. There would be a letter from the EU to the Secretariat. The sooner the clarifications could be provided, the better. The EU would like new compilations more consistent with decision IX/12.

29. **Fernando Casas** stated that the outcome of seventh meeting of the Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing would need to include scope and objectives. There was no other time to return to this issue. The Co-Chairs would like to definitively finish these two issues in Paris and welcomed all contributions to that end. **Timothy Hodges** also emphasized that the Co-Chairs wished to avoid protracted discussions on process at the outset of the meeting. This should be sorted out through informal consultations. The **President** concurred that procedural discussions at the meeting should be avoided.

27. **Timothy Hodges** stated that the Co-Chairs were contemplating preparation of a scenario or explanatory note to build a common understanding of workflow and objectives of the meeting. This would have no status and could be circulated through a notification from the Secretariat. This had worked on earlier occasions. **Fernando Casas** indicated that the Co-Chairs would use all relevant

tools, including contact groups at the seventh meeting of the Working Group. This would be discussed during the informal consultations so that everyone would know what to expect.

30. The **President** summarized the discussions by stating that it was clear that a full fledged Bureau meeting would be necessary in Paris on 30 March before the regional consultations. A draft would be prepared by the Presidency, the Co-Chairs and the Secretariat outlining key messages that Bureau members could convey to the regional meetings. The Co-Chairs would provide a briefing on the state of play before the regional meetings, with an outline of their intended approach to deal with process issues. Finally, he proposed that the Bureau designate Mr. Damaso Luna of Mexico as Rapporteur for the WGABS-7. The representative of **Mexico** was unanimously nominated by the Bureau.

**ITEM 8 REVISION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN: STATUS UPDATE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DRAFT TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES AT ITS TENTH MEETING AND PREPARATIONS REGARDING THE ORGANIZATION OF AN “EMINENT PERSONS WORKSHOP”**

31. The **President** indicated that the EMG would have informal consultations on this issue the following day. A series of events were being planned to enable a broad range of stakeholders to brainstorm and be consulted on the post 2010 targets, to enhance broad based ownership and build up momentum. An Eminent Persons Workshop was being planned in March, in Bonn. Consultations had been carried out with Norway to use the Trondheim meeting as a wrap-up meeting even though has no explicit mandate. There was a need to bring everything together. The Trondheim Conference could pass a message to the UNEP Global Ministerial Environment Forum. WGRI and SBSTTA were being planned for mid-2010. This would all feed into the special meeting of the United Nations General Assembly the latter half of 2010.

32. The representative of **Japan** stated that the post-2010 targets were linked to the success of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. These needed to be action-oriented, with differentiated targets for different sectors. He expressed appreciation for the workshop being organized by UNEP on the post-2010 targets.

33. On the Eminent Persons Workshop, the **President** indicated that it would be useful if a representative of the Bureau could attend. Initially it had seemed that all Bureau members could attend, but having received thirty eight confirmations this might not be feasible.

**ITEM 9 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

34. Under this item, the issue of the letter to the Bureau from the NGO ETC Group (Action Group on Erosion Technology and Concentration) regarding the alleged breach of CBD decisions on Ocean fertilization was taken up. The President requested the representative of **Malawi** to chair the discussions under this agenda item. This begged the question as to where the Bureau stood on this matter.

35. The **President** informed the Bureau that the German Minister of Environment had strongly opposed the ocean fertilization experiment and felt that ocean fertilization was not the solution to climate change. He had therefore written to the Minister dealing with Science. The project was scientific in nature. It was not large scale but it was conducted outside coastal water. There had been a detailed discussion in the German Government as well as in the German Parliament. The COP decision, particularly the requirement that such experiments be carried out in coastal waters, had been questioned since the conduct of such an experiment in coastal waters, where there was already a high input of iron in any event, did not serve any purpose. Therefore the project was submitted for peer reviews by different scientific institutions, which included an NGO known to be critical of such experiments. They, however, gave a positive assessment and cleared the experiment. Therefore, the Minister of Science went ahead with the project in spite of opposition from the Minister of Environment. One positive outcome was the recognition from the Government that ocean fertilization was not the solution to climate change, but experiments such as the one under reference would serve to generate scientific evidence on the link between algae and iron etc.

36. Following this background explanation, the representative of Germany left the room to allow Bureau members to discuss the course of action to be decided by the other Bureau members on how to react to the ETC letter.

37. The **Executive Secretary** clarified that the issue of implementation of COP decisions was not addressed in the rules of procedure. The responsibility to implement COP decision lay with the Parties at the national level. The International Maritime Organization (IMO) had also had a technical meeting and come up with some recommendations on risk assessment. Bureau members felt that there was a need to respond formally to the NGO.

38. Summing up the discussions, the Chair (Malawi) noted that it was up to Germany to respond to the ETC letter. It was agreed that a letter will be sent by Malawi on behalf of the Bureau to Germany and India conveying the concerns expressed of the Bureau. All parties would be notified of this action through the Secretariat website.

39. The **President** then joined the meeting invited the representative of **Japan** to brief the Bureau on preparations for the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The latter indicated that the Japanese government had organized broad based consultations nationally with a range of stakeholders and had come up with a broad concept note for the meeting. Some key points included the need for specific actions to be identified for different stakeholders/sectors, the need to identify a short theme/message for COP-10. He asked Bureau members to consider the content of the note and to provide comments. The concept paper would be further fine tuned at the next meeting of the Bureau. Japan would like to obtain the support of the Bureau for the theme presented for COP-10.

#### **ITEM 10 CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

40. It was confirmed that the next meeting of the Bureau will be held in Paris at the headquarters of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. on 30 March 2009.

41. The meeting was closed at 8 p.m. on 13 February 2009.

-----