



**CONVENTION ON
BIOLOGICAL
DIVERSITY**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/6/20
27 May 2002

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL
DIVERSITY**

Sixth meeting
The Hague, 7-19 April 2002

**REPORT OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY**

CONTENTS

<i>Item</i>	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION.....	4
I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS	11
1. OPENING OF THE MEETING.....	11
1.1. Welcome address by Mr. Laurens Jan Brinkhorst, Minister of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries of the Netherlands.....	11
1.2. Opening of the meeting and statement by Mr. Joseph Kamotho, President of the Conference of the Parties at its fifth meeting.....	11
1.3. Opening statement by Ms. Geke Faber, President of the Conference of the Parties at its sixth meeting	11
1.4. Statement by Mr. Willem Deetman, Mayor of The Hague	12
1.5. Opening statement by Mr. Klaus Töpfer, Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).....	12
1.6. Opening statement by Hamdallah Zedan, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity.....	12
2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS	14
	/...

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies

3.	ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	15
4.	ORGANIZATION OF WORK.....	17
5.	REPORT ON THE CREDENTIALS OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES	18
6.	PENDING ISSUES.....	18
7.	DATE AND VENUE OF, AND PREPARATIONS FOR, THE SEVENTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES	18
II.	ADOPTION OF REPORTS	19
8.	REPORTS OF THE REGIONAL PREPARATORY MEETINGS	19
9.	REPORTS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE.....	26
10.	REPORT OF THE INTER-SESSIONAL MEETING ON THE STRATEGIC PLAN, NATIONAL REPORTS AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION....	27
11.	REPORT OF THE AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING	27
12.	REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE 8(j) AND RELATED PROVISIONS.....	28
13.	REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE BIOSAFETY PROTOCOL.....	28
14.	REPORT OF THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY	30
15.	REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE CONVENTION AND THE BUDGET FOR THE TRUST FUND OF THE CONVENTION.....	30
III.	REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK.....	30
16.	THEMATIC PROGRAMMES OF WORK—PROGRESS REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION: BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY OF INLAND WATERS; MARINE AND COASTAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY; BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY OF DRY AND SUB-HUMID LANDS; AND AGRICULTURAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY	30
17.	CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES – PROGRESS REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION	34
17.1.	Identification, monitoring, indicators and assessments	34
17.2.	Global Taxonomy Initiative: progress report on implementation.....	35
17.3.	Global Strategy for Plant Conservation	36

17.4.	Article 8(j) and related provisions	38
17.5.	Liability and redress	39
17.6.	Ecosystem approach, sustainable use and incentive measures.....	41
18.	MECHANISMS FOR IMPLEMENTATION	43
18.1.	Financial resources and mechanism (Article 20 and 21).....	43
18.2.	Scientific and technical cooperation and the clearing-house mechanism (Article 18, paragraph 3).....	45
18.3.	Education and public awareness (Article 13).....	46
19.	COOPERATION	48
19.1.	Cooperation with other conventions and international organizations and initiatives	48
19.2.	Contribution to the ten-year review of the implementation of Agenda 21 (“Rio+10”)	50
20.	BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR THE BIENNIUM 2003-2004	52
IV.	PRIORITY ISSUES	53
21.	FOREST BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY	53
22.	ALIEN SPECIES THAT THREATEN ECOSYSTEMS, HABITATS OR SPECIES	56
23.	ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING AS RELATED TO GENETIC RESOURCES	63
24.	STRATEGIC PLAN, NATIONAL REPORTING AND OPERATIONS OF THE CONVENTION.....	65
V.	FINAL MATTERS	71
25.	OTHER MATTERS.....	71
26.	ADOPTION OF THE REPORT.....	71
27.	CLOSURE OF THE MEETING.....	71
<i>Annexes</i>		
I.	DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AT ITS SIXTH MEETING.....	70
II.	THE HAGUE MINISTERIAL DECLARATION OF THE CONFERENCE OF PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY	339

INTRODUCTION

1. In accordance with rules 3 and 4 of the rules of procedure for meetings of Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and decision V/29 adopted at its fifth meeting, the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity was held at the Netherlands Congress Centre, in The Hague, from 7 to 19 April 2002.

2. All States were invited to participate in the meeting. The following Parties to the Convention attended:

Albania	Cuba
Algeria	Cyprus
Angola	Czech Republic
Antigua and Barbuda	Democratic Republic of the Congo
Argentina	Denmark
Armenia	Djibouti
Australia	Dominica
Austria	Dominican Republic
Azerbaijan	Ecuador
Bahamas	Egypt
Bangladesh	El Salvador
Barbados	Equatorial Guinea
Belarus	Eritrea
Belgium	Estonia
Benin	Ethiopia
Bhutan	European Community
Bolivia	Federated States of Micronesia
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Fiji
Botswana	Finland
Brazil	France
Brunei Darussalam	Gabon
Bulgaria	Gambia
Burkina Faso	Georgia
Burundi	Germany
Cambodia	Ghana
Cameroon	Greece
Canada	Grenada
Cape Verde	Guatemala
Central African Republic	Guinea
Chad	Guinea Bissau
Chile	Guyana
China	Haiti
Colombia	Holy See
Comoros	Honduras
Congo	Hungary
Cook Islands	Iceland
Costa Rica	India
Côte d'Ivoire	Indonesia
Croatia	Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Ireland	Qatar
Israel	Republic of Korea
Italy	Republic of Moldova
Jamaica	Romania
Japan	Russian Federation
Jordan	Rwanda
Kazakhstan	Saint Lucia
Kenya	Samoa
Kiribati	Sao Tome and Principe
Kyrgyzstan	Saudi Arabia
Lao People's Democratic Republic	Senegal
Latvia	Seychelles
Lebanon	Sierra Leone
Lesotho	Singapore
Liberia	Slovak Republic
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Slovenia
Liechtenstein	Solomon Islands
Lithuania	South Africa
Luxembourg	Spain
Malawi	Sri Lanka
Malaysia	Sudan
Maldives	Suriname
Mali	Swaziland
Marshall Islands	Sweden
Mauritania	Switzerland
Mauritius	Syrian Arab Republic
Mexico	Tajikistan
Monaco	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Morocco	Togo
Mozambique	Tonga
Myanmar	Trinidad and Tobago
Namibia	Tunisia
Nepal	Turkey
Netherlands	Turkmenistan
New Zealand	Tuvalu
Nicaragua	Uganda
Niger	Ukraine
Nigeria	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Norway	United Republic of Tanzania
Oman	Uruguay
Pakistan	Uzbekistan
Palau	Venezuela
Panama	Viet Nam
Paraguay	Yemen
Peru	Yugoslavia
Philippines	Zambia
Poland	Zimbabwe.
Portugal	

3. The following States were represented by observers:

/...

Bosnia and Herzegovina
 Brunei Darussalam
 Holy See
 Iraq

Kuwait
 Thailand
 Tuvalu
 United States of America.

4. Observers from the following United Nations bodies, Secretariat units, convention secretariats, specialized agencies and related organizations also attended:

African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Agreement Secretariat (AEWA)
 Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans In the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic area (ACCOBAMS)
 Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas (ASCOBANS)
 Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)
 Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)
 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
 Global Environment Facility (GEF)
 International Finance Corporation - World Bank Group (IFC)
 United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)

United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)
 United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
 United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
 United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
 United Nations Environment Programme, World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP/WCMC)
 United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF)
 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)
 United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)
 United Nations University (UNU)
 World Bank
 World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)
 World Trade Organization (WTO)

5. The following other organizations were represented:

(a) *Intergovernmental organizations:*

Andean Development Corporation
 Comité Permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte Contre la Sécheresse dans le Sahel
 Commonwealth Secretariat
 Council of Europe
 European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization
 European Bank
 European Commission
 European Environment Agency
 European Parliament
 International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO)
 International Union for Protection of New Varieties of Plants
 Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE)

Nordic Gene Bank
 Nordic Investment Bank
 Office International des Epizooties
 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
 Permanent Court of Arbitration
 Ramsar Convention on Wetlands
 Secretaria General de Integración Centroamericano Comisión Centroamericano de Ambiente y Desarrollo
 Secretariat of EU Council of Ministers
 South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)
 Southern African Development Community (SADC)

(b) *Non-governmental organizations:*

Abya Yala Fund for Indigenous Self-Development
 Acción Ecológica
 Action Group on Erosion, Tech and Concentration
 Action Plus
 ACTIONAID
 ADT-TOGO
 Africa Resources Trust
 African Indigenous Women Organization
 AGRICO
 Agricultural University of Norway
 AIDEnvironment
 Alberg
 ALMACIGA
 Altenburg & Wymenga Ecological Consultants
 ALTERRA
 Animal Legislation Consultancy
 ARA
 Arcadis
 Arctic Athabaskan Council
 Arctic People Alert
 ASEED Europe
 Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact
 Asian Regional Center for Biodiversity Conservation
 Asociación Ixacavaa De Desarrollo e Información Indígena
 Asociacion Kunas Unidos por Napguana/Organizacion de Mujeres Kumas
 Association Burundaise pour la Protection des Oiseaux
 Association pour l'épanouissement de la femme Nomade
 AV2 Foundation
 AV-Team
 Biodiversity Convention Office (BCO)
 Bio-Diversity Support Program (BSP)
 BioNET-INTERNATIONAL
 Biotechnology Industry Organization (BIO)
 Biotopic Foundation / Biotopic
 Biowatch South Africa
 BirdLife International
 BirdLife International / Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
 BirdLife/ Vogelbescherming Nederland
 Botanic Gardens Conservation International (BGCI)
 Both Ends
 Buko Agrar Koordination
 Bundeskoordination Studentischer Ökologearbeit
 Bureau & Zo
 CAB International
 CAB International Bioscience
 Carnegie -Stichting (Vredespaleis)
 Censat Agua Viva-FOE
 Center for Environment and Development
 Center for Genetic Resources
 Center for International Environmental Law
 Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
 Centro Austral de Derecho Ambiental
 Centro de Asistencia Legal Popular
 Centro de Derecho Ambiental (Universidad de Chile)
 Centro de Desarrollo Indígena Andino-Amazónico
 Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maíz y Trigo (CIMMYT)
 CIDOB
 Climate Alliance
 CLM
 Cohorscio Cezap Capa Centro Ecologia
 Confederacion De Nacionalidades Indigenas Del Ecuador
 Confederacion Indigena Tayrona
 Congress of Aboriginal Peoples
 Consejo de Coordinacion Nacional Indigena del Salvador
 Consejo de Todas Las Tierras
 Consejo Estatal de Medicos Indigenas Tradicionales de Oaxaca
 Consejo Organizaciones Mayas de Guatemala
 Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)
 Coord. Mapuche de Neuquen
 Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica (COICA)

/...

Corporate Watch
 Defenders of Wildlife
 Deloitte & Touche
 Development Alliance
 DIALOG
 Diversa Corporation
 DIVERSITAS
 DLV
 Dutch Platform Genetechnology
 Duvilla Consulting
 EarthWatch Institute
 Eco-Accord
 Ecological Tourism in Europe (ETE)
 ECONEXUS
 Ecooperation
 Environment Liaison Centre International
 (ELCI)
 Environmental Law Foundation Nigeria
 EUCC
 European Association of Zoos and
 Aquaria
 European Centre for Nature
 Conservation
 European Youth Forest Action (EYFA)
 Federation des Organisations
 Autochtones de Guyane
 Federation of Sask. Indian Nations
 Fern
 Fobomade
 Forest Action Network
 Forest Alliance of British Columbia
 Foundation for Aboriginal and Islander
 Research Action
 Foundation for International
 Environmental Law and Development
 (FIELD)
 Foundation for the Sustainable
 Development of the South American
 Chaco
 Foundation The Court of Eden
 Friends of Bosavi
 Friends of the Earth
 Friends of the Earth International
 Friends of the Environment
 Fundacion Heinrich Boll
 GAIA Foundation
 Gen-ethisches Netzwerk e V.
 Genetic Engineering Network
 Geovision
 German Forum for Environment and
 Development
 German Technical Cooperation (GTZ)
 Global Biodiversity Information Facility
 (GBIF)
 Global Environment Centre
 Global Forest Coalition/E. Labore
 Global Invasive Species Programme
 Global Invasive Species Programme
 (GISP)
 Global Mountain Biodiversity
 Assessment
 Green Dossier
 Greenpeace
 Greenpeace International
 Haribon Foundation
 HATOF Foundation
 HIVOS Magazine
 Holthuijzen BV
 Humanist Institute for Development
 Cooperation
 IAC
 IAMM
 ID-Lelystad
 IMCG
 Indian Confederation of Indigenous and
 Tribal Peoples North-East Zone
 Indigenous Forum
 Indigenous Media Network
 Indigenous Peoples Biodiversity
 Information Network (IBIN)
 Indigenous Peoples Biodiversity
 Information Network Tulalip Tribes of
 Washington
 Indigenous Women's Biodiversity
 Network
 Indigenous World Associations
 Indonesian Biodiversity Foundation
 INNU Nation
 Institut du Développement Durable et
 des Relations Internationales
 Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
 Institute for Biodiversity
 Institute for Ecology and Action -
 Anthropology (INFOE)
 Institute for Global Environmental
 Strategies
 Institute for Global Society Studies
 Instituto Nacional Indigenista
 Instituto Socio-Ambiental

Inter Mountain Peoples Education and Culture in Thailand Association
 Interior Alliance of Indigenous Nations
 Interior Alliance of Indigenous Nations in British Columbia
 Interlake Reserves Tribal Council
 Intermediate Technology Development Group (ITDG)
 International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests
 International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD)
 International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE)
 International Chamber of Commerce
 International Fund for Animal Welfare
 International Institute for Environment & Development (IIED)
 International Marinelife Alliance
 International Mire Conservation Group
 International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI)
 International Research for Maori and Indigenous Education
 International Seed Trade Federation/International Association of Plant Breeders
 International Support Centre for Sustainable Tourism
 International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA)
 Investigen Inc.
 Istituto Agronomico d'Oltremare
 IUCN - The World Conservation Union
 Janun
 Kalpavriksh
 Kenya Institute of Organic Farming
 Kitasoo Nation Band
 Klimaatverbond NL, Municipalities
 Koninklijke Nederlandse Natuurhistorische Vereniging (KNNV)
 Kosuo Oroeo Resource Holders Association
 KWIA
 Lawyer's Environment Action Team (LEAT)
 Le Centre Béninois de Développement Durable (CDBB)
 Legal Rights and Natural Resources Center
 Marine Aquarium Council
 Meridian Institute
 Metis National Council
 Millennium Debate
 Millennium Assessment Secretariat
 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
 Movimiento Indígena Nicareguense
 Museum Naturalis
 National Ecological Centre of Ukraine
 Native Plant Conservation Campaign
 Nature Kenya
 Naturschutzbund Deutschland
 Nederlands Platform Genetechnology
 Nepesthus
 Netherlands Center for Indigenous Peoples (NCIV)
 Netherlands Committee for IUCN - The World Conservation Union (NC-IUCN)
 Netherlands GBIF Node
 Netherlands Institute for the Law of the Sea - Utrecht University
 Novib/ Oxfam Netherlands
 Novib/BothENDS
 NS Travel Group BV
 NTFP Project
 Oasis Inc.
 Office National des Forêts (ONF)
 Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica
 Organization of Indigenous Peoples in Suriname (OIS)
 Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association
 Oro Verde
 Oxfordshire County Council
 Pan-European Coalition of Environmental Citizens Organisations ECO-Forum
 Peguis First Nation
 Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council
 Plant Research International
 Planta Europa
 Plataforma Rural
 Primal Seeds
 Programa Manejo Forestal de la Amazonia Boliviana
 Pronatura Chipas A.C.
 Proprew
 Regional Environmental Center
 Regional Environmental Centre Moldova
 Regrowth

/...

Research Foundation for Science, Technology and Ecology	Trent University
Rif	Tropenbos International
Rigoberta Menchu Foundation	Turtle Island Institute
Rijnlands Lyceum Wassenaar	Unilever Research Vlaardingen
RIOD/BIOSTAN	University of Amsterdam
Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew	University of Bonn
Royal Dutch Society for Nature Conservation	University of Frankfurt
Russian Association of Indigenous People of the North (RAIPON)	University of Goettingen
Saami Council	University of Hannover
Safari Club International Foundation	University of Leiden
Saskatchewan Indian Federated College	University of Oxford
SGS Agro Control	University of Sopron, Department of Environmental Sciences
Slovak Agricultural University	University of Utrecht
Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute	University of Wageningen
Sobrevivencia - Friends of the Earth (Paraguay)	Vereniging Natuurmonumenten
Societa Botanica Italiana	Vereniging voor Bos in Vlaanderen
Sodeygi Prestige	Vereniging voor Zoogdierkunde en - bescherming
Solagral	Viola
Solidarité - Canada - Sahel	Vogelbescherming Nederland
Southeast Asia Regional Institute for Community Education	Walhi/ Indonesian Forum for Environment- Friends of the Earth Indonesia
Spaces for Nature/CBT	WATU Accion Indigena
Staatsbosbeheer	Western Canada Wilderness Committee
Stiching Nederlands Platform Genetechnologie	Wetlands International
Stichting Boom	Wetlands International
Stichting Ecooperation	Wildlife and Environment Society of Malawi
Stichting Tigris	Wildlife Preservation Trust Nigeria
SWAN International	World Endangered Species Protection Association (WESPA)
Swedish Taxonomy Initiative	World Lawyer Association for Environment Protection
T.M.C. Asser Institute	World Rainforest Movement
Taller de Historia Oral Andina	World Resources Institute (WRI)
Tebtebba Foundation	World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)
The Indigenous Plant Network	WRM
The Nature Conservancy	Xminy Solidarityfunds
The Sunshine Project	Yale University
There's More to Forestry	York University
Third World Network	Zimbabwe Trust
Traditional Indigenous Healers	
TRAGSA	

I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

1.1. Welcome address by Mr. Laurens Jan Brinkhorst, Minister of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries of the Netherlands

6. At commencement of the opening ceremony, held on 7 April 2002, Mr. Laurens Jan Brinkhorst, Minister of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries of the Netherlands, welcomed all participants on behalf of the Government of the Netherlands, and stressed that it was the policy of his Government to contribute as much as possible to the realization of the goal of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Noting that the upcoming World Summit on Sustainable Development had the important task of revitalizing the drive for sustainable development, he said that agreements and policies had to be followed up by deeds. The world community had to commit itself to specific initiatives with clear targets, timetables, implementation mechanisms, predictable funding and technology transfer. The conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity represented an essential contribution to future sustainable development. Thus, broad cooperation was required among all involved, and, in that respect, he called for universal membership of the Convention. Considering the future, he stated that investing in raising awareness with young people was very important.

1.2. Opening of the meeting and statement by Mr. Joseph Kamotho, President of the Conference of the Parties at its fifth meeting

7. The meeting was then opened by Mr. Joseph Kamotho, Minister for Environment and Natural Resources of Kenya and President of the Conference of the Parties at its fifth meeting.

8. Mr. Kamotho said that it had been a great honour and privilege for Kenya to have guided the work of the Convention over the past two years, during which considerable progress had been made on a number of issues, including the development of a Strategic Plan for the Convention, access and benefit-sharing, which was of great concern to the vast majority of developing country Parties, and sustainable use of biodiversity. The Convention had considerably advanced the participatory approach with stakeholders, especially the local communities, and further progress had been achieved in refining the instruments to protect, maintain and promote traditional knowledge, innovations and practices, and to ensure recognition of indigenous people's organizations as true partners in attaining the objectives of the Convention. In an effort to maintain momentum with respect to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the Bureau had rendered all possible support to the work of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (ICCP) at its two sessions. He expressed his gratitude to all Parties and to the Executive Secretary for the support provided over the last two years and declared his Government's intention to work constructively for the success of the current meeting.

1.3. Opening statement by the Ms. Geke Faber, President of the Conference of the Parties at its sixth meeting

9. Upon her election as President of the Conference of the Parties at its sixth meeting (see para. 15 below), Ms. Geke Faber, State Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries of the Netherlands, said that the Conference of the Parties must send a crystal clear signal to the World Summit on Sustainable Development that conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity were essential for achieving sustainable development. It was necessary to move from policy development and dialogue to action, and there had to be a shift in emphasis from the conservation of biodiversity to its

/...

sustainable use. The Conference would have to discuss and agree on draft guidelines on access to and benefit-sharing of genetic resources, since an agreement on that subject was crucial to the process of sustainable development. Another important theme was forests, because they were rich in biodiversity and provided a wide range of services and products to many groups of people. Cooperation between stakeholders, institutions, countries and regions was vital in order to trigger a constructive debate, as they were and essential factor in the implementation process. Lastly, the Strategic Plan had to lay down clear and verifiable targets for the years to come and outline ways of organizing work and monitoring the implementation of decisions taken within the framework of the Convention.

1.4. Statement by Mr. Willem Deetman, Mayor of The Hague

10. Speaking at the opening session of the meeting, Mr. Willem Deetman, Mayor of The Hague, welcomed all participants to The Hague, which he said was proud to play host to such an important meeting. He stressed the cultural and religious diversity of the city, and its role as host to an increasing number of judicial institutions and international organizations, as well as international conferences. The city was constantly striving to provide the best possible facilities to the international organizations and their community. In conclusion, he invited participants to take time to enjoy the city and wished them success in their deliberations.

1.5. Opening statement by Mr. Klaus Töpfer, Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

11. Also speaking at the opening session of the meeting, Mr. Klaus Töpfer, Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), said that the forthcoming World Summit on Sustainable Development should be a summit for partnership, concrete action, and accountability. It should commit itself to eradicating poverty, changing unsustainable consumption and production patterns, removing perverse subsidies, reducing the ecological footprints of developed countries and ensuring the fair and equitable distribution of the benefits of globalization. He urged more countries to ratify the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and stressed that it was imperative to replenish the Global Environment Facility (GEF). UNEP fully supported close cooperation between the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Forum on Forests, particularly with regard to forest biological diversity. Similarly deforestation was high on the list of UNEP's priorities. Given that it was the International Year of the Mountains, it was relevant to underline the biodiversity expertise of the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre and interrelationship of mountains with water resources and biodiversity. UNEP was fully committed to assisting developing countries with regard to access to genetic resources and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from their use. The Cancun meeting of the Like-Minded Group of Megadiverse Countries had provided a major stimulus to addressing the issue. The joint case-studies carried out by UNEP and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) illustrated the lessons learned from the use of intellectual property rights in the sharing of benefits. Lastly he hoped that the Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue to be held in the course of the meeting would enrich and strengthen deliberations on those important subjects.

1.6. Opening statement by Hamdallah Zedan, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity

12. At the opening session of the meeting, Mr. Hamdallah Zedan, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, said that the loss of biological diversity was intimately linked to economic conditions and problems of social injustice. Although much had been achieved under the Convention over the relatively brief time in which it had been in force, biodiversity continued to be lost. Most of the challenges faced in stemming that loss came from powerful external forces such as

/...

inappropriate government policies and incentives relating to trade and agriculture; lack of intersectoral coordination and cooperation; a poorly articulated role for biodiversity in defining national and international development and in poverty alleviation; piecemeal and fragmented decision-making; and failure of national Governments to coordinate their positions at the national and international levels. While awareness of those issues had led to increased efforts to halt the loss, they were being hampered by institutional weaknesses and the lack of effective governance at national and international level. The time had come to move from policy development to action on the ground and to the implementation of agreed policies and work programmes. That step required not only political will, but also a greater transfer of financial resources and technologies to the developing countries and countries with economies in transition. A strong message should be sent to the World Summit on Sustainable Development that global environmental problems were interlinked and that the objectives of the Convention were vital to achieving sustainable development and poverty alleviation. The message should likewise recognize that the Convention was an effective international instrument that could strengthen efforts being undertaken through the numerous regional and international biodiversity-related agreements and programmes.

13. At the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 9 April 2002, Mr. Zedan made an introductory statement, in which he thanked the Government of the Netherlands for hosting the meeting. He also expressed his gratitude to Australia, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, New Zealand, Sweden and the United Kingdom, who had provided financial support for the participation of developing countries and countries with economies in transition in the current meeting, and to all of the countries that had contributed financially and in kind to activities that had taken place under the Convention since the last meeting of the Conference of the Parties. He thanked expressly the President and the members of the Bureau of the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the Chairs and Bureau members of subsidiary bodies and the various other groups, as well as Canada, host of the Secretariat, which had renewed its pledge of \$2 million dollars in financial support through the year 2004.

14. Briefly introducing the main items on the agenda before the meeting, he said that, with regard to priority issues, the Strategic Plan and the proposed multi-year programme of work would help focus the Convention by setting priorities for its activities. Progress had been made on access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing, and an expanded programme of work on forest biodiversity, as well as interim guidelines on alien invasive species were being presented for consideration and adoption. Of the thematic issues on the agenda, only agricultural biological diversity had been the subject of substantive discussion and recommendations by SBSTTA since the last meeting of the Conference of the Parties. In relation to cross-cutting issues, the meeting had before it extensive recommendations from the second meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions; from SBSTTA on a Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, on options for pilot scientific assessment projects, on guidelines for incorporating biodiversity-related issues into legislation and/or processes of strategic environmental assessment, and on incentive measures; and from a workshop held in Paris in June 2001 on liability and redress. With respect to mechanisms for implementation, the Conference of the Parties would be considering the results of the second review of the financial mechanism, as well as recommendations of the Consultative Group of Experts on Biodiversity Education and Public Awareness. Cooperation with fellow Rio conventions and organizations within and outside the United Nations system on the wide range of issues covered by the Convention had been and would continue to be fruitful and essential. The significant increase in the proposed budget compared to the current biennium was consistent with the work programme and the workload expected of the Secretariat as a result of the various decisions made by the Conference of the Parties and its subsidiary bodies. The seventy-five meetings organized by the Secretariat since the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties had put a great strain on its human and financial resources but had produced recommendations covering every item on the meeting's extensive agenda.

ITEM 2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Election of the President

15. In accordance with rule 21 of the rules of procedure, at the opening session of the meeting, on 7 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties elected Ms. Geke Faber, State Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries of the Netherlands as President of its sixth meeting.

16. As agreed at the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/5/23, p. 15, footnote), the members of the Bureau elected at the fifth meeting remained in office until the end of the current meeting. The Bureau of the Conference of the Parties for the meeting thus comprised:

<i>President:</i>	Ms. Geke Faber (Netherlands)
<i>Vice-Presidents:</i>	Mrs. Suzanne Uwimana (Rwanda) Mr. Joseph Kamotho (Kenya) Mr. Hassan Hashim (Malaysia) Ms. Elaine Fisher (Jamaica) Ms. Mitzi Gurgel Valente da Costa (Brazil) Ms. Gordana Beltram (Slovenia) Ms. Ilona Jepsen (Latvia) Mr. Peter Schei (Norway)
<i>Rapporteur:</i>	Mr. Esko Jaakkola (Finland)

Election of ten Vice-Presidents

17. In accordance with rule 21 of the rules of procedure, the Conference of the Parties elected, at the 4th and 5th plenary sessions of the meeting, the following representatives to serve as Vice-Presidents of the Conference of the Parties for a term of office commencing upon the closure of the current meeting and ending at the closure of the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties:

Mr. Soumayila Bance (Burkina Faso)
Mr. Sherif Baha El Din (Egypt)
Mr. Desh Deepak Verma (India)
Mr. Mahfuzul Haque (Bangladesh)
Mr. John Ashe (Antigua and Barbuda)
Mr. Fernando Castañeda (Colombia)
Ms. Gordana Beltram (Slovenia)
Mr. Alexander Shestakov (Russian Federation)
Mr. Max Kitchell (Australia)
Ms. Ines Verleye (Belgium)

Election of the Chair of the ninth and tenth meetings of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice

18. At the 2nd session of the meeting, on 8 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties elected Mr. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana) as Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at its ninth and tenth meetings.

ITEM 3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

19. At the 2nd session of the meeting, on 8 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted the following agenda, on the basis of the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Rev.1):

I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Election of officers.
3. Adoption of the agenda.
4. Organization of work.
5. Report on the credentials of representatives to the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
6. Pending issues.
7. Date and venue of, and preparations for, the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

II. REPORTS

8. Reports of regional meetings.
9. Reports of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.
10. Report of the Inter-Sessional Meeting on the Strategic Plan, National Reports and the Implementation of the Convention.
11. Report of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing.
12. Report of the Open-ended Ad Hoc Inter-Sessional Working Group on the Implementation of Article 8(j) and Related Provisions.
13. Report on the status of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.
14. Report of the Global Environment Facility.
15. Report of the Executive Secretary on the administration of the Convention and the budget for the Trust Fund of the Convention.

III. REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK

16. Thematic programmes of work—progress reports on implementation: biological diversity of inland waters; marine and coastal biological diversity; biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands; and agricultural biological diversity.
17. Cross-cutting issues—progress reports on implementation:

/...

- 17.1. Identification, monitoring, indicators and assessments;
 - 17.2. Global Taxonomy Initiative;
 - 17.3. Global Strategy for Plant Conservation;
 - 17.4. Article 8(j) and related provisions;
 - 17.5. Liability and redress (Article 14, paragraph 2);
 - 17.6. Ecosystem approach; sustainable use; and incentive measures.
18. Mechanisms for implementation:
 - 18.1. Financial resources and mechanism (Articles 20 and 21);
 - 18.2. Scientific and technical cooperation and the clearing-house mechanism (Article 18, paragraph 3);
 - 18.3. Education and public awareness (Article 13).
 19. Cooperation:
 - 19.1. Cooperation with other conventions and international organizations and initiatives;
 - 19.2. Contribution to the ten-year review of the implementation of Agenda 21 ("Rio+10").
 20. Budget for the programme of work for the biennium 2003-2004.

IV. PRIORITY ISSUES

21. Forest biological diversity.
22. Alien species that threaten ecosystems, habitats or species.
23. Access and benefit-sharing as related to genetic resources.
24. Strategic Plan, national reporting and operations of the Convention.

V. FINAL MATTERS

25. Other matters.
26. Adoption of the report.
27. Closure of the meeting.

ITEM 4. ORGANIZATION OF WORK

20. At the 2nd session of the meeting, on 8 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties approved the suggestions for the organization of work of the meeting, as contained in annex II to the revised annotations to the agenda (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.1/Rev.1).

21. Accordingly, the Conference of the Parties established two working groups: Working Group I, under the chairmanship of Mr. Peter Schei, Vice-President from Norway, to consider agenda items 16, 17 (with the exception of agenda item 17.4), 21 and 22, and Working Group II, under the chairmanship of Ms. Elaine Fisher, Vice-President from Jamaica, to consider items 17.4, 18, 19, 23 and 24.

Work of the sessional working groups

22. Working Group I held 14 meetings, from 9 to 19 April 2002. It decided to establish two contact groups: a contact group on aliens species, dealing with agenda item 22, under the chairmanship of Andreas Demeter (Hungary), and a contact group on forest biological diversity, dealing with agenda item 21, under the chairmanship of Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana).

23. Working Group I adopted its report (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.32) at its 14th meeting, on 19 April, 2002. The report of the Working Group has been incorporated into the present report under the appropriate agenda items.

24. Working Group II held 16 meetings, from 9 to 18 April 2002. It decided to establish three contact groups: one on financial resources and mechanism, co-chaired by Ms. Linda Brown (United Kingdom) and Mr. Desh Deepak Verma (India), dealing with agenda item 18.1, a contact group under the co-chairmanship of Mr. Brendan Tobin (Peru) and Mr. Alwin Kopse (Switzerland) to consider the draft Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising Out of Their Utilization, dealing with agenda item 23, and a contact group on the Strategic Plan, co-chaired by Ms. Mary Fosi (Cameroon) and Mr. David Brackett (Canada), dealing with agenda item 24.

25. Working Group II adopted its report (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.31) at its 16th meeting, on 18 April, 2002.

26. At the 4th and 5th plenary sessions of the meeting, on 12 and 18 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties heard interim progress reports by the Chairs of the two working groups.

27. The final reports of the working groups were presented to the Conference of the Parties at the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April.

Ministerial Roundtable Discussion, Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue and Youth Meeting on Biodiversity

28. In conjunction with the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the Government of the Netherlands organized a Ministerial Roundtable Discussion on 17-18 April and a Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue on 18 April 2002, together with a Youth Meeting on Biodiversity from 14 to 18 April 2002. The Ministerial Statement adopted at the Ministerial Roundtable is contained in annex II to the present report, and the outcomes of the Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue and Youth Meeting are appended thereto.

ITEM 5. REPORT ON THE CREDENTIALS OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

29. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, Ms. Ilona Jepsen, Vice-President from Latvia, said that, according to rule 19 of the rules of procedure for meetings of the Conference of the Parties, the Bureau had examined the credentials of 152 representatives attending the meeting. Of those 152 credentials, 127 had been found to be in good order. Twenty-five credentials had been examined and found not to be in good order. A further 30 Parties had not yet submitted their credentials. As had been the practice, the Conference of the Parties might allow these Parties to participate in the meeting on the understanding that they would submit their credentials to the Executive Secretary within 30 days of the closure of the meeting.

30. The Conference of the Parties took note of the report on the credentials of representatives to the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

ITEM 6. PENDING ISSUES

31. Agenda item 8 was taken up at the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 8 April 2002. The item was introduced by Mr. Joseph Kamotho (Kenya), President of the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, who announced that, following consultations with the Parties, no consensus had been reached for the resolution of the pending issues related to the rules of procedure and the financial rules for the administration of the Trust Fund. He noted that, at its second meeting, the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety had noted the lack of agreement might have some implications on the effective operation of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. Consequently, the ICCP had recommended that the Conference of the Parties further consider paragraph 1 of rule 40 of the rules of procedure with a view to reaching agreement.

32. The Conference of the Parties decided to continue informal negotiations and take up the issue again at the end of the meeting, should there appear to be a consensus allowing the Conference of the Parties to adopt the pending rules.

ITEM 7. DATE AND VENUE OF, AND PREPARATIONS FOR, THE SEVENTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

33. Working Group I took up agenda item 7 at its 14th meeting, on 19 April 2002. In considering the item, it had before it notes by the Executive Secretary on preparations for the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/2) and on the role of protected areas within the Convention on Biological Diversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/16), for information purposes.

34. Introducing the item, the Secretariat said that, in decision IV/6, the Conference of the Parties had decided on themes for its subsequent meetings. The principal themes for the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties were protected areas, mountain ecosystems and transfer of technology and technology cooperation. Assistance would be required from Parties to carry out all of the planned preparatory activities, which would take advantage of, *inter alia*, the International Year of Mountains in 2002, and the World Congress on Protected Areas of 2003 to gather information for the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

35. Statements were made by the representatives of Canada and the United States of America.

36. A draft decision on the preparatory activities proposed by the Secretariat was approved for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.26.

37. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.26 as decision VI/31. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present report.

38. At the same session, the Conference of the Parties gratefully accepted the offer of the Government of Malaysia to host its seventh meeting in Kuala Lumpur in the first quarter of 2004 on a date to be specified by the Bureau and communicated to all Parties. The Conference adopted decision VI/32 on the basis of a draft decision that had been circulated under symbol UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.35. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present report.

II. ADOPTION OF REPORTS

ITEM 8. REPORTS OF THE REGIONAL PREPARATORY MEETINGS

39. Agenda item 8 was taken up at the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 8 April 2002. In considering the item, the Conference of the Parties had before it the report of the Second Intergovernmental Conference "Biodiversity in Europe" (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/34), the report of the African regional preparatory meeting for the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/35), the report of the Asian and Pacific regional preparatory meeting for the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/36) and the report of the Latin American and Caribbean regional preparatory meeting for the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/37).

40. The representative of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the African Group, reported on the African regional preparatory meeting, held in Nairobi from 19 to 21 March, which had been attended by 33 African Parties to the Convention. Participants had reviewed key issues on the agenda of the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The report of the meeting identified priority issues for Africa regarding those agenda items, and participants had also raised issues of special concern to the region, for the attention of the Conference of the Parties. In particular, they underlined the need for adequate and predictable financing in order to ensure the effective implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans. In that respect, it was considered that GEF procedures should be further simplified or streamlined to allow for easy access to available resources for the effective implementation of the Convention. The meeting had also stressed the need to encourage the rapid implementation of the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources. Participants had considered that three days was not adequate to discuss all the issues to be addressed at the Conference of the Parties, and had emphasized that in future more time had to be accorded to such preparatory meetings. In addition, participants had underlined the need to provide interpretation services during the African regional group meetings during the current meeting.

41. The representative of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of the Asian and Pacific Group, reported on the Asian and Pacific regional preparatory meeting, held in Bangkok from 18 to 20 March, which had been attended by 20 countries. He said that the special socio-economic and geographical situation of small island countries had to be taken into account in the consideration of the items on the agenda of the Conference of the Parties, particularly with regard to technical and financial cooperation. It was also important to recognize the role of women in preserving biological diversity, and include a reference to this role in the Strategic Plan for the Convention on Biological Diversity. With regard to invasive alien species, participants in the regional meeting had pointed to the lack of baseline data and the need to take into

/...

account existing regional and subregional agreements when formulating measures to deal with invasive alien species under the Convention. They had also noted the complexity of the Global Environment Facility's financing procedure.

42. The representative of Jamaica, speaking on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group, reported on the Latin American and Caribbean regional preparatory meeting, held in Kingston from 18 to 20 March, which was attended by 24 countries. She said that that meeting had given in-depth consideration to the issues of forest biological diversity, alien invasive species, access and benefit-sharing, the Strategic Plan, national regulations and the importance of the Convention, cross-cutting issues, as well as education, communication and public awareness. The Strategic Plan had been examined in great detail. It was considered to be over-ambitious and had failed to give equal emphasis to all three objectives of the Convention. The Bonn Guidelines constituted merely the first step on a long and complex process to secure access and benefit-sharing and the meeting had held that more work was needed on the subject. As for financial resources, it had been noted that it was hard to access funds from the Global Environment Facility and that small island developing States faced particular difficulties when trying to obtain finance.

43. The representative of Hungary, speaking on behalf of the European countries, reported on the Second Intergovernmental Conference "Biodiversity in Europe" held in Budapest from 26 to 28 February and attended by 44 countries. The main message from the Conference was that European countries were committed to working jointly for attaining the common goals of conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. Europe was convinced of the importance of integrating biodiversity issues into sustainable development and, to that end, encouraged the promotion of cooperation between the Convention on Biological Diversity and other multilateral environmental agreements and relevant agencies and organizations within and outside the United Nations system. Important steps in that direction were the development of joint activities with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the strengthening of the role and mandate of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity as a lead agency on forest biological diversity within the Collaborative Partnership on Forests. Implementation of the Convention must be made more efficient through, *inter alia*, the Strategic Plan. The Convention on Biological Diversity should, at its highest level, deliver a strong message for transmission to the World Summit on Sustainable Development emphasizing the fundamental role of biodiversity as a cornerstone for sustainable development and the importance of the full implementation of the Convention.

44. The representative of Spain, speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States, expressed appreciation for the efforts of all who had contributed to the preparation for the current meeting, in particular for the regional and subregional processes, all of which provided an excellent basis for the decisions to be taken at the meeting. Noting that biodiversity loss continued to threaten many ecosystems, he stressed the need for a strong political commitment to stop such loss by 2010 at the global, regional, subregional and national levels and to fully implement the Convention on Biological Diversity. The Convention had to play a central role to enhance cooperation with multilateral environmental agreements and other relevant conventions and processes, securing a focus for a coherent view on the implementation of all biodiversity actions. He emphasized that adequate financial, human and technical resources should be directed to the implementation of the Convention, which should be instrumental in mainstreaming biodiversity in policies and programmes for sustainable development, in particular poverty reduction strategies. The Convention's strategy for the next ten years must focus on the necessary policy changes and actions in favour of biodiversity. That was the best message that the current meeting could send to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. Noting that the European Union believed that success was possible and necessary in all four of the priority areas on the agenda of the current meeting, he reiterated the European Union's commitment to the Convention as one of the most important instruments for achieving sustainable development, and its clear commitment to help provide adequate financial, human and technical resources for the implementation of the Convention.

45. The representative of Mexico, speaking on behalf of the Like-minded Megadiverse Countries (Brazil, China, Costa Rica, Colombia, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Peru, South Africa and Venezuela), drew attention to the Cancun Declaration of Like-minded Megadiverse Countries, adopted by the ministers of environment of those countries on 18 February 2002 (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/33). He enumerated the elements of the Declaration, noting that it defined a common strategy and position for the countries of the group, which together represented nearly 70 per cent of the biodiversity of the planet. The Declaration proposed an international legal regime on access and benefit-sharing that should provide for, *inter alia*, the certification of legal provenance of biological material, prior informed consent and mutually agreed terms for the transfer of genetic material, as requirements for the application for, and granting of, patents, in strict accordance with the conditions of access agreed by the countries of origin. The Group had also defined an agenda for cooperation on *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation in the countries of origin, the respect for, and maintenance of, traditional knowledge, training of human resources, scientific and technical cooperation, exchange of experts, strengthening of institutional research capacities in order to add value to the goods and services provided by biodiversity and the development of biotechnology, the harmonization of laws, information exchange, and efforts to combat the illegal acquisition of biological material.

46. Under this item, the Conference of the Parties also heard statements from representatives of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification; the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals; the Ramsar Convention; the Global Environment Facility; the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora; the United Nations Development Programme; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; the Commission on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture; the World Intellectual Property Organization; the United Nations Forum on Forests; the International Tropical Timber Organization; the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment; the Global Biodiversity Forum; the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity; the NGO Caucus; and Kids for the Forests.

47. Mr. Hama Arba Diallo, Executive Secretary of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), said that that Convention and the Convention on Biological Diversity exhibited a significant convergence of their objectives and showed ample concern with linking the biodiversity and desertification agendas. He said that progress had been made on the joint programme of work on the biodiversity of dry and sub-humid lands. The meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on the Biodiversity of Dry and Sub-humid Lands, held in Montreal in March 2002, had dealt at length with ways to advance the joint work programme, which needed to be given adequate support. Concerning the initiative to promote cooperation and synergies between the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and Convention on Desertification, he pointed to national-level workshops to promote and strengthen horizontal dialogue and consultation at the national level between the focal points of the three conventions and of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. As a first attempt to give substantive content to the initiative, it had been decided to hold a workshop on forests and forest ecosystems, based on the realization that countries would be able to identify activities that were at the interface of the three conventions. It was expected that the results of the workshop would be presented to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. He also stressed the need to send a clear message to the Summit that conventions were ready to address the broader question of how to strengthen cooperation and build partnerships, since that should be a central theme for the achievement of the objectives of all the relevant environmental treaties.

48. Mr. Arnulf Müller-Helmbrecht, Executive Secretary of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), pointing to the continuing close collaboration between the Convention on Migratory Species and the Convention on Biological Diversity, explained that migratory

species were a unique component of biodiversity and played an important role in economic, cultural and social activities. The conservation and sustainable use of such species could make an important contribution to poverty alleviation, and CMS Agreements on species served that end by translating legal commitments into concrete plans of action. In that way, the achievements of CMS also served the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity itself. Since the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the CMS Secretariat had worked to enhance the synergy with the Convention on Biological Diversity and to build on the existing Memorandum of Understanding. The draft joint work programme that had been developed between the two conventions was before the current meeting, and he hoped participants would be able to welcome and endorse it. He stressed that the CMS Secretariat had also played an active role within the UNEP-guided process on cooperation and collaboration between the biodiversity-related conventions. In conclusion, he invited all participants to attend the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CMS, which would also be held in conjunction with the second session of the Meeting of the Parties to the African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Agreement, to be held in Bonn from 18 to 27 September 2002.

49. Mr. Delmar Blasco, Secretary-General of the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, Iran, 1971), described the good progress made in the implementation of the second joint work plan between the Convention on Wetlands, and the Convention on Biological Diversity. He said that the proposal for a third joint work programme that was before the current meeting for adoption covered a wider range of issues than previously, particularly cross-cutting issues; it foresaw the joint development of tools for both conventions, and it covered a four-year period, to allow a more reasonable timeframe for its implementation. Other important areas of collaboration included the involvement in facilitating the review of the implementation of the programme of work in relation to the biodiversity of inland waters, and the work in the area of marine and coastal protected areas. Work had continued on the River Basin Initiative, although funding problems had slowed progress. The Convention on Wetlands, the Convention on Desertification and the Convention on Biological Diversity were closely associated in the implementation of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Ramsar was planning to take on board the guidelines related to impact assessment and those on invasive alien species, which were before the current meeting for adoption, with additional guidance on how to apply them more specifically to wetland ecosystems. It was also hoped that at its meeting in November 2002, the Ramsar Conference of the Parties would adopt a significant body of new guidance in areas of interest to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

50. Mr. Kenneth King, speaking on behalf of Mr. Mohamed T. El-Ashry, Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), said that donors would be meeting in Washington in May to finalize what was expected to be an increased replenishment of the GEF for the financial years 2003 to 2006. In its first decade, GEF had allocated nearly \$1.4 billion in grants for 470 projects dealing with biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. It was proceeding with the capacity-building programme for biosafety. An integral part of the GEF replenishment was a comprehensive assessment of virtually all aspects of the GEF's operation by an independent review team whose recommendations constituted constructive suggestions for further strengthening of the GEF's biodiversity operations. He was pleased to note that GEF collaboration with the Convention Secretariat was strong and growing. As part of its contribution to the World Summit on Sustainable Development, GEF had sponsored a series of high level roundtables, one of which, on forestry, was especially relevant to the objectives of the Convention. GEF looked forward to expanding its partnerships with Governments, international organizations, civil society, the private sector and local communities and hoped to build on the good will and momentum of the World Summit for its second Assembly, to be held in Beijing in October 2002.

51. Mr. Willem Wijnstekers, Secretary-General of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), said that there was substantial scope for closer collaboration between the Convention on Biological Diversity and CITES at several levels and not just that

of secretariats. As CITES did not deal with species conservation within countries, its work was complementary to that of the Convention on Biological Diversity. His organization was constantly working on integrating its activities more closely with those of the Convention on Biological Diversity and he hoped that participants at the meeting would provide guidance on how to achieve more cohesive collaboration in a number of fields. The meeting was important to CITES, since most of the issues to be discussed at it were of relevance to his organization.

52. Mr. Frank Pinto, GEF Executive Coordinator and Deputy Leader, Environmentally Sustainable Development Group, Bureau for Development Policy, United Nations Development Programme, said that in the ten years since the Rio Conference, UNDP had allocated over \$100 million of its core resources to biodiversity activities and had contributed a further \$100 million towards cost-sharing for those activities. UNDP had received approval for over \$430 million in GEF funding for biodiversity projects and had obtained an additional \$600 million in co-financing from other sources, including the private sector. Over the past ten years, UNDP had channelled a total of over \$1 billion to developing countries to underpin their biodiversity conservation efforts. The UNDP/GEF biodiversity portfolio included 285 protected areas covering 23.3 million hectares. UNDP biodiversity support to countries was closely integrated into its core activities and its GEF small grants programme had provided assistance to over 1,300 grassroots projects, which had helped local communities to integrate biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into their own local development activities. Through South-South networking, the biodiversity planning support programme was offering technical support to over 100 countries engaged in preparing national biodiversity strategies and action plans. The Equator Initiative was a new programme which would contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the equatorial belt by identifying and strengthening innovative community partnerships. In partnership with the GEF, UNDP was assisting many countries to undertake national self-assessment of their capacities to protect the global environment. UNDP was also particularly concerned about access and benefit-sharing and the threats posed by alien invasive species

53. The representative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) said that his organization was highly committed to the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity. He then presented a video, produced in collaboration with a number of partners, which illustrated the importance of communication, education and public awareness in safeguarding biodiversity.

54. The representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) spoke of the extensive cooperation between his organization and the Convention on Biological Diversity at the intergovernmental and secretariat level, stressing shared interests in agricultural biological diversity—the root of humanity's basic food, clothing and medication needs. He highlighted the adoption of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture as a major achievement, and touched on other activities carried out by FAO that were related and complementary to the objectives of the Convention, including work on animal genetic resources, pollinators, forest biological diversity, mountain landscapes and responsible fishing, as well as access and benefit-sharing of genetic resources in the context of Farmers' Rights. On the issue of food security in relation to biological diversity, whereas humanity had used between 7,000 and 10,000 thousand species to feed itself throughout history, now only four species accounted for over 50 per cent of food energy resources. More had to be done to increase food security for future generations, and to reach the goal of halving the number of hungry people in the world by 2015.

55. Mr. Fernando Gerbasi, Chair of the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, provided a more in-depth account of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. The binding treaty, adopted by consensus, would go into effect upon ratification by 40 Governments. Cooperation with related conventions and organizations to develop sustainable use of

plant genetic resources was incorporated into the very fibre of the Treaty, which had been developed in harmony with the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The financial strategy for implementation of the Treaty addressed the issue of access and benefit-sharing through both voluntary and compulsory contributions. Once the Treaty came into force, its governing council would meet to decide how payments would be made, and to carry work forward under the Treaty.

56. The representative of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) gave an overview of his organization's work programme on intellectual property rights linked to genetic resources, traditional knowledge and folklore. WIPO had developed guide contractual practices and model intellectual property clauses for contracts on the use of genetic resources. Its work on the protection of traditional knowledge had centred on holding discussion and compiling views on the scope of the issue, developing criteria for including traditional knowledge as searchable prior art, and assisting indigenous communities in protecting their traditional knowledge. WIPO had coordinated with the Convention on Biological Diversity and WTO in its consideration of establishing traditional knowledge databases and a *sui generis* system for the protection of indigenous knowledge, and had examined the issue of legal protection of elements of folklore in conjunction with the Convention and FAO. While the work of WIPO was fully consistent and in harmony with the work of the Convention on Biological Diversity and other conventions and organizations, it dealt exclusively with intellectual property aspects of the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources.

57. The representative of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) said that the outcome of deliberations at the Conference would contribute to efforts to secure the sustainable use of forest biodiversity and might help to attract public support for forests. A recent workshop in Accra had explored areas of synergy between the UNFF and the Convention on Biological Diversity and had identified bases for collaboration and immediate areas of action. She therefore confirmed her organization's support for enhanced cooperation between the UNFF and the Convention on Biological Diversity. At its second session, held the previous month, UNFF had acknowledged that forests were a rich reservoir of biological diversity and that a comprehensive approach was required to their conservation and sustainable use. UNFF was supported by the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), which had two purposes, namely to underpin the work of UNFF and to improve collaboration among the eleven international organizations which were its members. The CPF was an informal mechanism to facilitate the involvement of stakeholders and it was a partnership, not an implementation agency. Nevertheless, its members were contributing to the achievement of goals shared with the Convention on Biological Diversity.

58. The representative of the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) introduced his organization and described its mandate and activities. With 57 member Governments from countries on which 80 per cent of the world's tropical forests were found, the work of ITTO focused mainly on a network of transboundary totally protected forest sites, but took into account the need for sustainable use of forest resources outside the protected network. It was also conducting pilot projects for socially and environmentally acceptable, and financially feasible, forest management initiatives, with the participation of local communities. Other issues addressed by ITTO included forest landscape restoration, mangrove conservation and use, illegal logging and illegal trade. Cooperation with the Convention and all organizations with shared interests was desirable and welcome.

59. The representative of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, Mr. A. N. Zakri, said that the Assessment had been launched a year earlier and was designed, *inter alia*, to meet the assessment needs of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Its Secretariat had been established in Malaysia. Technical support units had been set up in a number of countries. Over the next three years it would be producing reports which would be of assistance to the Convention on Biological Diversity. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment was a product of the Convention on Biological Diversity and was consistent with

the ecosystem approach. The process was moving from design to implementation and its Secretariat was ready to help parties to meet their assessment needs.

60. Mr. Jeff MacNeely, Chair of the sixteenth session of the Global Biodiversity Forum, reported that, from 5 to 7 April 2002, some 150 participants from Government and civil society had met during the Forum to discuss in its workshops three issues that were central to the deliberations of the current meeting: biodiversity plans for business; managing forests for sustainable livelihoods; and the role of communication, education and public awareness in bringing biodiversity into the mainstream of society. He highlighted three of the most important results of the discussions: the need to draw more stakeholders into the Convention process, since the business sector had shown itself to be a significant potential actor in the implementation of the Convention's objectives; the need to ensure that rural poor were able to earn a sustainable living from forest resources, with the provision of further support for capacity-building, appropriate land tenure rights, and consistent policies; and the need to involve decision makers, politicians, judges, law-enforcement officers, the general public, local communities and other stakeholders. The Forum also believed that Governments should start to give more attention to the implementation of Article 6(b) of the Convention, and thereby give more sectors an opportunity to contribute. In addition, since sustainable development was utterly dependent on the three objectives of the Convention, it was necessary to send a strong message about the work of the Convention to the upcoming World Summit on Sustainable Development.

61. The representative of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity said that it was his role to call the attention of the Conference to the fact that indigenous peoples had a fundamental role to play in the conservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of the environment. Indigenous women's participation was vital in that process. His organization was concerned that emphasis was being placed on globalization at the expense of the obligations and spirit of the Rio Summit and that in turn meant that indigenous peoples' rights were being violated and that an unrecoverable loss of languages, knowledge and cultures was occurring. Ten years after the Rio Conference, indigenous peoples were confronting the incursion of industry into their ancestral lands, despite the fact that their collective rights had been recognized in numerous international instruments. As an advisory body, his organization had developed general and specific recommendations on the items before the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

62. A representative of the NGO Caucus urged the Conference to assert the vital importance of biodiversity at the World Summit on Sustainable Development. He supported a Strategic Plan that would give vision and overall guidance for the effective implementation of the Convention. Work under the Convention was not moving fast enough to outpace the loss of biodiversity. It was necessary to take action to stop the conversion of natural forests and the illegal exploitation of forest products. Corporate-led globalization and the economic models imposed by it were a fundamental underlying cause of biodiversity loss. He therefore urged delegates to stand up to that challenge and protect their Convention against the World Trade Organization and the decisions taken at the Doha ministerial meeting. He supported the proposal that access and benefit-sharing should be legally binding and not voluntary and called upon Parties to the Convention to make a clear statement against patents of life. He asked that the Convention take a tough stance on the spread of genetically modified crops and genetic pollution and reassert the precautionary principle with respect to the use of new technologies.

63. Another representative of the NGO Caucus expressed deep concern about the unabated loss of forest diversity. Since forests provided benefits for all, humankind must stop the degradation of forests. He urged the Conference to adopt the work programme on forests recommended by the SBSTTA and to set clear targets for the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity. While he recognized the

need for protected areas, he drew attention to the problems that the establishment of such areas entailed for local communities. It was necessary to deliver on past promises, and targeted action was expected.

64. The representative of Kids for Forests donned a tiger's mask and reminded delegates that animals needed ancient forests if they were to survive. Eighty per cent of ancient forests had been destroyed and 100 species became extinct every day owing to forest loss. She begged delegates to act immediately to prevent further loss of biological diversity.

ITEM 9: REPORTS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

65. Agenda item 9 was taken up at the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 8 April 2002. In considering the item, the Conference of the Parties had before it the reports of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice on the work of its sixth and seventh meetings (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/3 and 4).

66. Mr. Cristián Samper, Chair of the sixth meeting, introduced the report of that meeting (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/3), which had been held in Montreal from 12 to 16 March 2001. He said that annex I to the report contained nine recommendations on the issues addressed at that meeting, which would be considered under the appropriate agenda items during the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The recommendations had also been incorporated into the compilation of draft decisions before the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2). He reported that, in preparing and carrying out its work, the Subsidiary Body had undertaken some changes that could be seen in its new *modus operandi* and in the new focused format of its meetings. It had also developed and strengthened ideas and procedures that were making SBSTTA a forum where the best possible science-based advice could be developed for the Conference of the Parties. It had been agreed that the agenda of the Subsidiary Body would consist of three clusters: the reporting items; a main theme, corresponding to one of the themes for in-depth consideration by the Conference of the Parties; and other substantive issues. In addition, SBSTTA meetings had started to be used as an opportunity to share up-to-date scientific information on biodiversity issues by inviting well known scientists for keynote addresses. In addition, a poster session had been launched to provide specific examples and experiences on the main theme of each SBSTTA meeting. Finally, he described SBSTTA deliberations on the issue of invasive alien species, the decision to launch some pilot assessments to improve information on the status of biological diversity and the effectiveness of measures taken, and the newly developed cooperation with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

67. At the same plenary session, Mr. Jan Plesnik (Czech Republic), Chair of the seventh meeting, introduced the report of that meeting (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/4), which had been held in Montreal from 12 to 16 November 2001. He said that the Subsidiary Body would continue to strengthen cooperation with organizations dealing with the main themes of the Body's meetings and those items being considered by ad hoc technical expert groups. It would also explore ways to enhance the use of the clearing-house mechanism as a true instrument for scientific and technical cooperation, and to ensure scientific and technical input into the Strategic Plan of the Convention. At its seventh meeting, SBSTTA had adopted 13 recommendations, which were annexed to the report of the meeting. The recommendations had likewise been incorporated into the compilation of draft decisions before the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2). Highlighting some of the main points arising from the meeting, he said that the development of elements for an expanded programme of work on forest biodiversity had benefited greatly from the work of the Ad Hoc Technical Working Group on Forest Biodiversity, established by the Conference of the Parties at its fifth meeting. He regarded the development of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation as a milestone in the work of the Convention. With the strategy, SBSTTA, perhaps

/...

for the first time, considered outcome-oriented targets to promote the implementation of the Convention. Finally, the guidelines proposed by SBSTTA for the integration of biodiversity considerations in impact assessment and procedures would, if adopted, contribute to ensuring the best way to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity.

68. The Conference of the Parties took note of the two reports of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, on the understanding that the substantive elements of the reports would be taken up under the corresponding items of the agenda.

ITEM 10. REPORT OF THE INTER-SESSIONAL MEETING ON THE STRATEGIC PLAN, NATIONAL REPORTS AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

69. Agenda item 10 was taken up at the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 8 April 2002. In considering the item, the Conference of the Parties had before it the report of the Inter-Sessional Meeting on the Strategic Plan, National Reports and the Implementation of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5).

70. Mr. Reuben Olembo (Kenya), speaking in his capacity as Chair of the Open-ended Inter-Sessional Meeting, said that the meeting had taken place in Montreal from 19 to 21 November 2001, had advanced the Strategic Plan and had recommended that the Conference of the Parties adopt the elements on issue, mission statement, vision, constraints, operational goals, monitoring and reporting and periodic assessment and review, review of implementation and communication of the plan (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5, annex, recommendation 1). The meeting also requested the Executive Secretary to prepare parameters for as many of the operational goals as possible for submission to the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The operational goals were set out in document UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5/Add.1. Concerning national reports, the meeting had requested the Executive Secretary to make a full assessment of the content of the second set of national reports, and those assessments were before the current meeting as information documents (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/10 and INF/11). The Meeting had also prepared draft elements for a decision on national reports and requested the Executive Secretary to prepare draft formats for three new thematic reports. Those draft formats were contained in a note prepared by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5/Add.5). Further draft recommendations on facilitating the implementation of the Convention were contained in the annex to the report of the meeting.

71. The Conference of the Parties took note of the report of the Open-ended Inter-Sessional Meeting on the understanding that the substantive elements of the reports would be taken up under item 24 of the agenda (Strategic Plan, national reporting and operations of the Convention).

ITEM 11. REPORT OF THE AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING

72. Agenda item 11 was taken up at the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 8 April 2002. In considering the item, the Conference of the Parties had before it the report of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/6).

73. The representative of Germany, speaking on behalf of Ms. Gila Altmann, Co-Chair of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-Sharing, which met in Bonn from 22 to 26 October 2001, reported that the Working Group had successfully adopted the draft Bonn Guidelines on Access and Benefit-Sharing, which were submitted for the consideration of the current Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/6, annex). Those draft guidelines constituted an important step in the achievement

/...

of one of the three main objectives of the Convention, and would assist Parties, governments and other stakeholders when establishing legislative, administrative or policy measures on access and benefit-sharing and/or when negotiating contractual arrangements for access and benefit-sharing. A few issues of the guidelines were still outstanding and might require clarification. The Working Group had also considered important related issues and had identified elements for an action plan on capacity-building. It had requested the Executive Secretary, in consultation with the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties, to convene as soon as possible, and depending on voluntary financial contributions by Parties and other donors, an open-ended expert workshop on capacity-building for access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing, with a view to developing further the draft elements for an action plan on the subject. The Group's recommendation on the role of intellectual property rights in the implementation of access and benefit-sharing arrangements recognized the need for further work and identified a number of issues requiring further information gathering and analysis. Work was to be carried out in collaboration with relevant international organizations, and it was recommended that a number of important questions be transmitted to WIPO for further study and advice.

74. The Conference of the Parties took note of the report of the second meeting of the Working Group, on the understanding that the substantive elements of the report of the Group would be taken up under agenda item 23 (Access and benefit-sharing as related to genetic resources).

ITEM 12. REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE 8(j) AND RELATED PROVISIONS

75. Agenda item 12 was taken up at the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 8 April 2002. In considering the item, the Conference of the Parties had before it the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity on the work of its second meeting (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/7).

76. Mr. Reuben Olembo (Kenya), Chair of the second meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity, introduced the report of the Working Group. He said that the meeting had taken place in Montreal, from 4 to 8 February 2002, with the mandate to review the implementation of the priority tasks of the work programme adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its fifth meeting and to recommend further action. Representatives of indigenous and local communities were numerous and participated fully, attending Bureau meetings as friends of the Chair and as co-chairs, and taking part in plenary and sub-working group discussions. He then outlined the main items considered by the Working Group. The Working Group had formulated recommendations on all of those items for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/7, annex) and their adoption would represent a significant step forward in the implementation of Article 8(j).

77. The Conference of the Parties took note of the report of the second meeting of the Working Group, on the understanding that the substantive elements of the report would be taken up under agenda item 17.4 (Article 8(j) and related provisions).

ITEM 13. REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE BIOSAFETY PROTOCOL

78. Agenda item 13 was taken up at the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 8 April 2002. In considering the item, the Conference of the Parties had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the status of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/8) and the reports of the

Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety on its first and second meetings (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/Add.1 and Add.2).

79. Introducing the item the Chair of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (ICCP), Mr. Philemon Yang (Cameroon), said that, as provided for in its work plan adopted by the Conference of the Parties in its decision V/1, the Committee had held two meetings, in Montpellier, France, in December 2000, and in Nairobi in October 2001. The Committee had made considerable progress in advancing the preparatory work for the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. He then briefly outlined the specific progress made on each of the nine elements in the Committee's work plan, including the recommendations it had formulated for the consideration of the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. In particular, he noted that the Intergovernmental Committee had recommended that, in formulating its guidance to the financial mechanism at the current meeting, the Conference of the Parties should reiterate the need to continue supporting capacity-building to assist recipient countries not only to implement the Protocol after it had entered into force, but also to prepare for entry into force, since some of its requirements would become operational from that moment.

80. He pointed to three issues to which the Conference of the Parties might wish to pay particular attention at the current meeting. First, ICCP had recognized that the lack of agreement on rule 40, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure might have some implications for the work of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. It had therefore urged the Conference of the Parties to further consider the issue, with a view to reaching agreement. Secondly, he stressed that adequate funding for the Secretariat was important to Protocol-related work, and urged all Parties in a position to do so to continue their support and financial contributions to the Secretariat budget related to activities under the Protocol. It was essential to recognize that the Protocol would benefit everyone, Parties and non-Parties alike and that no undue emphasis should be given to recommending that the cost of secretariat services that might be distinct from the services related to the Convention should be borne entirely by Parties to the Protocol. Such an arrangement might not be workable, especially in the early years after entry into force, when the number of Parties to the Protocol would be relatively limited compared to non-Parties. Thirdly, he said that, if the Protocol were not to enter into force in the reasonably near future, it might be necessary to convene a further meeting of the Committee to continue advancing preparatory work for the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol and to retain the momentum of the Protocol process. He invited the Conference of the Parties to consider and endorse the scenarios outlined in the note by the Executive Secretary on the status of the Biosafety Protocol regarding the convening of the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, and the continuation of the work of the ICCP, depending on the speed with which the Protocol entered into force. Finally, he urged all Parties to the Convention that had not yet ratified the Protocol to do so at the earliest opportunity, so as to enable its entry into force as soon as possible.

81. The Conference of the Parties requested Mr. Yang to conduct informal consultations with a view to developing a draft decision under agenda item 12 for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties.

82. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties considered a draft decision on the status of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The draft decision was adopted, as orally amended, as decision VI/1. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present report.

ITEM 14. REPORT OF THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

83. Agenda item 14 was taken up at the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 8 April 2002. In considering the item, the Conference of the Parties had before it the report of the Global Environment Facility (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/9 and Add.1).

84. The report of the Global Environmental Facility was introduced by Mr. Herbert Acquay of the Global Environment Facility Secretariat, who outlined its five main highlights. Between 1 July 1999 and 30 June 2001, GEF had provided \$434 million and leveraged an additional \$1.2 billion from its partners. That had brought the total contribution from the GEF Trust Fund for biodiversity conservation since 1991 to \$1.3 billion and another \$1.3 billion in co-financing. The GEF had taken steps to assist countries in the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biodiversity. In response to growing demand for capacity building to implement global environment conventions the GEF Council had approved the Capacity Development Initiative in May 1999. The independent Second Overall Performance Study of the GEF had been completed in January 2002. Lastly, the report referred to the need for a substantial replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund. GEF support for the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity had been very strong during the past decade.

85. The Conference of the Parties took note of the report of the Council, on the understanding that the information contained therein would be considered when deciding upon the need for further guidance to the financial mechanism under item 18.1 and other items of relevance.

ITEM 15. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE CONVENTION AND THE BUDGET FOR THE TRUST FUND OF THE CONVENTION

86. Agenda item 15 was taken up at the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 8 April 2002. In considering the item, the Conference of the Parties had before it the report of the Executive Secretary on the administration of the Convention and the budget for the Trust Fund of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/10).

87. Introducing his note on the administration of the Convention and the budget for the Trust Fund of the Convention, the Executive Secretary said that the document set out the status of income of the three Trust Funds and showed levels of expenditure. In general the percentage of assessed contributions paid in full or part had steadily increased. Payments were however received in the course of the year, rather than at the beginning and that had led to cash flow difficulties. The report also contained information about personnel matters. He was pleased to say that Canada had renewed its pledge of \$2 million as host country to offset contributions from Parties for the biennium 2003-2004.

88. The Conference of the Parties took note of the report and decided to take up the information contained therein in its consideration of agenda item 20 (Budget for the programme of work for the biennium 2003-2004).

III. REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK

ITEM 16. THEMATIC PROGRAMMES OF WORK—PROGRESS REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION: BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY OF INLAND

/...

**WATERS; MARINE AND COASTAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY;
BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY OF DRY AND SUB-HUMID LANDS; AND
AGRICULTURAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY**

89. Working Group I took up agenda item 16 at its 4th meeting, on 10 April 2002. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it notes by the Executive Secretary on progress in the implementation of the programmes of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems, marine and coastal biological diversity, agricultural biological diversity and the biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/11) and on the impact of the application of genetic use restriction technologies on indigenous and local communities and farmers' rights (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/11/Add.1). Draft decisions covering each thematic area were before the Working Group in the compilation of draft decisions for consideration at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, pp. 7-22).

90. The Working Group also had before it, as information documents, notes by the Executive Secretary on the potential implications of genetic use restriction technologies (GURTs) for the conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biological diversity and the range of agricultural production systems in different countries (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/1/Rev.1), the impact of trade liberalization on the conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biological diversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/2), the report of the informal consultation on the potential impacts of the application of genetic use restriction technologies on indigenous and local communities and on Farmers' Rights (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/8), assessment of the information contained in the second national reports concerning thematic programmes of work under the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/11), a progress report on the second joint work plan (2000-2001) of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands (UNEP/CBD/COP/INF/12), progress on the River Basin Initiative (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/13), the draft third joint work plan (2002-2006) of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Ramsar Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/INF/14), the first report on the State of the World's Animal Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF11), an analysis of integrated marine and coastal area management documents in relation to the Convention's objectives (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/32), the report of the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Dry and Sub-Humid Lands (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/39) and a note on the implementation of the programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/41).

91. Introducing the item, the Secretariat said that in decision V/2, the Conference of the Parties had requested the Executive Secretary to report on progress with the implementation of the programme of work on biological diversity of inland water ecosystems, which had been adopted at its fourth meeting in Bratislava in May 1998. It had also requested the SBSTTA to review, refine and elaborate the programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems at its eighth meeting and to review the final report of the World Commission on Dams released on 16 November 2000 and to report to the Conference of the Parties at its sixth meeting on the introduction of suitable elements of the report of the World Commission in the programme of work on biological diversity of inland water ecosystems.

92. Turning to the subject of marine and coastal biological diversity, he stated that in its decision IV/5, the Conference of the Parties had adopted the programme of work on marine and coastal diversity. An update of progress was provided for each of the five key elements of the programme of work. In decision V/3, the Conference of the Parties had decided to integrate coral reefs into programme element 2 of the programme of work. In response to that decision, SBSTTA had adopted recommendation VI/2, annex II to which contained a specific work plan on coral bleaching and annex I contained proposed draft elements of a work plan to control human-induced causes of physical degradation and destruction of coral reefs.

93. With regard to the biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands, he said that at its fifth meeting, the Conference of the Parties had adopted the programme of work on dryland, Mediterranean, arid, semi-arid, grassland and savannah ecosystems, as contained in decision V/23. The Conference had requested the Executive Secretary to review the programme of work, identify expected outcomes, further activities, potential actors and timeframes, establish a roster of experts, disseminate relevant information and develop joint activities with the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification. In addition, the Conference had requested SBSTTA to review and assess periodically the status and trends of the biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands and make recommendations for the further refinement and prioritization of activities in the programme of work. SBSTTA had also been asked to establish an ad hoc technical expert group with a clearly defined mandate. SBSTTA had considered a progress report on dry and sub-humid lands prepared by the Executive Secretary at its sixth meeting, noted the importance of synergy between the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and had convened the expert group about a month before the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

94. As for the progress report on agricultural biological diversity, at its fifth meeting the Conference of the Parties had adopted the programme of work on agricultural diversity, established the International Initiative for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Pollinators and decided to continue work on genetic use restriction technologies (GURTs) under the programme of work on agrobiodiversity. The programme of work also contained elements on animal genetic resources and referred to the International Undertaking on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, the World Trade Organization and soil biological diversity. At its seventh meeting, SBSTTA had reviewed the programme of work on agrobiodiversity and had prepared a plan of action for the International Initiative. It had further noted with satisfaction the adoption by the FAO Conference of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. In addition, SBSTTA had recommended that the Conference of the Parties adopt a format for the thematic report on agricultural biodiversity. The SBSTTA Bureau had, however, proposed that the format of the thematic report be considered at the seventh rather than at the current meeting. As requested by the Conference of the Parties at its fifth meeting, the Executive Secretary had held an informal consultation in February 2002 to assess the potential impacts of the application of GURTs on local and indigenous communities and on Farmers' Rights.

95. Mr. Cristian Samper, Chair of SBSTTA at its sixth meeting, said that the issues of marine and coastal biodiversity and inland water biodiversity had been treated through progress reports at that meeting. That was part of the restructuring of the work of SBSTTA, where in-depth review would be conducted in a four-year cycle, following guidance from the Conference of the Parties. In the case of coral reefs, however, SBSTTA had carried out a review and introduced an amendment to the work programme.

96. Following the introduction, statements were made by the representatives of Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Burkina Faso, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, Germany, Haiti, India, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia, Nigeria, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela.

97. The representative of Turkey stated for the record that since the report of the World Commission on Dams had no worldwide acceptance, and was being criticized by many countries, it could not be used as a technical and scientific tool for the implementation of the programme of work on biological diversity of inland water ecosystems. Consequently, the Turkish delegation requested that the paragraph referring to the report of the World Commission on Dams in SBSTTA recommendation VI/3, paragraph 3, and in the draft decision on inland waters in the compilation of draft decisions for the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2) be deleted. The Turkish delegation did not

object to the endorsement of the third draft work plan with the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands in general, but expressed a reservation on activity 2 in section B of the plan (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/14), which referred to the report of the World Commission on Dams and also touched upon the issue of water distribution and management and tried to establish principles and guidelines concerning the issue.

98. Statements were also made by the representatives of FAO, UNEP and UNESCO.

99. Statements were also made by BirdLife International (speaking on behalf of Africa Resources Trust, Environment Liaison Centre International and Solidarité Canada Sahel), Civil Society Organizations (CSO), the Etcetera Group, the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, Pueblos Indígenas de Mesoamerica, and the Southern African Forum for Communities and Non-Governmental Organizations.

100. Following the statements, the Chair of the Working Group said that the majority of issues under agenda item had met with support or been the object of revisions that could be incorporated straightforwardly into a draft paper by the Chair, to be presented to the Working Group later in the meeting. However, the potential implications of genetic use restriction technologies (GURTs) had proven more controversial, and would require further work before becoming the subject of a proposal. The Working Group therefore agreed to set up a group of Friends of the Chair on the subject, with a core membership of Argentina, Australia, Colombia, Ethiopia, the European Union, India, Norway, the Philippines, Poland and Uganda.

101. At its 8th meeting, on 12 April 2002, the Working Group considered a conference room paper submitted by the Chair, containing a draft decision on marine and coastal biodiversity. The draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.4.

102. At its 10th meeting on 15 April 2002, the Working Group considered a conference room paper, submitted by the Chair, containing a draft decision on the biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands. The draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.5.

103. The Working Group also considered a conference room paper, submitted by the Chair, containing a draft decision on agricultural biological diversity. The draft decision, as orally amended and subject to the inclusion of a footnote on Farmers' Rights, was approved for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.11. It likewise considered a conference room paper, submitted by the Chair, containing a draft decision on the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. The draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.12.

104. In relation to agricultural biological diversity, the representative of Argentina requested that the report reflect the understanding that the term "Farmer's Rights" should not be interpreted as granting special rights to farmers other than those recognized in the national legal system.

105. In addition, the Working Group considered a conference room paper, submitted by the Chair, containing a draft decision on the biological diversity of inland waters. The draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.9.

106. The representative of Turkey reiterated his delegation's reservation on the references to the report of the World Commission on Dams in the draft decision.

107. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decisions UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.4, UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.5, UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.9,

/...

UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.11, UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.12 as decisions VI/2, VI/3, VI/4, VI/5, and VI/6, respectively. The texts of the decisions are contained in annex I of the present report.

ITEM 17. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES – PROGRESS REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION

17.1. Identification, monitoring, indicators and assessments

108. Working Group I took up item 17.1 at its 5th meeting, on 11 April 2002. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on progress in the implementation of cross-cutting issues (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/12). Two draft decisions under the item were before the Working Group in the compilation of draft decisions for consideration at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, pp. 23-41).

109. The Working Group also had before it, as information documents, a note by the Executive Secretary on assessment of the world's protected areas (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/25) and the report on the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment to the Conference of the Parties on the Convention on Biological Diversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/38).

110. Introducing the item, the Secretariat said that, with regard to environmental impact assessment, the Conference of the Parties had requested the Executive Secretary in decision V/18 to compile case-studies and evaluate existing guidelines, procedures and provisions for environmental impact assessment and had asked SBSTTA to further develop guidelines for incorporating biodiversity-related issues into legislation and/or strategic environmental assessment processes, for consideration by the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. At its seventh meeting, SBSTTA had considered draft guidelines on that subject and had recommended that the Conference of the Parties should consider requesting the Executive Secretary to prepare for consideration by SBSTTA prior to the seventh meeting of the Conference a programme of work in collaboration with relevant organizations.

111. As for monitors and indicators, in decision V/7, the Conference of the Parties had requested the Executive Secretary to develop a set of principles for designing national level monitoring programmes and indicators and a key set of standard questions, as well as a list of available and potential indicators. The Conference of the Parties had further requested SBSTTA to review progress and report to the Conference of the Parties at its sixth meeting. At its seventh meeting, SBSTTA had adopted recommendation VII/11 on designing national-level monitoring programmes and indicators.

112. On the matter of scientific assessments, he explained that, in its decision V/20, the Conference of the Parties had requested SBSTTA to identify and, where necessary, further develop procedures and methods to undertake or participate in scientific assessments and to undertake a limited number of pilot scientific assessments. In recommendation VI/5, SBSTTA had advocated that the Conference of the Parties at its sixth meeting examine the need for financial resources to support the assessment processes under the Convention. At its seventh meeting, SBSTTA had identified options for potential pilot assessment projects. SBSTTA had also proposed methods and procedures for scientific assessment within the framework of the Convention. In paragraph 9 of recommendation VII/2, SBSTTA had requested the Executive Secretary to inform the Conference of the Parties at its sixth meeting on progress with pilot assessments.

113. Mr. Cristian Samper, Chair of SBSTTA at its sixth meeting, said that SBSTTA had taken the view that the overall question of scientific assessment was a fundamental issue and the next major area of concern for SBSTTA. Inputs on that topic would help to reduce uncertainties. The SBSTTA recommendation recognized that it was vital to test a wide range of options for scientific assessment. The

first step was to forge links with other processes and with the clearing-house Mechanism. While work on that area was a big challenge to SBSTTA, substantial progress had already been made towards achieving results.

114. Statements under this item were made by the representatives of Albania, Algeria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Cuba, Ethiopia (speaking on behalf of the African Group), Ghana, Hungary, India, Malaysia, New Zealand, Norway, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia (speaking on behalf of the Central and Eastern European Group), Spain (speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States), Tunisia, Turkey and Yugoslavia.

115. Following the statements, the Working Group agreed that the Chair should prepare a revised text of the draft decision, incorporating the amendments proposed from the floor for the consideration of the Working Group at a subsequent meeting.

116. At its 10th meeting on 15 April 2002, the Working Group considered a conference room paper, submitted by the Chair, containing draft decisions on: (i) the further development of guidelines for incorporating biodiversity-related issues into environmental-impact-assessment legislation or processes and in strategic impact assessment; (ii) the design of national-level monitoring programmes; and (iii) indicators. The draft decisions, as orally amended, were approved for transmission to plenary as draft decisions UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.8 A-C.

117. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decisions UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.8 A-C as decisions VI/7 A, B and C. The text of the decisions is contained in annex I of the present report.

17.2 Global Taxonomy Initiative: progress report on implementation

118. Working Group I took up agenda item 17.2 at its 5th meeting, on 11 April 2002. In considering the item, the Working Group had before its section of the Executive Secretary's progress report on cross-cutting issues (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/12), which contained a report on the activities of the Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI), as well as a more detailed report on the progress and status of the GTI (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/13). A draft decision under the item, including a proposed programme of work for the GTI, was before the Working Group in the compilation of draft decisions for consideration at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, pp. 42-68).

119. Introducing the item, the Secretariat said that the Conference of the Parties had recognized the lack of taxonomic knowledge as a key obstacle in the implementation of the Convention. At its fourth meeting, the Conference of the Parties had endorsed, as initial advice, a set of suggestions for action to develop and implement a Global Taxonomy Initiative. At its fifth meeting, in decision V/9, the Conference of the Parties had established a Coordination Mechanism to assist the Executive Secretary facilitate international cooperation and coordinate activities under the GTI, and had requested the drafting of a work programme for the GTI, as well as a series of short-term activities.

120. Mr. Cristian Samper, Chair of SBSTTA at its sixth meeting, said that the programme of work for the GTI was an important step in the implementation of Article 7 of the Convention on Biological Diversity. He stressed the scientific community's involvement in the GTI, and appealed to the Conference of the Parties to endorse the detailed programme of work. Any adjustments to the programme of work that might be required could be made by SBSTTA once implementation had begun. He also drew the Working Group's attention to two issues that had been raised in SBSTTA meetings but were outside the scope of the Subsidiary Body, namely, the need to finance capacity-building in developing countries and

countries with economies in transition in order to implement GTI at the national level, and funding for the GTI Programme Officer at the Secretariat, since funding derived from voluntary contributions had ceased.

121. Following the introductory statements, statements were made by the representatives of Algeria, Armenia, Australia, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, the Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic (speaking on behalf of the Central and Eastern European Group), the Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador (speaking on behalf of the Central American Group), Ethiopia (on behalf of the African Group), Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia (on behalf of the Asia and Pacific Group), Mauritania, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, the Philippines, Samoa (speaking on behalf of the small island developing States), Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States), Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

122. Statements were made by the representatives of the Council of Europe, the Global Biodiversity Information Facility and UNESCO.

123. A statement was also made by the representative of BioNET INTERNATIONAL.

124. Following the statements, the Working Group agreed that the Chair should prepare a revised text of the draft decision, incorporating the amendments proposed from the floor for the consideration of the Working Group at a subsequent meeting.

125. At its 10th meeting on 15 April 2002, the Working Group considered a conference room paper, submitted by the Chair, containing a draft decision on the Global Taxonomy Initiative. The draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.7.

126. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.7 as decision VI/8. The text of the decision is contained in annex I of the present report.

17.3. Global Strategy for Plant Conservation

127. Working Group I took up agenda item 17.3 at its 7th meeting, on 13 April 2002. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it the Executive Secretary's progress report on cross-cutting issues (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/12) containing a report on the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation and a note by the Executive Secretary comprising a technical review of the targets and an analysis of opportunities for their implementation (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/12/Add.4). A draft decision under the item, supplemented by an annex and an appendix, was before the Working Group in the compilation of draft decisions for consideration at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, pp. 69-80).

128. The Working Group also had before it, as information documents, the report of the meeting of technical experts on the Global Plant Conservation Strategy, held in Gran Canaria, from 11 to 13 February 2002 (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/21 and Add. 1-4) and a brochure on the European Plant Conservation Strategy (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/22).

129. Introducing the item, the Secretariat said that in decision V/10, the Conference of the Parties had decided to consider at its sixth meeting the adoption of a Global Strategy for Plant Conservation designed to halt the unacceptable loss of plant diversity. In preparation for SBSTTA's consideration of the proposed strategy, the Executive Secretary had solicited the view of Parties and liaised with relevant organizations to gather information. The Executive Secretary had also convened two informal

consultations in March and May 2001. In the light of those consultations, SBSTTA had prepared a proposal for the Strategy, including 16 outcome-oriented global targets for 2010. At its seventh meeting, SBSTTA had recommended that the Conference of the Parties consider that proposal for adoption, taking into account the results of inter-sessional work and had requested the Executive Secretary to refine the quantitative elements of the targets in the draft Strategy, providing a scientific and technical rationale in each case and clarifying the terms as necessary and to prepare an analysis of the opportunities for the implementation of the strategy through the thematic and cross-cutting programmes of work of the Convention. To that end, the Executive Secretary had convened a meeting of technical experts on the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation in Gran Canaria, Spain, from 11 to 13 February 2002.

130. Mr. Jan Plesnik (Czech Republic), Chair of SBSTTA at its seventh meeting, said that the proposed Global Plant Conservation Strategy should be regarded as a milestone in the work of the Convention on Biological Diversity. For the first time, the Convention on Biological Diversity had an opportunity to set outcome-oriented targets making the concept of biodiversity more specific for policymakers and providing reference points against which the implementation of the Convention could be assessed. Another reason for adopting the Strategy was that focusing on a particular taxon, or ecological group within the Convention should substantially contribute to a truly integrated ecological approach. The targets had been greatly improved by the Gran Canaria meeting of the technical experts in February and they would help to conserve, manage and use plant resources in a sustainable manner. He therefore called on the Parties to adopt the draft Strategy.

131. Following the introductory statements, statements were made by the representatives of Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Cape Verde, China, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Colombia, Cuba, the Czech Republic, Eritrea, Ethiopia (on behalf of the African Group), Gabon, Ghana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran (on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group), Kenya, Malaysia, Mali, Myanmar, New Zealand, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovenia (on behalf of the Central and Eastern European Group), South Africa, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States), Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Tonga (on behalf of Pacific small island developing States), Turkey, Uganda and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

132. Statements were also made by the Commonwealth Secretariat, the Council of Europe and UNESCO.

133. Statements were also made by Botanic Gardens Conservation International and the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity.

134. The representative of the Botanic Gardens Conservation International said that, in view of the limited funds available to the Convention and given its sincere commitment to the global strategy process, Botanic Gardens Conservation International would offer what resources it could to the Secretariat, including, if appropriate, support for a staff position in the Convention Secretariat for a two-year period.

135. Following the statements, the Working Group agreed that the Chair should prepare a revised text of the draft decision, incorporating the amendments proposed from the floor and the results of informal consultations, for the consideration of the Working Group at a subsequent meeting.

136. At its 8th meeting, on 12 April 2002, the Working Group considered a conference room paper, submitted by the Chair, containing a draft decision on the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation.

137. The draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.3.

/...

138. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.3 as decision VI/9. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present report.

17.4. Article 8(j) and related provisions

139. At its 9th meeting, on 15 April 2002, Working Group II took up its consideration of this item. In its deliberations, the Working Group had before it the report of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Inter-sessional Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity on the work of its second meeting (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/7). A draft decision for consideration under the item was contained in the compilation of draft decisions prepared by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, paras. 81-101).

140. Introducing the item, a representative of the Secretariat said that, in its decision V/16, the Conference of the Parties had extended the mandate of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Inter-sessional Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity to review progress in the implementation of the priority tasks of its programme of work according to reports provided by the Executive Secretary and the Parties to the meeting of the Inter-Sessional Working Group, and requested it to report to the Conference of the Parties at its sixth meeting. At its second meeting, held in Montreal from 4 to 8 February 2002, the Working Group made recommendations on, *inter alia*, the outline of a composite report on the status and trends regarding the knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity; the conduct of cultural, environmental and social impact assessment regarding developments proposed to take place on sacred sites and on lands and waters occupied or used by indigenous and local communities; participatory measures for indigenous and local communities; and assessment of the effectiveness of existing subnational, national and international instruments, particularly intellectual property rights instruments, that might have implications for the protection of the knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities. The Conference of the Parties was invited to consider the recommendations of the Inter-Sessional Working Group.

141. Statements on the item were made by the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil (on behalf of the Latin America and Caribbean Group), Cameroon (on behalf of the African Group), Canada, Chile, the Cook Islands (on behalf of Pacific small island developing countries), Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, India (on behalf of the Asia and Pacific Group), the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico (on behalf of the Like-minded Megadiverse Countries), New Zealand, Nicaragua (on behalf of the Central American Group), Norway, Peru, the Philippines, the Russian Federation (on behalf of the Central and Eastern European Group), Senegal, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States), Switzerland, Turkey, the United Republic of Tanzania, Togo, the United States of America, and Venezuela.

142. Statements were also made by representatives of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO).

143. Statements were also made by the representatives of the Instituto Socioambiental, and the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity.

144. At its 10th meeting, the Working Group continued its deliberations on the item. Statements were made by Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indigenas de la Cuenca Amazonica (COICA), Pueblos Indigenas de Mesoamerica, the South African Forum on Communities and Non-Governmental Organizations (on behalf of Africa Resources Trust, Zimbabwe Trust, Environmental Liaison Centre

International and ETC Group) and the TEBTEBBA Foundation (Indigenous People's International Centre for Policy Research and Education).

145. At its 14th meeting, on 17 April 2002, Working Group II considered a conference room paper prepared by the Chair, containing a draft decision on Article 8 (j) and related provisions. The representative of the Secretariat made an editorial correction to paragraph 16 of the draft, and also introduced a draft proposal for that same paragraph, submitted by Australia, Canada, Jamaica, Malaysia, New Zealand and the United States of America.

146. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Kenya, Mexico, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, the Russian Federation, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States), Switzerland, Turkey, Uruguay and Venezuela.

147. A statement was also made by the representative of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity.

148. The Working Group agreed to convene a group of Friends of the Chair, comprising representatives of Argentina, Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, Kenya, the Russian Federation, Switzerland, Spain and Turkey to discuss outstanding issues in the draft decision.

149. At its 15th meeting, on 17 April 2002, Working Group II considered a revised conference room paper prepared by the Chair and based on the deliberations of the Friends of the Chair and other consultations, containing a draft decision on Article 8(j) and related provisions. The Chair made an editorial correction to the draft.

150. Statements were made by the representatives of Canada, Colombia, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Norway, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States) and the United States of America.

151. Statements were also made by the representatives of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity and of the Alliance for British Columbia (Canada).

152. The draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to plenary as document UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.25.

153. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.25, as orally amended, as decision VI/10. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present report.

17.5. Liability and redress

154. Working Group I took up item 17.5 at its 10th meeting, on 15 April 2002. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on cross-cutting issues (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/12, paras. 52-55), and a note by the Executive Secretary comprising an update of the synthesis report of submissions from Governments and international organizations (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/12/Add.1). A draft decision on liability and redress was before the Working Group in the compilation of draft decisions for consideration at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, pp.102-103).

155. The Working Group also had before it, as an information document, a report of the Workshop on Liability and Redress in the Context of the Convention on Biological Diversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/5).

156. Introducing the topic, the Secretariat said that in its decision IV/10 C, the Conference of the Parties had invited submissions from Parties, Governments and relevant international organizations on national and international measures concerning liability and redress applicable to damage to biological diversity and information on experiences with their implementation, as well as information on access by foreign citizens to national courts in cases of transboundary harm. At the behest of the Conference of the Parties, the Secretariat had prepared a synthesis report based on those submissions for the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. In its decision V/18, the Conference of the Parties had renewed its call for information and requested the Executive Secretary to update the synthesis report for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its sixth meeting.

157. The Conference of the Parties had also decided to consider at its sixth meeting a process for reviewing paragraph 2 of Article 14 of the Convention, including the establishment of an ad hoc technical expert group, taking into account the outcome of the workshop referred to in paragraph 8 of decision V/18 and the consideration of those items within the framework of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

158. The Conference of the Parties had welcomed the offer of the Government of France to organize a Workshop on Liability and Redress, in Paris from 18 to 20 June 2001. The Workshop had suggested that the Executive Secretary collect further information, had recommended that a group of legal and technical experts be convened to assist the Conference of the Parties in its task in pursuance of paragraph 2 of Article 14 and had proposed its terms of reference.

159. At the invitation of the Chair, Ms. Marie-Laure Tanon, Chair of the Workshop on Liability and Redress in the Context of the Convention on Biological Diversity, reported on the findings of the Workshop, which had focused on the assessment of the status of existing national and international law, the scope of paragraph 2 of Article 14, the main situations and activities to be considered in the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity, as well as recommendations to the Conference of the Parties.

160. The participants had noted that only two groups of relevant international conventions had entered into force to date, to wit the conventions of the International Maritime Organization on the maritime transport of oil and two conventions on nuclear energy, neither of which had ever been implemented. Many other instruments had been negotiated in the previous 15 years, but had never come into force. The assessment of the status of national law had been brief owing to a lack of input from States, although the representative of the IUCN had stressed the crucial role of national law in preventing assaults on biodiversity. The Workshop had therefore referred in its recommendation to the need to update documentation on legal instruments.

161. With respect to the scope of paragraph 2 of Article 14, the Workshop had concluded that none of the essential terms had been defined and that the Conference of the Parties had jurisdiction to determine that scope. Furthermore, the participants in the Workshop had underlined the need to identify more clearly, by means of specific examples, situations and activities to be considered within the context of the Convention. Paragraph 2 of Article 14 stressed the international context of such situations, but exchanges of information on that subject were still in their preliminary stages, and more in-depth study was required. If the Conference were to decide to follow up that first evaluation of issues raised by the article in question, it should give priority to an examination of those situations and activities.

162. Following the introductory statements, statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia (on behalf of the African Group), India, Japan, Kenya, Norway, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States), Switzerland and Togo.

163. A statement was also made by Defenders of Wildlife.

164. Following the statements, the Working Group agreed that the Chair should engage in informal consultations to prepare a revised text of the draft decision, incorporating the amendments proposed from the floor for the consideration of the Working Group at a subsequent meeting.

165. At its 11th meeting, on 16 April 2002, the Working Group considered a conference room paper, submitted by the Chair, containing a draft decision on liability and redress. The draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.14.

166. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.14 as decision VI/11. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present report.

17.6. Ecosystem approach, sustainable use and incentive measures

167. Working Group I took up item 17.6 at its 9th meeting, on 15 April 2002. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it the report of the seventh meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/4), the progress report on cross-cutting issues (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/12, paras. 56-66), and notes by the Executive Secretary on the results of the electronic consultation on the draft international guidelines for activities related to sustainable tourism development (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/12/Add.2) and on the synthesis report on case-studies and best practices on incentive measures, including information on perverse incentives (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/12/Add.3). A draft decision on incentive measures was before the Working Group in the compilation of draft decisions for consideration at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, pp. 104-114).

168. The Working Group also had before it, as information documents, a note by the Executive Secretary on the reports of the regional workshops on the sustainable use of biological diversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/24), as well as the reports of those regional workshops, held in Maputo, Hanoi and Salinas (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/24/Add.1-3).

169. Introducing the issue of the ecosystem approach, the Secretariat said that, in its decision V/16, the Conference of the Parties had invited Parties, other Governments and relevant bodies to identify case-studies and organize pilot projects, workshops and consultations aimed at enhancing awareness and sharing experiences. The Executive Secretary had been asked to collect and prepare a synthesis of case-studies, to be reviewed by SBSTTA prior to the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties, at which time SBSTTA would also review the principles and operation guidelines of the ecosystem approach, develop guidelines for implementation of the approach based on the case-studies and lessons learned, and review the incorporation of the ecosystem approach into the programmes of work of the Convention. Work was ongoing but proceeding slowly because only a limited number of case-studies had been submitted. SBSTTA would be considering the ecosystem approach as a substantive issue at its ninth meeting in 2003.

170. With regard to sustainable use, the Secretariat stated that, in decision V/24, the Conference of the Parties had invited organizations to gather, compile and disseminate case-studies on best practices and

/...

lessons learned from the use of biological diversity, and requested the Executive Secretary to develop practical principles and operational guidelines on sustainable use, using a process similar to that used to develop ecosystem-approach principles. The Executive Secretary was furthermore requested to present a progress report to a SBSTTA meeting prior to the sixth Conference of the Parties, and compile case-studies and lessons learned. At its seventh meeting, SBSTTA noted the progress made on the development of practical principles and operational guidance, and encouraged Parties to support the organization of a meeting to synthesize the findings of the three regional workshops convened by the Executive Secretary. SBSTTA was planning to consider sustainable use as a substantive issue at its ninth meeting.

171. On the issue of biological diversity and tourism, the Secretariat said that, in its decision V/25, of the Conference of the Parties had endorsed the work of SBSTTA on interlinkages between biological diversity and tourism, called for the submission of case studies, and requested SBSTTA to transmit its findings through the Secretariat to the Commission on Sustainable Development. In response to a further request by the Conference of the Parties to prepare a proposal for the Convention's contribution to the international work programme on sustainable tourism development under the CSD process, the Executive Secretary convened a workshop to develop draft international guidelines for activities related to sustainable tourism development in vulnerable ecosystems, which it forwarded to the Commission on Sustainable Development at its first substantive session as preparatory committee for the World Summit on Sustainable Development, and submitted to the preparatory process for the World Summit on Ecotourism. The Secretariat also conducted an electronic consultation to gather further reactions to guideline elements from Parties. SBSTTA would consider the draft elements of the guidelines on sustainable tourism development, and the comments gathered through electronic consultation, at a meeting prior to the seventh Conference of the Parties.

172. Under incentive measures, the Secretariat recalled that, in decision V/15, the Conference of the Parties had established a programme of work on incentive measures for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, and requested the Executive Secretary to gather and disseminate information on positive and perverse incentive measures in collaboration with relevant organizations, to promote coordinated action on incentives with other international biodiversity-related organizations, and elaborate proposals for the design and implementation of incentive measures. SBSTTA had considered these proposals at its seventh meeting, along with additional elements developed by a workshop with a number of collaborative organizations, convened by the Executive Secretary. SBSTTA had recommended that the Conference of the Parties, at its sixth meeting, consider and endorse the proposals for design and implementation, and the recommendations for further cooperation on incentive measures. SBSTTA also called upon the Executive Secretary to continue collecting information on perverse incentives and make the information available to the Conference of the Parties at its current meeting.

173. Mr. Jan Plesnik (Czech Republic), Chair of SBSTTA at its seventh meeting, stressed the need for the submission of case-studies on the ecosystem approach and sustainable use, so that both negative and positive stories about stakeholders' experiences could be analysed and learned from to review and make more practicable the principles and operational guidelines being developed. He said that the guidelines for activities related to sustainable tourism development in vulnerable ecosystems could be used to send an important message to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. He also invited Parties to endorse the proposals for the design and implementation of incentive measures following appropriate discussion.

174. Statements under this item were made by Argentina, Australia, Brazil (speaking on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), Burkina Faso (speaking on behalf of the African Group), Cameroon, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Ethiopia (also speaking on behalf of the African Group), India,

Indonesia, Kenya, Malawi, Mexico, Norway, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Spain (speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States) and Switzerland.

175. Statements were also made by representatives of the Southern African Forum on Communities (also speaking on behalf of the African Resources Trust, the Zimbabwe Trust and the Environment Liaison Centre International), the Forest Alliance of British Columbia and Defenders of Wildlife.

176. Following the statements, the Working Group agreed that the Chair, following informal consultations with Parties, should prepare a revised text of the draft decision, incorporating the amendments proposed from the floor for the consideration of the Working Group at a subsequent meeting.

177. At its 11th meeting, on 16 April 2002, the Working Group considered conference room papers, submitted by the Chair, containing draft decisions on incentive measures, sustainable use, biological diversity and tourism, and the ecosystem approach. The draft decisions, as orally amended, were approved for transmission to plenary as draft decisions UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.18, UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.16, UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.17, UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.15, respectively.

178. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decisions UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.15, UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.16, UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.17, as orally amended, and UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.18, as orally amended, as decisions VI/12, VI/13, VI/14 and VI/15. The text of those decisions is contained in annex I to the present report.

ITEM 18. MECHANISMS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

18.1. Financial resources and mechanism (Article 20 and 21)

179. Working Group II took up agenda item 18.1 at its 5th meeting, on 11 April 2002. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it the notes by the Executive Secretary on the progress report on the mechanisms for implementation (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/13); on the executive summary of the report of the independent evaluator for the review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/13/Add.1); on the second overall performance study of the Global Environment Facility (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/9/Add.1); and on additional financial resources (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/14). A number of draft decisions for consideration under the item were contained in the compilation of draft decisions prepared by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, pp. 115-117). The Working Group also had before its information documents on: a compilation of past guidance to the financial mechanism (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/3); the report of the independent evaluator for the review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/4); and the Second Overall Performance Study (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/29).

180. Introducing the item, the representative of the Secretariat said that it comprised three main elements, the first of which was further guidance to the financial mechanism. Pursuant to Article 21, and in accordance with the memorandum of understanding between the Conference of the Parties and the GEF Council, the Conference of the Parties was to communicate its guidance, and any revisions of previous guidance, to GEF. To assist the Conference of the Parties, the Executive Secretary had prepared as an information document a compilation of past guidance to the financial mechanism, by substantive item of the agenda (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/3). The Conference of the Parties was invited to consider whether the guidance needed to be supplemented or adjusted, particularly in line with the discussions held on cross-cutting and thematic issues.

181. Concerning the second element, review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism, in accordance with decision V/12 an independent evaluator had been commissioned to conduct the review, and a description of the review process was contained in the progress report on mechanisms for implementation (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/13), paras. 20-27). The full report of the evaluator (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/4), together with an executive summary (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/13/Add.1) were also available. The letter to the Executive Secretary from the Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of GEF, transmitting the Second Overall Performance Study of the GEF, highlighted some of recommendations of the Performance Study of relevance to the Conference of the Parties. The Conference of the Parties was invited to review the effectiveness of the financial mechanism and make recommendations on how to improve it, based on the conclusions of the independent evaluator.

182. With regard to the third element, additional financial resources, the representative of the Secretariat recalled that the Conference of the Parties had invited GEF to assist the Convention Secretariat, in collaboration with other institutions, to convene a workshop on financing for biodiversity, to share knowledge and experience among funding institutions and to explore the potential of GEF as a funding catalyst. The report of the workshop (CBD-GEF/WS-Financing/2), which was held in Havana on 16-17 June 2002, had been circulated to the Parties. The Secretariat was also preparing to distribute a news supplement on financing for biodiversity. Information on biodiversity-related financing had also been provided through the clearing-house mechanism. In addition, the Executive Secretary had prepared a note on additional financial resources (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/14), in which he reported on the implementation of decision V/11 and put forward a number of recommendations for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties.

183. During the discussion, statements were made by the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil (on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), Burundi, Cameroon (on behalf of the African Group), Canada, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Federated States of Micronesia (on behalf of the Pacific island developing countries), Gabon, Grenada (on behalf of the small island developing States represented at the meeting), Haiti, India (on behalf of the Asia and Pacific Group), Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Mali, Maldives, Mexico (on behalf of the Like-minded Megadiverse Countries), Morocco, Myanmar, Niger, Norway, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States), the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Kingdom, the United Republic of Tanzania, and the United States of America.

184. The representative of GEF also made a statement.

185. A statement was also made by the representative of The Nature Conservancy, speaking on behalf of the Conservation Finance Alliance.

186. At the 11th meeting of Working Group II, on 16 April 2002, the Chair announced the establishment of a contact group on financial resources and mechanism, co-chaired by Ms. Linda Brown (United Kingdom) and Mr. Desh Deepak Verma (India).

187. At the 15th meeting of Working Group II, on 18 April 2002, the Working Group considered a conference room paper, containing a draft decision on additional financial resources, submitted by the co-chairs of the contact group on financial resources and mechanism. Introducing the draft decision, the co-chairs reported on the work of the group and expressed thanks to all participants for their hard work and spirit of cooperation.

188. Statements were made by the representatives of Bangladesh and Canada.

189. The draft decision on additional financial resources, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to plenary as document UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.24.

190. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.24 as decision VI/16. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present report.

191. At the 16th meeting of Working Group II, on 18 April 2002, the Working Group considered a revised conference room paper, containing a draft decision on the financial mechanism under the Convention, submitted by the Co-Chairs of the contact group on financial resources and the financial mechanism. Introducing the draft decision, Co-chair Ms. Linda Brown, speaking also on behalf of Co-chair Mr. Desh Deepak Verma, reported on the deliberations of the group that had led to the draft decision and on the issues therein that the contact group had been unable to resolve. She expressed thanks to all participants for their hard work and spirit of cooperation.

192. Statements were made by the representatives of Antigua and Barbuda (also speaking as Chair of the contact group on budget and finance), Armenia, Eritrea, Georgia, Lithuania, Russian Federation (on behalf of the Central and Eastern European Group), Turkmenistan, Ukraine and United Kingdom (speaking on behalf of the Co-chairs of the contact group on financial resources and the financial mechanism).

193. The representative of New Zealand requested that the report of the meeting reflect her increasing unease that the guidance to the financial mechanism was becoming a wish-list, that gave little real guidance. The key priority was to fund the national priorities in the National Biosafety Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), taking into account the level of need. The second priority would be support for key processes that were either included in the Strategic Plan or that would support the implementation of the NBSAP priorities. She requested that the issue be discussed at a future meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

194. The draft decision on the financial mechanism under the Convention was approved, as orally amended and with square brackets, for transmission to plenary as document UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.28.

195. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.28, as orally amended by the Chairs of Working Groups I and II, as decision VI/17. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present report.

18.2. Scientific and technical cooperation and the clearing-house mechanism (Article 18, paragraph 3)

196. Working Group II took up agenda item 18.2 at its 6th meeting, on 11 April 2002. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it the note by the Executive Secretary on the progress report on the mechanisms for implementation (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/13); as well as information documents on the report of the Joint Convention on Biological Diversity/Global Invasive Species Programme Informal Meeting on Formats, Protocols and Standards for Improved Exchange of Biodiversity-related Information (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/18); and the report of the Southern Africa Regional Training Workshop on the Commonwealth Knowledge Network/Clearing-house Mechanism (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/19). A draft decision for consideration under the item was contained in the compilation of draft decisions prepared by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, page 119).

197. Introducing the item, the representative of the Secretariat said that, pursuant to decision V/14 of the Conference of the Parties, the national-level operations of the clearing-house mechanism had been

/...

monitored and reviewed, drawing on information from the second national reports, on the mechanism's operations at the Secretariat, on the mechanism's strategic plan and on recommendations from the informal advisory committee created to provide feedback to the Executive Secretary throughout the clearing-house development process. The information-exchange phase of the clearing-house mechanism had been successfully completed, and the promotion and facilitation of technical and scientific cooperation between countries for the effective implementation of the Convention had been identified as the next step for the clearing-house mechanism. Work to support technical and scientific cooperation had included the examination, in cooperation with the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP), of formats, protocols and standards for improved exchange of biodiversity-related information, in search of ways to enhance the compatibility of disparate databases.

198. Following the introduction, statements were made by the representatives of Algeria, Belgium, Canada, China, Colombia, Gabon, Germany, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Latvia, Norway and Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States).

199. Statements were also made by the representatives of the Asian Regional Centre for Biodiversity Conservation, and the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity.

200. At its 8th meeting, on 12 April 2002, the Working Group considered a conference room paper, submitted by the Chair, containing a draft decision on scientific and technical cooperation and the clearing-house mechanism. Introducing the draft decision, the representative of the Secretariat explained the reasons for the bracketed elements and orally amended that text.

201. During the discussion of the draft decision, statements were made by the representatives of Brazil, Canada, Morocco, Nigeria, Netherlands and Norway.

202. At its 10th meeting, Working Group II took up consideration of a conference room paper containing a draft decision on scientific and technical cooperation and the clearing-house mechanism.

203. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Bolivia, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Italy, Norway, Peru and Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States).

204. Following informal consultations between the representatives of Bolivia, Canada, Colombia and Peru, the draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to plenary as document UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.6.

205. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.6 as decision VI/18. The text of the decision is contained in annex I of the present report.

18.3. Education and public awareness (Article 13)

206. Working Group II took up agenda item 18.3 at its 6th meeting, on 11 April 2002. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it the notes by the Executive Secretary on the progress report on the mechanisms for implementation (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/13) and on implementation of the Global Initiative on Biological Diversity Education and Public Awareness (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/13/Add.2). A draft decision for consideration under the item was contained in the compilation of draft decisions prepared by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, pp. 120-126).

207. Introducing the item, the Secretariat said that the Conference of the Parties, at its fourth meeting, had invited the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to consider launching a global initiative on biological diversity education, training and public awareness, and requested the Executive Secretary to explore the feasibility of such an initiative. Following consultation between the Secretariat and UNESCO, the initiative was proposed as a joint undertaking, which would also involve other relevant international organizations as partners. At its fifth meeting, the Conference of the Parties requested the Secretariat, in cooperation with UNESCO, to convene a consultative working group of experts, including the United Nations Environment Programme, the World Bank, the United Nations Institute for Training and Research, the Commission for Education and Communication of IUCN, the World Wide Fund for Nature, representatives of Parties and other relevant bodies to further develop the initiative and to provide advice and support in its implementation. The Working Group would furthermore take into account priorities developed by the Conference of the Parties for its work programme, as well as priorities identified in the strategic plan of the Convention, when approved. Three meetings of the Consultative Working Group of Experts on Biological Diversity Education and Public Awareness had taken place, and had produced the proposed programme of work for a Global Initiative on Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA), contained in the draft decision being presented for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties.

208. The representative of UNESCO also made an introductory statement. He said that the programme of work for the initiative, in its preliminary phase, had three main objectives: (i) building the necessary platform and creating networks of actors and owners in the area of biodiversity and CEPA; (ii) identifying and collecting the necessary knowledge and expertise; and (iii) building capacity. In relation to the latter point, UNESCO was ready to assist Parties' needs for technical and technological assistance, whereas funding for capacity-building might come from further involvement of the Global Environment Facility in CEPA projects, or from the Convention's own budget. The representative also informed the Conference of the Parties that dialogue had been initiated with UNESCO member States' ministries of education on a number of issues on the Convention on Biological Diversity's agenda, and that UNESCO would be reporting regularly, through the Convention Secretariat, on progress made in integrating biodiversity issues into formal education programmes.

209. Statements were made by the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil (on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), Canada, the Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Denmark, Gabon, Germany, Grenada (on behalf of the small island developing States), Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States), Thailand, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay.

210. A statement was also made by the representative of UNESCO.

211. At its 13th meeting, on 17 April 2002, Working Group II considered a conference room paper, submitted by the Chair, containing a draft decision on education and public awareness (Article 13).

212. Statements were made by the representatives of Canada, China and Norway.

213. A statement was also made by the representative of GEF.

214. The draft decision on education and public awareness (Article 13), as orally amended, was approved for transmission to plenary as document UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.20.

215. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.20, with oral corrections by the Secretariat, as decision VI/19. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present report.

ITEM 19. COOPERATION

19.1. Cooperation with other conventions and international organizations and initiatives

216. Working Group II took up agenda item 19.1 at its 7th meeting, on 12 April 2002. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it the note by the Executive Secretary on cooperation with other bodies and contribution to the 10-year review of progress achieved since the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/15). Also before the meeting was an information paper on the joint work programme of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (2002-2005) (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/15). A draft decision for consideration under the item was contained in the compilation of draft decisions prepared by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, pp. 127-129).

217. Introducing the item, the representative of the Secretariat recalled that, at its first meeting, the Conference of the Parties decided to consider as a standing item on its agenda the relationship of the Convention with the Commission on Sustainable Development and biodiversity-related conventions, other international agreements, institutions and processes of relevance. At its second meeting, in decision II/13, the Conference of the Parties stressed the need to make implementation of the Convention and activities of other international and regional conventions mutually supportive, and the need to avoid unnecessary duplication of activities. The Conference of the Parties had repeatedly recognized the importance of cooperation and synergies at the scientific and technical level and, to that end, the Executive Secretary and the Chair of the SBSTTA participated in a number of processes designed to further the science of biodiversity, such as the International Biodiversity Observation Year, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and the Global Biodiversity Information Facility. Many cooperative activities were also described in the context of the specific areas of work under other items on the agenda of the current meeting.

218. The representative of the Secretariat explained that, to facilitate cooperation with other conventions and international organizations, since the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the Secretariat had entered into a number of memorandums of cooperation with relevant conventions and institutions. In accordance with decision V/19, the Secretariat had also participated in a project on harmonizing reporting requirements of biodiversity-related requirements of biodiversity-related conventions (CITES, CMS, Ramsar and the World Heritage Convention), and had continued to develop joint work programmes to implement a more harmonized system of reporting. The Conference of the Parties had also requested the Executive Secretary to collaborate with, *inter alia*, the CMS Secretariat, to develop a proposal on how migratory species could be integrated into the work programme of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and with the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, with a view to facilitating and supporting the undertaking of a number of pilot scientific assessments for SBSTTA. At its sixth meeting, SBSTTA considered a proposed joint work programme between CMS and the Convention on Biological Diversity. It requested the Executive Secretary in close collaboration with the Secretariat of CMS to further develop the joint work programme. Accordingly, the proposed joint work programme was before the Conference of the Parties for its consideration at the current meeting.

219. The Conference of the Parties also called for strengthened collaboration between the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), on issues such as: coral bleaching; the impact of climate change on forest biodiversity; incentive measures;

/...

and the integration of biodiversity considerations in the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. The UNFCCC Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technical Advice (SBSTA), at its thirteenth session took note of the decisions adopted at the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and their links to the UNFCCC. In response to the request of the Conference of the Parties, SBSTTA, at its sixth meeting, in its recommendation VI/7, noted the interlinkages between biological diversity and climate change, and decided to promote, on the basis of the ecosystem approach, a wider assessment of those inter-linkages. As a first step in that wider assessment, SBSTTA decided to carry out a pilot assessment to prepare scientific advice to integrate biodiversity considerations into the implementation of the Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol and, for that purpose, established, an ad hoc technical expert group in accordance with its *modus operandi*. To that end, an expert group was established and met in November 2001. The Group was expected to finalize its report at its second meeting in May 2002. The report would be considered by a joint Convention on Biological Diversity/UNFCCC workshop. It was expected that SBSTTA would consider a summary for policy makers at its ninth meeting and make recommendations to the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

220. Explaining that the note by the Executive Secretary prepared under this item (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/15) reported on the status of those activities, the representative of the Secretariat said that the Conference of the Parties was invited to endorse the joint work programme with CMS and take note of the activities with UNFCCC. He pointed out that a draft decision on the item was contained in the compilation of draft decisions prepared by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, pp. 127-129).

221. The Chair drew the attention of the Working Group to the last paragraph of section C of the draft decision on agenda item 19.1, as contained on page 129 of the English version of the compilation of draft decisions (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2), and pointed to the need to consider the financial implications of the draft decision in the discussions on the budget and on guidance to the financial mechanism.

222. The Executive Secretary of CMS gave a presentation on the Convention and on the draft work programme with the Convention on Biological Diversity.

223. During the discussion, statements were made by the representatives of Albania (on behalf of the Central and Eastern European Group), Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil (on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), Burundi, Cameroon (on behalf of the African Group), Canada, China, Colombia, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Gabon, Germany, Guinea, India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States), Switzerland, Togo and Turkey.

224. Statements were made by the Secretary-General of CITES and by the representative of the Global Biodiversity Information Facility.

225. Statements were also made by the representatives of Defenders of Wildlife, BirdLife International and the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity.

226. At its 10th meeting, Working Group II took up consideration of a conference room paper containing a draft decision on cooperation with various international organizations, initiatives and other conventions.

227. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Cameroon (on behalf of the African Group), Ethiopia, Netherlands, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States) and Switzerland.

228. At its 11th meeting, on 16 April 2002, the Working Group resumed its consideration of the conference room paper. Statements were made by the representatives of Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Ecuador, Eritrea, European Community, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States) and Turkey.

229. At its 13th meeting, on 17 April 2002, the Working Group considered a revised conference room paper, containing a draft decision on cooperation with various international organizations, initiatives and other conventions, which was introduced by the Chair.

230. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Ethiopia, Mali, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States), Switzerland and Turkey.

231. Statements were also made by the representatives of UNCTAD and of WIPO.

232. The draft decision on cooperation with various international organizations, initiatives and other conventions, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to plenary as document UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.23.

233. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.23, as orally corrected by the Secretariat, as decision VI/20. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present report.

19.2. Contribution to the ten-year review of the implementation of Agenda 21 ("Rio+10")

234. Working Group II took up agenda item 19.2 at its 8th meeting, on 12 April 2002. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it the note by the Executive Secretary on cooperation with other bodies and contribution to the 10-year review of progress achieved since the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/15). A draft decision for consideration under the item was contained in the compilation of draft decisions prepared by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, pp. 130-135).

235. Introducing the item, the representative of the Secretariat said that, pursuant to decision V/27 of the Conference of the Parties, the Executive Secretary had reported to the fifty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly on how the activities of the Convention on Biological Diversity had contributed to the implementation of Agenda 21 (Rio+10), and on its programme for further implementation of Agenda 21. The General Assembly welcomed the report and invited the Executive Secretary to report on its Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 at its 56th meeting. In response to General Assembly resolution 54/218 and decision V/27 of the Conference of the Parties, the Executive Secretary also prepared a report to the Commission on Sustainable Development on progress made in the implementation of the Convention, to be considered by the second meeting of the Commission acting as the Preparatory Committee for the WSSD. In parallel, the Open-ended Inter-Sessional Meeting on the Strategic Plan, National Reports and Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (MSP) considered the role of the Convention in the WSSD, and adopted a recommendation on the issue, contained in the annex to its report (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5). The MSP recommended that the Conference of the Parties develop and adopt a short and focused message for transmission to the WSSD, highlighting

the central role that fulfilling the commitments of the Convention played in the implementation of Agenda 21 commitments on sustainable development.

236. Proposed activities to contribute to the WSSD included: (i) taking note of the report of activities carried out by the Secretariat to contribute to the ten-year review of the implementation of Agenda 21, (ii) requesting the Executive Secretary of the Convention and the President of the bureau of the Conference of the Parties to represent the Conference of the Parties at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD); and (iii) issuing a statement to the WSSD based on the elements contained in the draft decision presented for the Working Group's consideration.

237. Following the introduction, statements were made by the representatives of Bangladesh, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, India, Kenya, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Peru, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States), Switzerland and Thailand.

238. A statement was also made by the representative of OASIS.

239. At its 12th meeting, on 16 April 2002, the Working Group considered a conference room paper containing a draft decision on the contribution to the ten-year review of the implementation of Agenda 21: World Summit on Sustainable Development. The representative of the Secretariat introduced the draft decision and made oral amendments.

240. Following the introduction, statements were made by the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Malaysia, Mali, Netherlands, Peru, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States) and Switzerland.

241. At its 16th meeting, on 18 April 2002, the Working Group considered a revised conference room paper containing a draft decision on the contribution to the ten-year review of the implementation of Agenda 21: World Summit on Sustainable Development.

242. Statements were made by the representatives of Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States) and Switzerland.

243. The Working Group approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary as document UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.30, on the understanding that, once adopted, it would be annexed to the Hague Ministerial Declaration of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

244. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, the Conference of the Parties took up draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.30.

245. The representatives of Brazil, Spain (speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States) and New Zealand proposed minor editorial changes to the chapeau of the Declaration for reasons of clarity.

246. The representatives of Colombia and Liberia, noting that, during the adoption of the draft decision on forest biological diversity (see paras 276-278 below), some representatives had pointed to an inconsistency between that decision and the Ministerial Declaration regarding the issue of time-bound commitments, recalled that those representatives had been informed that they should not re-open issues in an agreed draft. However, in the current case the Chair was allowing proposals for amendment to be made.

247. The Conference of the Parties then adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.30 as decision VI/21, and also took note of the Hague Ministerial Declaration of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.33). The text of decision V/21, which is to be annexed to the Ministerial Declaration, is contained in annex I to the present report, and the text of the Declaration is contained in annex II.

ITEM 20. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR THE BIENNIUM 2003-2004

248. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 8 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties took up its consideration of the item. In considering the item, the Conference of the Parties had before it notes by the Executive Secretary on the proposed budget for the programme budget for the biennium 2003-2004 (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/16 and Corr.1) and on programme and subprogramme activities and resources required (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/16/Add.1).

249. Introducing the proposed budget for the programme of work for the biennium, the Executive Secretary said that the documents before the Conference of the Parties provided details of the budget for each programme. Every recommendation that had been made with respect to work under the Convention had been costed, and it emerged that a substantial increase in the Secretariat's budget would be needed if action were to be taken on all the recommendations. If that was impossible, then priorities would have to be set. The Secretariat could say what the cost of each activity would be. The Secretariat was not prepared to embark on programmes without the requisite funds.

250. Also at the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, the Conference of the Parties decided to set up of a small contact group to be chaired by Mr. John Ashe (Antigua and Barbuda) in order to discuss that complex issue.

251. At the 4th plenary session of the meeting, on 12 April 2002, Mr. Ashe gave an interim report on the deliberations of the contact group on the proposed budget. The contact group had held three meetings, in which the Secretariat presented the report on the administration of the Convention and the budget for the Trust Fund of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/10), the proposed budget for the programme budget for the biennium 2003-2004 (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/16 and Corr.1) and the report on programme and subprogramme activities and resources required (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/16/Add.1), and answered questions by contact group members. Based on this exchange, the contact group had formulated a proposed draft decision, of which it had completed a first reading, and was in the process of setting the proposed new figure for the budget. Contact group members generally felt that the 40 per cent increase proposed in the Executive Secretary's reports was high. Moreover, even with approval of the full increase, some initiatives of the Conference of the Parties might have to be deferred. He cautioned the Conference of the Parties to be aware of cost implications when making decisions involving meetings, subsidiary bodies and new activities, and called for priorities to be set.

252. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.34, as orally corrected by the Secretariat and as amended by Antigua and Barbuda (speaking as the Chair of the Contact Group on budget and finance), New Zealand (speaking as a member of the Bureau of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice), as decision VI/29. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present report.

253. The representative of New Zealand, speaking as a member of the Bureau of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, expressed concern that no funding had been allocated

in the core budget to ensure that Bureau members from developing countries could undertake their mandated tasks without a financial burden being placed on them.

254. The Executive Director of UNEP, stating that there was a need to show a clear commitment to the Convention, announced that UNEP would provide a contribution of \$40,000 to the budget of the Convention to provide funding for the purposes outlined in paragraph 16 of decision VI/27 B on operations of the Convention.

255. The representative of Brazil, expressing a desire not to block the consensus on the decision on the budget, requested the report of the meeting to reflect a formal reservation by the Brazilian Government to the new scale of assessments, with the understanding that the scale of assessment previously applied at the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties was the scale to be applied as regards the Brazilian contribution to the Trust Fund for the Convention. Brazil had always given the highest priority to biological diversity and reiterated its commitment to the activities related to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Concerning approval of the budget for the next biennium, the new scale of assessment of contributions was based on the scale adopted by the United Nations. Brazil could not accept the results of this new arrangement, which meant that many developing countries and countries with economies in transition were paying higher contributions. Recognizing the independence and autonomy by which many conventions and organizations adopt their own scales of assessment, General Assembly resolution 55/5 C, of 23 December 2000, containing a new scale of assessments for contributions to the United Nations, clearly established that such a scale was not to be automatically applied to other bodies. Like many other developing countries, Brazil faced severe financial and budgetary constraints, and any proposal to increase the country's existing international commitments had to be carefully scrutinized. Also noting that, since the issue of the scale of contributions was put to discussion by Parties only that morning, and Brazil had no time to consult competent financial authorities, the Brazilian delegation proposed that the subject be fully analysed and formally decided upon at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties, as an item on the agenda.

256. The representative of Argentina said that her country had participated in the development of the Convention on Biological Diversity since its inception, and had been one of the fifteen major contributors to the general trust fund of the Convention. The recent significant deterioration in the economic situation of her country had forced Argentina to start a process of reconsideration of all contributions to international bodies, including the Convention on Biological Diversity. In that sense, she hoped she could count on the understanding and support of the international community.

257. The representative of the Russian Federation said that his country, which was party to many international conventions, would not be in a position to increase its contributions. He believed that the funding should be on the basis of voluntary contributions.

IV. PRIORITY ISSUES

ITEM 21. FOREST BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

258. Working Group I took up agenda item 21 at its 1st meeting, on 9 April 2002. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it notes by the Executive Secretary on elaboration of elements for an expanded work programme on forest biological diversity – relation to the existing work programme, activities of the United Nations Forum on Forests, and framework for selecting priorities and defining activities (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/17) and on potential priorities for the proposed expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/17/Add.1), as well as summary reports of the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Biodiversity and Climate Change

/...

(UNEP/CBD/COP/6/17/Add.2) and the Accra Workshop on Forests and Biological Diversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/17/Add.3). A draft decision under the item, including proposed elements for an expanded work programme, was before the Working Group in the compilation of draft decisions for consideration at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, pp. 144-162).

259. The Working Group also had before it, as information documents, the report of the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Biodiversity and Climate Change (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/6), the report of the Accra Workshop on Forests and Biological Diversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/7), a note by the Executive Secretary on potential actors, time-frames, performance measures for the implementation of the proposed activities, as well as indicators of progress, for the programme of work on forest biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/9), the report of the expert meeting on harmonization of forest-related definitions for use by various stakeholders (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/26) and submissions from Parties on: (i) potential priorities for the proposed expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity and (ii) potential actors, a suggested timeframe and possible ways and means for the implementation of the activities proposed, as well as indicators of progress in implementation (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/27).

260. Introducing the item, the Secretariat said that, at its fourth meeting, the Conference of the Parties had launched a programme of work on forest biological diversity focused on research, cooperation and the development of technologies necessary for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity of all types of forests. At its fifth meeting, the Conference of the Parties had decided to consider expanding the focus of the work programme from research to practical action. It had established the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on Forest Biological Diversity to provide information that could be useful in considering the expansion of the programme of work. The Conference of the Parties had also requested SBSTTA to consider three specific threats to forest biological diversity, i.e. climate change, human-induced uncontrolled forest fires and the impact of unsustainable harvesting of non-timber forest resources, including bush meat and living botanical resources. The Expert Group had met twice and produced a report, which had been considered by SBSTTA at its seventh meeting. On that basis, SBSTTA had developed for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties at its sixth meeting, elements for the expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity and had requested the Executive Secretary to prioritize the elements of the programme and provide potential actors, timeframes and indicators of implementation.

261. The Secretariat then presented the report of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group, saying that the Group had held its first meeting in Helsinki from 21 to 25 January 2002 with the financial support of the Government of Finland and the Government of Switzerland. The meeting had been attended by 27 participants and had produced an assessment report on linkages between biological diversity and climate change and had concluded with regard to SBSTTA recommendation VII/6 on forest biological diversity that the output of its work would provide a basis for the development of activities pursuant to the recommendation. A second meeting was planned, in August or September 2002, after which the Group intended to draft a substantive report.

262. Mr. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana), Co-Chair of the Accra Workshop on Forests and Biological Diversity, said that the Workshop had taken place from 28 to 30 January 2002, with financial support from the Netherlands. Forty-three experts, as well as representatives of indigenous communities, international and non-governmental organizations, one of the co-chairs of the Ad Hoc Technical Group on Forest Biological Diversity and two members of the SBSTTA Bureau had attended the Workshop. The Workshop had emphasized that collaboration between the United Nations Forum on Forests and the Convention could strengthen the ability of both processes to support and guide immediate and effective

action by Governments and other bodies with regard to conservation and sustainable use of forest biological diversity. It had formulated a proposal for collaboration and recommended that collaborative actions should aim at the further development and integration of the concepts of ecosystem approach and sustainable forest management, cross-sectoral impacts on forest biological diversity, protected forest areas, and at facilitating the integration of forest biodiversity considerations at the national level, especially in national forest programmes and national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

263. Following the introductory statements, statements were made by the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil (speaking on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Japan, Liberia, Malaysia, Mexico (speaking on behalf of Like-Minded Megadiverse Countries), New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Spain (speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States), Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda (speaking on behalf of the African Group), and the United Republic of Tanzania.

264. At the 2nd meeting of the Working Group, on 9 April 2002, statements were made under this item by the representatives of Brazil, Cape Verde, the Central African Republic, Cuba, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovenia (speaking on behalf of the Central and Eastern European Group), the Solomon Islands, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United States of America, Uruguay and Zimbabwe.

265. A statement was made on behalf of the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE).

266. Statements were also made by representatives of the Friends of the Earth Inc., the Global Forest Coalition, Greenpeace International, the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, the International Indigenous Forum on Biological Diversity, the International Network of Forests and Communities (endorsed by the Environment Liaison Centre International, the World Rainforest Movement, Friends of the Earth International, Sobrevivencia, the Institute of Cultural Affairs, Kalpavriksh – Environmental Action Group, Spaces for Nature, the Indigenous People's Biodiversity Network and Greenpeace International), and the World Rainforest Movement.

267. Following the statements, the Working Group set up a contact group on forest biological diversity, to be chaired by Mr. Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana), with the mandate to look at how the input provided by Parties in their statements could be incorporated into the draft recommendations on the issue contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, without reopening the text of the expanded programme of work. The contact group's tasks included: (i) finding a process for defining terms; (ii) emphasizing national responsibility in relation to the programme of work; (iii) setting global priorities, and (iv) providing guidance on international cooperation, follow-up and monitoring, and evaluation of the programme of work. The contact group was asked to report back to the Working Group on Thursday, 11 April 2002.

268. At the 6th meeting of the Working Group Mr. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana), Chair of the contact group on forest biological diversity, reported that the contact group had met twice and had considered the inputs from the floor in an effort to accommodate them all in the draft decision. The question of priority-setting had proved to be very complex and so the Friends of the Chair had been set up in order to facilitate deliberations on that subject. The Friends of the Chair had met twice. At its first meeting, the Friends of the Chair had decided on a conceptual framework to guide them. The framework had been presented to and approved by the contact group. Eighteen out of the 26 paragraphs considered had been approved by the group, and a further meeting was to be held that evening in the hope of making more headway. He

trusted that the Friends of the Chair would continue to provide assistance and was confident that the contact group would supply a satisfactory product.

269. At its 8th, 12th and 13th meetings on 12, 16 and 17 April 2002, the Working Group heard further progress reports from the Chair of the contact group.

270. In his progress report at the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 18 April 2002 (see para. 26 above), the Chair of Working Group I said that his Group had completed its consideration of all the topics entrusted to it, apart from the item on forest biological diversity. His Group had been allocated an additional agenda item – preparations for the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Some progress had been made with regard to forests, but unforeseen difficulties had been encountered. The four controversial matters were whether the target for halting the loss of forest biodiversity should be 2010 or 2020, financial resources for the expanded work programme on forests, the focus on primary forests and the concept of illegal logging. He left it to the discretion of the plenary session to decide what mechanism should be employed to resolve the issue.

271. The Conference of the Parties agreed that the Chair should undertake bilateral consultations to resolve outstanding issues and report to Working Group I the following day.

272. At its 14th meeting, the Working Group had before it a conference room paper submitted by the Chair, containing a draft decision.

273. Mr. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana), Chair of the contact group, introduced the draft decision and explained the background to the discussions behind it. He expressed gratitude to all those who had helped to achieve the successful outcome.

274. Statements under this item were made by the representatives of Cameroon and New Zealand.

275. The draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.27.

276. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.27 as decision VI/22. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present report.

277. The representatives of China, Colombia, Brazil, Indonesia and Malaysia expressed concern about the apparent lack of consistency between the text of the draft decision and paragraph 11 of the Hague Ministerial Declaration of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

278. The representative of the European Community said that the European Community and its member States had agreed to the deletion of the paragraph relating to a political target as proposed by the chair of the contact group to avoid any inconsistencies with the Ministerial Declaration. As there was no reference to any targets in the decision, there was clearly no inconsistency with the Ministerial Declaration.

ITEM 22. ALIEN SPECIES THAT THREATEN ECOSYSTEMS, HABITATS OR SPECIES

279. Working Group I took up agenda item 22 at its 2nd meeting, on 9 April 2002. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it notes by the Executive Secretary on review and consideration of

/...

options for the implementation of Article 8(h) on alien species that threaten ecosystems, habitats or species (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/18) and on use of terms (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/18Add.1/Rev.1). A draft decision under the item, including proposed elements for an expanded work programme, was before the Working Group in the compilation of draft decisions for consideration at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, pp. 163-175).

280. The Working Group also had before it as an information document, a progress report on matters relating to the implementation of paragraph 14 of decision V/8 of the Conference of the Parties and section B in SBSTTA recommendation VI/4 (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/28).

281. Introducing the item, the Secretariat said that in decision V/8, paragraph 15, the Conference of the Parties had requested the Executive Secretary to develop in collaboration with other relevant organizations and instruments, a paper for consideration by SBSTTA and the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties comprising a progress report on invasive alien species, a summary of a review of the efficiency and efficacy of existing measures for the prevention, early detection, eradication and control of invasive alien species and options for the full and effective implementation of Article 8(h) of the Convention on Biological Diversity. At its sixth meeting, SBSTTA had taken note of a report on the status and trends of invasive alien species prepared by the Executive Secretary, pursuant to a recommendation of the SBSTTA Bureau, revised the interim guiding principles, and reviewed the efficiency and efficacy of existing legal instruments applicable to invasive alien species. SBSTTA had adopted recommendation VI/4, the annex to which contained draft Guiding Principles for the Prevention, Introduction and Mitigation of Impacts of Invasive Alien Species. In the recommendation, SBSTTA had reaffirmed that full and effective implementation of Article 8(h) was a priority and had recommended that the Conference of the Parties adopt the Guiding Principles. It had also urged Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to promote and implement the Guiding Principles. In the same recommendation, SBSTTA and other international organizations were invited to identify and explore further specific gaps in the international regulatory framework from a technical perspective of the threats of invasive alien species and to report back to the Conference of the Parties at its seventh meeting.

282. Mr. Cristian Samper, Chair of SBSTTA at its sixth meeting, said that it had been the first time that SBSTTA had decided to have one main theme for a meeting. Three days had been devoted to the topic of invasive alien species. The meeting had greatly benefited from inputs from the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP). Many successes might go undetected because, on reading the recommendation of SBSTTA, it was easy to focus solely on the draft Guiding Principles. SBSTTA did more than just draft recommendations; it endeavoured to promote an exchange of information, cooperation and capacity-building. A wealth of information had indeed been provided. Recommendations on the status, impact and trends of invasive alien species were to be found in an information note on the subject by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/6/INF/11). During the deliberations on the draft Guiding Principles, many issues had been identified that went beyond the mandate of SBSTTA, which was why the text offered options. SBSTTA had also considered the need for additional international instruments. Lastly, he urged the Conference of the Parties to adopt the draft Guiding Principles.

283. Following the introduction, statements were made by the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Chile, China, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia (also speaking on behalf of the African Group), Gabon, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Samoa (speaking on behalf of the Pacific small island developing States), Senegal, South Africa, Spain (speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States),

/...

Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, the United States of America, Uganda, Ukraine, Venezuela, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

284. At the 3rd meeting of the Working Group, statements under this item were made by the representatives of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the Council of Europe and IUCN–The World Conservation Union.

285. Statements were also made by Defenders of Wildlife, the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, the Sunshine Project, the Centre for International Environmental Law and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat.

286. Following the statements, Mr. Cristian Samper, Chair of SBSTTA at its sixth meeting, reminded representatives that, while Working Group discussion so far had focused on outstanding issues in the draft Guiding Principles, it was important to address the other issues contained in the SBSTTA recommendation on invasive alien species, particularly those related to implementation of the Guiding Principles once adopted. Technical cooperation and capacity-building, the role of the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP) as the focal point for the clearing-house mechanism, and linkages and gaps in related international agreements were a few such issues. Mr. Samper also suggested that a very specific mandate be provided in the event that the Conference of the Parties request further guidance from SBSTTA on invasive alien species.

287. The Chair of the Working Group then invited the Secretariat's legal advisor to provide an opinion on the respective legal implications of the terms "guiding principles" and "guidelines". The legal advisor said that, while guiding principles were more conceptual and guidelines were more action-oriented, the effect of both was simply to guide or orient action at the national level. There was no legal distinction between the terms, since neither was legally binding.

288. Following a show of hands to determine the extent of agreement on the outstanding elements in the text of the draft Guiding Principles, the Working Group agreed to set up a contact group to discuss the bracketed text about which there seemed to be an even split of opinion among representatives. The contact group's mandate also included: (i) addressing the use of terms to determine whether they could be defined before the adoption of the draft Guiding Principles and, if not, the process by which they could be defined later; (ii) identifying international cooperative action and discussing the place of national obligations therein; (iii) examining implementation and follow-up mechanisms for the draft Guiding Principles once adopted, and looking at the relationship with the GISP in this context. The contact group would be chaired by Mr. Andreas Demeter (Hungary), and would meet at times to be determined in coordination with the chair of the contact group on forest biological diversity, to avoid overlapping meetings of the two contact groups that might restrict attendance by representatives of small delegations. The contact group on invasive alien species was asked to report back to the Working Group on Friday, 12 April 2002.

289. At its 8th meeting, on 12 April 2002, the Working Group heard a progress report from the Chair of the contact group.

290. At its 11th meeting, on 16 April 2002, the Working Group considered a conference room paper, submitted by the Chair, containing a draft decision on alien species that threaten ecosystems, habitats or species.

291. The representative of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity proposed additional language to include indigenous peoples and local communities, and promote the use of traditional

knowledge, in combating alien invasive species. With regard to assessment, information and tools, the representative proposed to add cultural implications to the socio-economic implications of invasive species for indigenous and local communities. He also called for the text on the precautionary approach to include a specific reference to traditional knowledge as an integral component thereof, indigenous peoples being the first to notice changes in their traditional lands and waters. Furthermore, "Indigenous peoples" should be added to the reference to local communities under guiding principle 5, on research and monitoring, and under guiding principle 6, on education and public awareness.

292. Given the time and effort invested in reaching consensus on the document in the contact group, the Working Group agreed that, as an alternative to reopening the document, the statement by the representative of the International Indigenous Forum on Biological Diversity would be reflected in the report, and the concerns of Indigenous peoples would be taken into account when it came to implementing the Guiding Principles.

293. The draft decision on alien species that threaten ecosystems, habitats or species, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.13.

294. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties took up draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.13. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties had before it draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.13, containing the Guiding Principles for the Prevention, Introduction and Mitigation of Impacts of Alien Species that Threaten Ecosystems, Habitats or Species.

295. The representative of Australia said that, while Australia strongly supported the environmental objective of the guiding principles, and recognized that much effort had been made at the meeting to further improve them and to resolve outstanding differences, with much regret he had to inform the meeting that Australia could not agree to adopt some small specific elements in the current text, in particular the language in principles 1 and 10, and the text of the footnote dealing with definition of risk analysis. A particular concern was the potential for unclear language in the guiding principles to be taken out of context and misused, for example, as a justification to avoid obligations under the WTO Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures Agreement, or other relevant agreements, by claiming that these guiding principles permitted measures to be taken without an appropriate scientific basis. It was for such reasons that there was considerable controversy surrounding the approaches associated with the precautionary approach in international texts. In an area of such sensitivity, the Conference of the Parties should not go beyond the widely agreed formulations that could be readily accepted by all. The elements of the text that Australia could not accept were not part of the substantive guidance that would be of assistance to Governments in responding to threats from alien species and they created ambiguity, rather than clarity. Australia was also concerned that the language was not consistent with the recommendation to the current Conference of the Parties that Parties work to ensure coherence with other multilateral agreements. The need to take into account existing international rights and obligations was the key to the integrity of any multilateral agreement. He therefore proposed that the Conference of the Parties should adopt the good work done to date in the following form: an asterisk should be placed against principles 1 and 10 and the last words of the risk analysis footnote indicating that the text had not been agreed, and the principles should be identified as interim. On that basis, Australia could support the text.

296. The President said that the understanding was that the words "taking into account socio-economic and cultural considerations" should not be used in a discriminatory manner. The other proposals by Australia would reopen the substance of the draft decision, which she did not deem wise, given that the draft had been approved unanimously in Working Group I. She added that, in her view, in the United Nations and other international organizations, consensus did not mean unanimity but, rather, broad

agreement. If there was such broad agreement, it was usual practice for other delegations to ask for their objections to be reflected in the report of the meeting.

297. The representative of Australia said that, if the Chair did not wish to re-open the text, footnotes could be used to designate areas that had not been agreed, and that the guiding principles be designated as "interim". That would enable Australia to support their adoption.

298. The representative of Brazil said that her country shared the concern expressed by Australia and expressed regret that it impeded adoption of the guidelines. The proposal Australia made regarding the small footnote would be very appropriate in having the meeting continue to discuss the issues that still had not been appropriately discussed at the present point. She stated that she supported Australia's position.

299. The representative of Spain (speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States), supported by a number of others, considered that the debate on the draft decision should not be re-opened and insisted that the text should remain as it stood.

300. The representative of New Zealand, supported by Argentina, considered that, where a Party had some unease about material, it was generally common practice for them not to block consensus in return for having material reflected in the report. But clearly that only applied in circumstances where the matter was not of fundamental importance. While New Zealand did not necessarily agree with Australia's position, in the present case, she respected Australia's need to have their views heard. She proposed a number of amendments to the draft to make it clear that the disagreement was only on the wording regarding the precautionary principle and risk analysis, rather than on the concepts themselves as part of the guiding principles.

301. The representative of Canada said that he believed that the precautionary approach embodied in Rio Principle 15 and the preamble of the Convention on Biological Diversity offered all the scope needed to take action to protect biodiversity and the environment. He also believed that the language in the last two paragraphs of guiding principles 1 and 10 respectively, as it was, created the potential for different and possible conflicting interpretations of precaution in the future.

302. The President said that as only a few countries had voiced reservations, there was broad agreement on the text. Those reservations would be reflected in the report. She therefore proposed that the meeting adopt the text before it. Disagreement could be reflected as a reservation.

303. In response, the representative of Australia said that the matter was one of such substance for his Government that expressing a reservation was not enough. He believed that footnoting guiding principles 1 and 10 and the last few words of the definition of risk analysis and adopting the text as interim guiding principles would not amount to a reopening of the text. He also did not share the view that consensus could be interpreted as broad agreement. He cautioned that, at some future time, the procedure used might be scrutinized by legal experts and, if it was found to be not legally valid, the decision taken would be null and void. He believed that the meeting should revert to the conventional meaning of consensus, which was adoption without formal objection, and Australia formally objected to adoption of a text with those parts that it had indicated.

304. Following the statement of Australia, the Conference of the Parties agreed to a proposal by the President to hold informal consultations in a group comprising Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Ethiopia, Kenya, Norway, the Seychelles, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States) and Uganda.

305. Following the informal consultations, the President introduced an amendment to the draft decision whereby the words “in accordance with rights and obligations under the Convention and other international and regional agreements” would be added at the end of section II, paragraph 5. Two new paragraphs would be added: a paragraph 6 indicating the parts of the text that were not agreed by some Parties, and a paragraph 7 stating that the words “taking into account socio-economic and cultural considerations” in footnote 3 should not be used in a discriminatory manner.
306. The representative of Australia said that his delegation could accept the amendment proposed by the President, provided that the guiding principles were referred to as interim throughout the text, as parts of the text had not been agreed.
307. The representative of Norway said that his delegation could accept the amendment proposed by the President, but nothing else.
308. The representative of the European Commission said that language had been searched to accommodate the concerns raised by Australia on the basis of the full adoption of the guiding principles, but that implied that they could not be adopted only on an interim basis. It was impossible to do both.
309. The representative of Turkey, supported by several others and referring to the decision-making procedure of the Conference, recalled that, in the case of draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.9, on inland water biodiversity, the Secretariat had explained that the only way to accommodate a reservation which Turkey considered to be of vital importance would be to reflect it in the report of the meeting as a reservation, and Turkey had agreed to that procedure. He very much regretted that an alternative which was denied to the Turkish delegation had been given to other delegations. Therefore he could not accept the proposal that the Chair had presented to the plenary, since there was no consensus and therefore no decision on the text. Turkey therefore wanted to hear clarification from the Chair with regard to the decision-making procedure of the Conference.
310. The representative of Colombia, supported by Turkey and Zimbabwe, said that the proposed text, particularly the reference noting that certain elements were not agreed by some Parties, constituted a complex precedent that would endanger the very concept of consensus, which was the basis of negotiation not only in the framework of the Convention, but in most existing multilateral environmental agreements.
311. The representative of Brazil said that the guiding principles should be adopted on an interim basis pending further discussion of the issues highlighted by some members of the consultation group and in the President’s summary.
312. In view of the lack of agreement on her amendment, the President withdrew her compromise proposal. She then suggested that the views of countries unable to accept UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.13 as it stood be reflected in the report, but that the decision be adopted.
313. The representative of Australia said that he had been instructed not to go beyond the position he had just outlined. Australia could not accept the guiding principles as set forth in the document in question. His formal objection therefore stood.
314. The representative of Brazil said that she did not agree with the principle on which the draft decision was being adopted, because the bracketed text in the rules of procedure of the Convention meant that the Conference of the Parties did not have a clear idea of what constituted consensus. In her view, the principle of unanimity for consensus had been broken.

315. Many representatives said that the Conference of the Parties should adhere to its established procedure and adopt the guiding principles, with the dissenting views being recorded in the report of the meeting.

316. The Chair declared that the debate closed and said that, following established practice, the Conference of the Parties would proceed to the adoption of draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.13. No amendments would be made to the text, but the formal objections of dissenting Parties would be reflected in the report of the meeting.

317. The draft decision was adopted as decision VI/23. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present report.

318. The representative of Australia reiterated Australia's view that consensus was adoption without formal objection. He did not believe that the Conference of the Parties could legitimately adopt a motion or text with a formal objection in place, and he had formally objected to the adoption of the draft document.

319. The representative of Argentina, speaking on behalf of Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay wished to see express mention in the report of the need to apply and interpret the Guiding Principles in accordance with the rights and obligations in international and regional agreements, in particular regarding sanitary and phytosanitary measures in international law.

320. The representative of Canada wished the report to reflect the fact that Canada, while not objecting to the adoption of the guidelines, expressed regret at the interpretation which the Chair had given to the term "consensus" within the Convention. The Conference of the Parties had always worked hard to achieve full consensus on all documents, and in the absence of an agreed voting process, Canada expressed a strong preference to continue in that manner.

321. The representative of Australia reiterated that his delegation had grave concerns about the legality of the adoption procedure for draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.13 and the precedent it set. In the event of the President's decision that the text had been adopted, Australia wished the inclusion of a detailed statement in the report, to the effect that Australia did not agree with some specific elements in the guiding principles, namely, the language of the last paragraph of principle 1, the last line of principle 10, and the text in a footnote dealing with the definition of risk analysis. Of particular concern to Australia was the potential for unclear language in the guiding principles to be taken out of context and misused, for example as a justification to avoid obligations under the WTO Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures Agreement or other relevant agreements by claiming that these guiding principles permit measures to be taken without appropriate scientific basis. It was Australia's view that the Conference of the Parties should not go beyond the widely agreed formulations of Rio principle 15 or the preamble to the Convention. The elements of the text that Australia did not support were not part of the substantive guidance that would be of assistance to Governments in responding to threats posed by alien species. They created ambiguity rather than clarity. Australia was concerned also that the language was not consistent with the recommendations of the Conference of the Parties that Parties work to ensure coherence with other multilateral agreements. The need to take account of existing international rights and obligations was key to the integrity of any multilateral agreement. His delegation entered its strong reservation about the adoption of the Guiding Principles in their current form.

322. The representative of Spain (speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States) said that the European Union agreed fully with the content of the decision and that, regarding

procedure, it understood that the statements made by the representative of Australia meant only a reservation, and that he had agreed to have the reservation included in the report.

323. The representative of Australia clarified that he had only made the reservation on the basis of the procedure used in ruling that the draft decision had been adopted. He said that the report should record that he had earlier expressed a formal objection to the draft decision.

324. After that statement by the representative of Australia, the representative of Spain (speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States) said that the European Community and its member States made a reservation on the procedure through which the plenary of the Conference of the Parties had adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.13.

ITEM 23. ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING AS RELATED TO GENETIC RESOURCES

325. Working Group II took up agenda item 23 at its 1st meeting, on 9 April 2002. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it the report of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/6), a progress report on the implementation of decisions V/26 A-C (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/19) and a note by the Executive Secretary on recent developments on access and benefit-sharing (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/19/Add.1). It also had before it, as an information document, a compilation of submissions by experts on the use of terms (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/40). A number of draft decisions for consideration under the item were contained in the compilation of draft decisions prepared by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, pp. 176-199).

326. Introducing the item, the Secretariat drew attention to the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-Sharing, concerning the draft Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of their Utilization; other approaches, including the development of an action plan for capacity-building; and the role of intellectual property rights in the implementation of access and benefit-sharing arrangements. He also pointed to section III of the progress report on the implementation of decisions V/26 A-C, which contained complementary draft recommendations on the draft Bonn Guidelines; capacity-building; the relationship between the WTO Agreement on Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights and the Convention on Biological Diversity; information related to access and benefit-sharing arrangements; and *ex situ* collections acquired prior to the entry into force of the Convention and not addressed by the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. The note by the Executive Secretary on recent developments on access and benefit-sharing contained a draft recommendation on additional elements relating to capacity-building for access and benefit-sharing. He explained that all the draft recommendations pertaining to the item were compiled in the note by the Executive Secretary containing draft decisions for the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

327. Following the introduction, statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil (also on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), Cameroon (on behalf of the African Group), Canada, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, India, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico (on behalf of the Group of Like-minded Megadiverse Countries), the Netherlands, Nicaragua (on behalf of the Central American Group), Norway, Philippines, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States), Switzerland and Turkey.

328. A statement was also made by the representative of the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV).

329. The representative of the German Forum for Environment and Development, speaking on behalf of the NGO Caucus, also made a statement.

330. At its 2nd meeting the Working Group resumed its consideration of the item. The representative of the Secretariat explained that, as concerned cooperation between the Convention on Biological Diversity and WTO, the situation remained unchanged. As concerned cooperation with WIPO, the Secretariat already participated in its work and cooperated informally to coordinate work and collaborate on documentation. The Secretariat had also attended the two sessions of the WIPO Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore. In addition, a memorandum of understanding was being prepared to formalize the cooperation between the Secretariat and WIPO.

331. During the discussion, statements were made by the representatives of Algeria, Australia, Bangladesh, Colombia, the Cook Islands (on behalf of the Pacific Island States present at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties), Ethiopia, the European Community, France, Germany, Indonesia, Nepal, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Senegal, Slovenia (on behalf of the Central and Eastern European Group), Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America.

332. Statements were also made by the representatives of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

333. The representative of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity also made a statement.

334. The Working Group decided to set up a contact group on the item, under the co-chairmanship of Mr. Brendan Tobin (Peru) and Mr. Alwin Kopse (Switzerland), with a mandate to consider the draft Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising Out of Their Utilization, in order to address the following issues: (i) the process to address the use of terms at a later stage; (ii) brackets remaining in the draft guidelines; (iii) to balance between user and provider responsibilities; (iv) appendices and incentive measures under section V A of the draft Bonn Guidelines. The contact group was also mandated to consider the following issues related to intellectual property rights: the disclosure of the origin of genetic resources; and certificate of origin of genetic resources.

335. At the 7th meeting of Working Group II, on 12 April 2002, Mr. Kopse, co-chair of the contact group, speaking also on behalf of Co-chair Mr. Tobin, gave an interim report on the progress made in its deliberations.

336. At its 11th meeting, on 16 April 2002, Working Group II considered a conference room paper, containing draft decisions on the Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of their Utilization, other approaches, including the development of an action plan on capacity-building, the role of intellectual property rights in the implementation of access and benefit-sharing arrangements, and a number of other issues. A representative of the Secretariat introduced the conference room paper, indicating where amendments had been introduced to reflect the discussions in the Working Group and in the contact group.

337. The Working Group also had before it an informal paper containing additional suggestions by the co-chairs, following informal consultations, on a proposed package to resolve issues surrounding the use of terms. Mr. Kopse gave a report on the work of the contact group and introduced the informal paper. Mr.

Tobin commented on the work of the contact group on the draft guidelines and expressed the co-chairs' thanks to all who had participated for their hard work.

338. During the consideration of the conference room paper and of the co-chairs' suggestions, statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Brazil (also on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), the European Community and Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States).

339. At its 12th meeting, on 16 April 2002, the Working Group considered a corrigendum to the draft decision on the Bonn Guidelines.

340. The representative of Cameroon, speaking on behalf of the African Group, requested that the report of the meeting reflect that the countries of the African region wished the Bonn Guidelines to be used through a negotiation process to develop an international legally binding instrument on access to genetic resources and fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of their utilization. To that end, they wished to request the establishment of an open-ended ad hoc group to negotiate the legally binding instrument or protocol, to operate with terms of reference to be developed by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and UNEP. They further wished to request the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with UNEP, to make the necessary arrangements for the Open-ended Ad Hoc Working Group to meet as soon as possible and to report its progress to the Conference of the Parties at its seventh meeting

341. The draft decisions, with the changes introduced by the corrigendum, were approved for transmission to plenary as draft decisions UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.19 A-G.

342. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decisions UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.19 A-G as decisions VI/24 A-G. The text of the decisions is contained in annex I to the present report.

ITEM 24. STRATEGIC PLAN, NATIONAL REPORTING AND OPERATIONS OF THE CONVENTION

343. Working Group II took up agenda item 24 at its 3rd meeting, on 10 April 2002. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it the report of the Open-ended Inter-Sessional Meeting on the Strategic Plan, National Reports and Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5) and notes by the Executive Secretary on the draft Strategic Plan for the Convention on Biological Diversity: planned activities, expected products, the timing of activities and products, actors, implementation mechanisms, and financial, human resources and other capacity requirements (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5/Add.1), on the multi-year programme of work for the Conference of the Parties up to 2010 (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5/Add.2/Rev.1), on assessment of information contained in the second national reports (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5/Add.3), on review of status of the decisions of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5/Add.4), and on formats for thematic reports (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5/Add.5).

344. The Working Group also had before it, as information documents, notes by the Executive Secretary on assessment of the information contained in the second national reports concerning cross-cutting issues under the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/10), assessment of the information contained in the second national reports concerning thematic programmes of work under the Convention (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/11), review of the status of the decisions of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/17), input to the development of the Strategic Plan of the Convention,

/...

particularly with respect to draft elements relating to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/20), and additional information on potential main themes for the multi-year programme of work of the Conference of the Parties for 2006-2010 (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/30). A number of draft decisions for consideration under the item were contained in the compilation of draft decisions prepared by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/1/Add.2, pp. 200-245).

Strategic Plan

345. The representative of the Secretariat, drawing attention to the report of the Open-ended Inter-Sessional Meeting (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5), said that the Meeting had adopted a recommendation on the Strategic Plan for the Convention and, as contained in the annex to that recommendation, the elements of the issue, mission statement, vision, constraints and operational goals, as well as a schedule for monitoring and reporting and periodic assessment and review, and a review of implementation. The Executive Secretary had also prepared a multi-year programme of work for the Strategic Plan (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5/Add.2/Rev.1); and parameters for the implementation of the Strategic Plan (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5/Add.1). He explained that there were still areas of the Strategic Plan that contained bracketed text and other areas, such as scope and communications, that also contained outstanding issues and invited participants to address those issues.

346. During the discussion, statements were made by the representatives of Brazil (also on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), Cameroon (on behalf of the African Group), China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Grenada, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Mexico (on behalf of the Group of Like-minded Megadiverse Countries), Norway, Peru, Poland, Seychelles, Slovenia (on behalf of the Central and Eastern European Group), Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States) and Switzerland.

347. After the convening of an informal meeting of a group of Friends of the Chair, comprising Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, China, Grenada, Indonesia, Liberia, Poland, Slovenia, and Spain, at its 4th meeting the Working Group agreed to set up an open-ended contact group on the Strategic Plan, co-chaired by Ms. Mary Fosi (Cameroon) and Mr. David Brackett (Canada). Working on the basis of the existing structure of the Strategic plan, the contact group was mandated to: (i) further review the existing operational goals, with a view to developing critical strategic goals and establishing a set of priorities; (ii) in undertaking the foregoing, focus on elements that address the process for the implementation of the Convention, such as financial resources, technology transfer and participation; (iii) endeavour to ensure appropriate linkages with national biodiversity strategy action plans and thematic work programmes; (iv) examine existing brackets and options, with a view to proposing a consensual text; and (v) define a process for the development, during the inter-sessional period between the sixth and seventh meetings of the Conference of the Parties, of an action plan for the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

348. At the 4th meeting of the Working Group, statements on the item were made by the representatives of Algeria, Canada, Ethiopia, Seychelles and Switzerland.

349. At the 7th meeting of Working Group II, on 12 April 2002, Mr. Brackett, Co-chair of the contact group, speaking also on behalf of Co-chair Ms. Fosi, gave an interim report on the progress made in its deliberations.

350. At the 13th meeting of Working Group II, on 17 April 2002, the Working Group considered a conference room paper, containing a draft decision on the Strategic Plan, submitted by the Co-chairs of the contact group. Introducing the paper, the Chair noted that the multi-year programme of work for the Strategic Plan still needed to be finalized.

351. In her report on the work of the contact group, Co-Chair Ms. Fosi said that the group had held four main meetings, and two meetings of a smaller group of friends of the Chair. The paper before the Working Group contained the final outcome of the deliberations of the group, and she expressed thanks to all who had participated in its work.

352. In his report, Co-chair Mr. Brackett echoed the thanks of Ms. Fosi to all participants in its work and enumerated the elements of the draft decision, drawing attention to its annex on the draft Strategic Plan for the Convention on Biological Diversity, and to the areas in square brackets which reflected unresolved issues. He explained that no action plan was contained in the document, as the contact group had agreed that that role was being played by the working programmes. On behalf of himself and Co-chair Ms. Fosi, he commended the paper to the Working Group.

353. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Cameroon (on behalf of the African Group), Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Latvia (on behalf of the Central and Eastern European Group), Malawi, Mexico, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States) and Ukraine.

354. At its 14th meeting, Working Group II resumed consideration of the conference room paper containing the draft decision on the Strategic Plan. Co-Chair Mr. Brackett, on behalf of the Co-chairs, introduced a package of amendments to the draft decision, which had been compiled by the Co-chairs on the basis of the comments and proposals made in the Working Group, as well as the further informal consultations that had taken place. He further explained that a proposal concerning provision of financial resources for the implementation of the Strategic Plan had been brought to the attention of the contact group on financial resources and mechanism.

355. The draft decision on the Strategic Plan was approved, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary as document UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.21.

356. A statement was made by the representative of the NGO Caucus.

357. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.21 as decision VI/26. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present report.

Multi-year programme of work

358. At its 15th meeting, on 18 April 2002, the Working Group considered the multi-year programme of work for the Strategic Plan (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5/Add.2/Rev.1).

359. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Brazil (also on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), Cameroon (on behalf of the African Group), Colombia, Czech Republic (on behalf of the Central and Eastern European Group), Ethiopia, Mexico, Norway, Peru, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States), Switzerland, Togo, Turkey, Uruguay.

360. The Working Group agreed to set up a group of Friends of the Chair to discuss how to proceed in the consideration of the multi-year programme of work for the Strategic Plan. The group was composed of representatives of Antigua and Barbuda, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark (Chair), India, Mexico, Norway, Spain, Switzerland, Togo and Turkey.

361. At its 16th meeting, on 18 April 2002, the Working Group considered a conference room paper containing a draft decision on the multi-year programme of work of the Conference of the Parties up to

2010. Introducing the draft decision, the Chair of the group of Friends of the Chair, after making oral amendments to the draft, explained that it enjoyed the consensus of his group.

362. Statements were made by the representatives of Antigua and Barbuda, Cameroon, Canada, and Denmark (as Chair of the group of Friends of the Chair). In answer to a query concerning the budgetary implications of the draft decision, the Secretariat provided a preliminary estimate of costs associated with an inter-sessional meeting, as discussed in the draft decision.

363. Having noted that the cost implications of the draft decision concerned the current biennium, rather than the biennium 2003-2004, the Chair requested the Chair of the contact group on budget and finance to bring those cost implications to the attention of that group.

364. The draft decision was approved, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as document UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.29.

365. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.29, as orally amended by New Zealand (speaking as a member of the Bureau of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice), as decision VI/28. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present report.

National reports

366. The representative of the Secretariat said that, as at the end January 2002, 65 second national reports had been received by the Secretariat, which meant that 65 per cent of Parties had not yet submitted their second reports. He invited participants to consider the assessments of information contained in the second national reports, as well as the formats for thematic reports on the topics for in-depth discussion by the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

367. At the 4th meeting of the Working Group, statements on the item were made by the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Brazil, Cameroon (on behalf of the African Group), Canada, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Dominica, Eritrea, Estonia, Grenada, India (on behalf of the Asia and Pacific Group), Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua (on behalf of the Central American Group), New Zealand, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States), Togo and Zambia.

368. The representative of the Secretariat said that the Executive Secretary's assessment of the information regarding cross-cutting issues in the second national reports provided a brief analysis of the relationship between the submission of the second national reports and the provision of financial resources for their preparation, showing an apparent correlation between the two (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/10, para. 284). He also explained that section V of the note by the Executive Secretary assessment of information contained in the second national reports (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5/Add.3, paras. 63-64) contained information on late or non-submission of the second national reports, and that the Secretariat was continuing to investigate the causes of late or non-reporting.

369. Statements were also made by the representatives of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity and of Lawyers Environment Action Team.

370. At its 10th meeting, on 15 April 2002, Working Group II took up consideration of a conference room paper containing a draft decision on national reports. The representative of the Secretariat made oral amendments to the draft decision.

371. Statements were made by the representatives of Islamic Republic of Iran, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States), Switzerland,

372. On the understanding that the deadline for submission of the thematic reports on mountain ecosystems would be established by the Bureau, in collaboration with the Chairs of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, the draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to plenary as document UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.10.

373. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.10, as orally amended, as decision VI/25. The text of the decision is contained in annex I of the present report.

Implementation of the Convention

374. The representative of the Secretariat drew attention to recommendations 3 and 4 of the Open-ended Inter-Sessional Meeting (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5, annex), on, respectively, implementation of the Convention, in particular, implementation of priority actions in national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and operations of the Convention. In that connection, he also pointed to the note by the Executive Secretary on the review of the status of decisions (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/5/Add.4), which was based on the analysis provided in document UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/17, and which provided a pilot review of the decisions adopted at the first and second meetings of the Conference of the Parties, set out three main approaches that the Conference of the Parties might wish to consider in carrying out the review of the status of its decisions, and a draft recommendation for the attention of the Conference of the Parties. He invited participants to consider the issues and draft recommendation contained in that document, as well as the recommendations 3 and 4 of the Open-ended Inter-Sessional Meeting.

375. During the discussion of the item, statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Cameroon (on behalf of the African Group), Canada, Eritrea, Indonesia, Lebanon, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand and Peru.

376. A statement was also made by the representatives of the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (speaking on behalf of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity) and the European Centre for Nature Conservation (speaking as the Chair of the side event on resourcing sustainable biodiversity).

377. At its 10th meeting, on 15 April 2002, Working Group II took up for consideration a conference room paper containing draft decisions on, respectively, implementation of the Convention, in particular, implementation of priority actions in national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and operations of the Convention.

378. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Canada, Cook Islands, European Community, Hungary, Kenya, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States) and Switzerland.

379. At its 11th meeting, on 16 April 2002, Working Group II considered a revised conference room paper containing draft decisions on the implementation and operations of the Convention.

380. During the discussion, statements were made by the representatives of Australia, Brazil (also on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), Canada, Colombia, Eritrea, Malaysia, New Zealand, Slovenia and Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States).

381. A statement was also made by a representative of GEF.

382. At its 14th meeting, on 17 April 2002, Working Group II considered a conference room paper containing a second revision to the draft decisions. The Chair introduced the draft decision and made some editorial corrections to it.

383. Statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Canada, Latvia (also on behalf of the Central and Eastern European Group), Mexico, Peru and Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States).

384. A statement was also made by the representative of GEF.

385. The draft decisions on implementation of the Convention, in particular, implementation of priority actions in national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and on operations of the Convention were adopted, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary as draft decisions UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.22 A and B.

386. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted draft decisions UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.22 A and B as decisions VI/27 A and B. The text of the decisions is contained in annex I to the present report.

V. FINAL MATTERS

ITEM 25. OTHER MATTERS

387. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, the Conference of the Parties had before it a draft decision submitted by the Bureau on a tribute to the Government and people of the Netherlands (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.36). The draft decision was adopted as decision VI/30. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present report.

388. Mr. David Brackett, Chair of the Species Survival Commission of the IUCN-The World Conservation Union, presented the President of the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties with the book *The Extinction Crisis: Face to Face* in recognition of her work.

389. The representative of New Zealand, speaking as a member of the SBSTTA Bureau, thanked the Executive Director of UNEP for the contribution to the funding of the Bureau announced earlier at the meeting.

ITEM 26. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

390. The present report was adopted at the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, on the basis of the draft report (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.1 and Add.1) and the reports of Working Groups I and II (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/L.31 and L.32). The report was adopted on the understanding that the Rapporteur would be entrusted with its finalization in the light of the discussion at the 6th plenary session.

ITEM 27. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

391. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 19 April 2002, the Conference of the Parties heard closing statements by Kenya (on behalf of the African Group), Malaysia (on behalf of the Asia and Pacific Group), Slovenia (on behalf of the Central and Eastern European Group), Spain (on behalf of the European Community and its member States) and Brazil (on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group).

392. Statements were also made by the representatives of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, the NGO Caucus and Greenpeace.

393. Closing addresses were also made by Mr. Paul Chabeda, UNEP, on behalf of the Executive Director of UNEP, Mr. Klaus Töpfer, and by Mr. Hamdallah Zedan, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

394. The President also made a closing statement and she declared the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties closed at 11.55 p.m. on Friday, 19 April 2002.