

Greenpeace's positions on UN biodiversity summit

Bonn, 19-31 May 2008

Climate change and loss of biodiversity are the biggest challenges to environmental policy in our time. Heads of state and government are negotiating biodiversity at the 9th meeting of the states party to the UN Convention on Biological Diversity in Bonn from 19 to 30 May. The conference will focus on the protection of forests, setting up a global network of terrestrial and marine reserves and their financing, and on more closely linking international processes for protecting the climate with the CBD.

Ten key decisions: For Greenpeace, a successful UN Biodiversity Summit requires that governments *decide*:

- 1.** □ to **initiate a heads of states initiative to increase public funding** for biodiversity conservation significantly towards the estimated **global need of 30 billion Euro per year** for protected areas on land and at sea, including for community conserved areas and collaboratively managed protected areas, **engaging all rich countries** from 1st January 2009 - with **Germany** as the host country of COP 9 taking the first step by donating **new and additional 2 billion Euro per year**;
- 2.** □ to **put a stop to biopiracy** by deciding on a **clear ABS-mandate and fulfilling the timetable** for the successful conclusion by COP 10 of text-based negotiations on a legally binding regime on access and benefit sharing as a minimum, and by deciding that the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities as agreed in the UN Declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples are protected and promoted, so that the sovereignty of indigenous peoples and local communities over their traditional knowledge and their genetic resources is guaranteed.
- 3.** □ to **fully respect the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities** by deciding to integrate the UN Resolution on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and other relevant human rights issues into all relevant decisions taken at the UN Biodiversity Summit;
- 4.** □ to **stop deforestation** by adopting time bound targets to achieve **zero deforestation by 2015**;
- 5.** □ to develop a **global mechanism to halt illegal logging by 2012** and thereby preparing the grounds for a global climate initiative to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD);
- 6.** □ to **fully integrated the protection of biodiversity, and hence CBD recommendations, into future climate change agreements**, including agreements on the reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD);
- 7.** □ to **prevent negative impacts of biomass production** by deciding to eliminate governmental support measures (e.g., subsidies, tax redemptions or mandatory targets) for any bioenergy without strict safeguards and to adopt **ecological and social safeguards for the production of biomass and biofuels**;
- 8.** □ to adopt the recommended scientific **criteria and steps for the identification of marine areas in need of protection** in open ocean waters and deep-sea habitats, in order to make progress towards establishing a global network of marine protected areas by 2012;
- 9.** □ to apply the **precautionary principle** by adopting bans, at least moratoria, preventing release of **genetically engineered trees** as well as **ocean fertilisation** experiments and projects;
- 10.** □ to improve the **effectiveness of decisions** and the efficiency of the CBD by deciding that the issue of voting (article 40 in the rules of procedures), which has been an outstanding issue since the 1st Conference of Parties, shall be resolved by 2010.

Facts about the loss of biodiversity

- The rate of loss of species and habitats is today about 1,000 times higher than it has ever been in the Earth's history.¹
- Over two thirds of all species that exist on land live in forests.²
- Deforestation is continuing throughout the world. Some 13 million hectares of forest - an area the size of Greece - are lost a year, the areas most affected being tropical ancient forests.³
- Soils and plants in forests store about a billion tonnes of carbon – roughly 50 per cent more than the atmosphere.⁴
- Global destruction of forests is the second biggest source of CO₂ after energy, and causes about 20 per cent of global emissions of CO₂ - more than all traffic and transport globally.⁵

The United Nations resolved at the world summit for sustainable development at Johannesburg in 2002 to reduce the loss of biodiversity significantly by 2010. The EU even went a step further and in Göteborg in 2001 set the ambitious goal of stopping its loss altogether by 2010.

To attain the 2010 goal the CBD countries decided to set up a global network of protected areas on land by 2010 and at sea by 2012. The CBD's programme for reserves and forests has so far not, however, been put into practice:

- 14 years after the CBD came into force only 11 per cent of habitats worldwide on land, and less than one per cent of marine areas, have been placed under protection.
- The industrialised countries have not yet met their commitment to make additional funds available (see CBD article 20) to developing countries for the biodiversity convention to be implemented.
- Even those measures decided on and what has been set up have been dramatically underfunded. The funds needed for a global network of reserves are estimated at around 30 billion Euro a year.
- As long as the industrial countries fail to fulfil their obligations, the developing and newly industrialised countries will continue to block the CBD process.

The UN Convention on Biodiversity

The CBD convention is an agreement which is binding in international law and has so far been ratified by 188 countries. It came into being in 1992 in negotiations on the framework convention on the climate at the world summit in Rio de Janeiro and is to date the only global agreement which takes into account biodiversity of both terrestrial and marine animals.

In this document the signatory states for the first time recognise protecting biodiversity to be a common concern for mankind and an integral part of sustainable development. They furthermore wish to protect the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities and to keep open the possibilities for using forests in traditional ways.

Besides proposals for protecting nature and using natural resources sustainably, the CBD includes just 'Access and Benefit Sharing of Plant Genetic Resources' (ABS) between industrialised and developing countries.

Course of negotiations

12-16 May 2008: Conference of the parties (CoP/MoP4) contracted to the biosafety protocol under the presidency of the German agriculture minister, Horst Seehofer.

19-30 May 2008: 9th meeting of the CBD conference of contracted states under the presidency of the German environment minister, Sigmar Gabriel.

28-30 May 2008: Opening of the ministerial part of the conference by Angela Merkel and Sigmar Gabriel in the presence of the UN Secretary-General, Ban Ki Moon, President Lula of Brazil (tbc), the President of the EU Commission, José Manuel Barroso, Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi (to have presidency of the CBD from 2010) and the Canadian Premier Stephen Harper.

¹Millenium Ecosystem Assessment (2005)

²FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment (2005)

³FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment (2005)

⁴FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment (2005)

⁵see Stern-Report (2006); 4th IPCC Assessment Report (2007)

Greenpeace at the CBD

Greenpeace will have an **international delegation** following the negotiations and be contactable on the spot for the press.

Greenpeace will also have an **booth** with information near the main entrance to the conference hotel, the Hotel Maritim.

Greenpeace Media Officer: Simone Miller, +49-171-8706647, simone.miller@greenpeace.de

Greenpeace Media Officer: Vicky Wyatt +44 7801 212 970, victoria.wyatt@int.greenpeace.org

Greenpeace CBD coordination, Forests: Martin Kaiser (English, German), +49-171-878-0817, martin.kaiser@greenpeace.de

Biodiversity & Climate: Christoph Thies (English, German), +49 171 8831107, christoph.thies@greenpeace.de

Oceans: Saskia Richartz (English, French, German), +32 495290028, saskia.richartz@diala.greenpeace.org

Biofuels/Agrofuels: Wolfgang Richert (English, Dutch, German), +31-6-1509-3586, wolfgang.richert@greenpeace.org, Eric Darier (French) eric.darier@yto.greenpeace.org

Protected Areas/Financing: Stefan Krug (English, French, German), +49-171-8780817, stefan.krug@greenpeace.de

Greenpeace's Kids for Earth campaign

The new *Kids for Earth* campaign by children and young people was launched with an 'action' at the Landungsbrücken landing stages in Hamburg on 1 March. Children and young people will be doing all they can to see the last ancient forests and the climate protected up until the beginning of the CBD and beyond it. These young environmentalists will paint banners, collect signatures for petitions and organise display stands throughout Germany.

The CBD will be the high point of the *Kids for Earth* campaign. Some 300 children and young people will meet the environment minister Sigmar Gabriel, the mayor of Bonn and chairperson of World Mayors Council on Climate Change (WMCCC), Bärbel Diekmann, and the Executive Director of the CBD Secretariat, Ahmed Djoghlaif, on 19 May. The *Kids for Earth* will then present their demands and wishes for the protection of ancient forests.

Events planned by Greenpeace

- 12 May, 10 a.m. Participation in event launching Planet Diversity. There will be an international demonstration where the international biological safety protocol is being discussed, with addresses by Percy Schmeiser, Vandana Shiva, José Bove and others. Meeting point at the 'Kleine Blumenwiese', Rheinaue.
- 19 May, 1.45-2.15 p.m. Procession for ancient forests of Greenpeace's *Kids for Earth* delegation at one of the main stages on the Robert-Schuhmann-Platz, with environment minister Sigmar Gabriel and CBD executive director Ahmed Djoghlaif.
- 19 May, 1.15-2.45 (applied for): Greenpeace side event **ROADMAP TO RECOVERY: GREENPEACE'S PLAN TO SAVE THE WORLD'S FORESTS AND THE CLIMATE**, on current deforestation and financing protection of ancient forests in the GSI Stresemann, Romm S17/S18
- 20 May, 11 a.m. (applied for). Press conference on deforestation and financing protection of ancient forests.
- 22 May, 6.15-7.45 pm. **PLANET OF FORESTS** - English language multi-vision slide show depicting the beauty of the world's forests by Greenpeace photographer Markus Mauthe, with introduction from Martin Kaiser of Greenpeace International in the GSI **Stesemann, Room S26**
- 27 May, 1.15.-2.45. Greenpeace side event **PROTECTING THE PACIFIC COMMONS: THE NEED FOR HIGH SEAS MARINE RESERVES** The side event will highlight the importance and benefits of marine reserves in the high seas, using the case study of the Pacific, where a number of Pacific Island countries are taking action to safeguard their marine resources by calling for marine reserves in three distinct high seas areas within the Western and Central Pacific Ocean. , **Saal Schumann, Maritim**
- 30 May, 11 a.m. **Closing Greenpeace press conference** on the results of the negotiations.
- 20-30 May, daily, at Greenpeace's booth: **Greenpeace Golden Chainsaw Award** nominating a country which has most blocked the negotiations.

Items on agenda at the coming UN negotiations⁶

Negotiations at the CBD will focus on the following.

- Ancient forests, forests: impacts on the climate and biodiversity of unchecked legal and illegal deforestation and trade with wood. Trade with illegally logged wood as driving force in destruction.
- Agrofuel: ecological impacts on intensive agricultural production of so-called 'bio' fuels.
- Financial problems: clarifying the financing of measures decided on and creating new incentives for implementing the convention.
- Determining the state of implementation of the 2010 Biodiversity target agreed by the UN Head of States to be fulfilled in 2010.
- Laying down a global strategy for protecting plants and combatting the introduction of alien species. Settling the questions of an intelligent approach to ecosystems and how to implement this.
- Negotiating regulated 'Access and Benefit Sharing of Plant Genetic Resources' (ABS).
- Impacts of global climate change on biodiversity, influence on production of greenhouses gases of destruction of ancient forests and industrial agriculture (together about one third of global CO₂ emissions).

⁶<http://www.cbd.int> UNEP/CBD/COP/9/1

UNEP/CBD/COP/9/3: Report of SBSTTA13 XIII/2. Review the implementation of the programme of work on Forest Biodiversity

SAVE THE WORLD'S FORESTS

Climate change is undoubtedly the most serious environmental threat currently facing the planet. Leading IPCC scientists warn that if we allow average global temperatures to rise above 2° Celsius, up to 30% of plant and animal species face increased risk of extinction, and about 15% of ecosystems are likely to be seriously affected⁷. A series of reports released during 2007 by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) acknowledged that climate change is already having heavy negative impacts.

Keeping the global temperature increase below 2°C (compared to pre-industrial levels) means anthropogenic global emissions of GHGs must peak no later than 2015 and that by this time the world must be set on track for drastic reductions in overall emissions.

Forests – and particularly tropical forests – are critical to climate regulation, through the carbon they store, absorb and recycle. However, industrial logging and deforestation for plantations and agriculture are rapidly destroying these natural buffers. The rapid ongoing expansion of these industries is a disaster for both climate and biodiversity.

Deforestation contributes to climate change through substantial GHG emissions: deforestation – mostly of tropical rainforests – accounts for about one fifth of all global emissions. This is more than the emissions from all the world's cars, trucks, and aeroplanes put together. Moreover, climate change – in part driven by forest destruction – may soon tip these carbon stores into sources as forests start to die back.

Forests are more than just Carbon

Forests are essential to life itself; they keep climate in check, regulate water flow, and maintain the healthy ecosystems on which humanity depends. Orangutans, elephants, tigers, and jaguars all make their homes in tropical forests that contain half or more of all land-based species on earth. Protection of biodiversity should prioritize the protection of intact and other important natural forests, such as peatland forests. These store significant amounts of carbon, and are key to protecting biodiversity given negative impacts of climate change.

Up to 150 million indigenous people live in forests worldwide and are guardians of the forests. All too often they have been sidelined or subject to human rights abuses by those intruding into their forests. Indigenous peoples need to have their futures and rights secured.

The 9th Conference of the Parties (COP9) at the crossroads

The in depth review of this programme of work at the 9th Conference of Parties is a unique opportunity for the world's forests. **Greenpeace calls on governments to further strengthen the implementation of the expanded programme** of work on forest biological diversity, in particular in view of the 2010 biodiversity target and the need to reduce carbon emissions from deforestation. The current document UNEP/CBD/COP/9/3: Report of SBSTTA13 XIII/2 lacks any strong recommendation for decision. It recommends to *urge* or to *invite* parties to act. However, in order to strengthen the implementation, COP9 has to make a difference and *decide* upon or *request* parties to act.

Greenpeace calls for the establishment of new forest protected areas and their sustainable and innovative financing, with a focus on forest areas of particular importance for biological diversity, especially large intact forests, along with urgent action to prevent human-induced fires, especially those caused by the agricultural sector, including through the strengthening of relevant governance structures.

⁷ IPCC (2007) AR4 WGII: Ch 4, Ecosystems

Greenpeace considers the designation of protected areas, where all industrial extractive and destructive activities have been excluded, as a key tool for the protection of biodiversity and the achievement of a reduction in emissions from deforestation. Emissions resulting from land-fragmentation, e.g., as a product of road building, are significant in their own right, and add to the emissions that result from land conversion to agriculture and other activities. For example, Greenpeace estimates that in the case of a single logging concession in the Congo Basin over 5 million tonnes of CO₂ would be released as a result of infrastructure development and timber extraction⁸. Although Greenpeace supports environmentally responsible and socially just logging practices in existing ventures, we oppose the expansion of logging operations that lead to an increase in emissions and therefore the extension of carbon financing to such activities.

Greenpeace further urges states to agree international definitions for, amongst others, the following terms: plantations, degraded forests, semi-natural forests and large intact forests (primary forests). In order to avoid loopholes in implementation, these definitions should apply globally and be specific and comparable. However, recognising ecological differences between biomes/ecosystems (e.g. between tropical and northern boreal forests), it may be necessary to further elaborate more specific, biome-based definitions.

The forest biodiversity and climate crisis is of such magnitude that countries cannot afford to wait until 2013 before taking significant measures to decrease deforestation. In particular, the international community must immediately build capacity and provide institutional, technical and financial support to developing countries to reduce forest destruction.

Target the Drivers of Deforestation

Measures must be targeted at the drivers of deforestation: unsustainable consumption and trade in commodities (timber, soya, palm oil, cattle, etc.), land conversion for agriculture and plantations, illegal and destructive logging, poor forest governance and law enforcement, endemic corruption, expansion of the mining sector and other extractive industries and infrastructure development.

In this context, Greenpeace urges states to agree sustainability standards for timber harvesting and mechanisms for timber tracking and licensing for the purpose of combating illegal logging and promoting sustainable use of forest resources. In addition, states should initiate a process towards agreeing common principles and criteria of good forest governance, building on the progress already made in various regional FLEG/T processes and the Amazon Treaty. The outcome of the latter should positively contribute to the ongoing negotiations under the UNFCCC for the establishment of a permanent financing scheme for the reduction of emissions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries (REDD), recognising that good forest governance and effective prevention of illegal logging will be two important parameters of these negotiations.

Rights and Livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples

All aspects of implementation must give due regard to the rights, social needs and livelihoods of indigenous peoples, avoiding in particular land conflicts, increased state control over forests, exclusionary models of forest conservation, violations of customary land and territorial rights. Human rights, free prior and informed consent, equitable benefit sharing, respect for traditional knowledge, and land tenure security must be central components of all policies and discussions. In particular, clear provision must be made – within any mechanism or fund – that recognises the land, resource use and ownership rights of indigenous peoples and directly engage such communities and civil society in international and national processes to discuss policies, mechanisms, and approaches aimed at reducing emissions from deforestation.

There are only two years left to realise the implementation of a global network of forest protected areas and to reduce and halt the loss of biodiversity by 2010. It is high time for courageous and clear commitments at COP9.

⁸ Greenpeace (2007) Carving up the Congo. www.greenpeace.org/international/campaigns/forests/africa/congo-report

Greenpeace urges parties at the 9th Conference of the Parties (COP9) on the following issues in particular:

- To initiate a **Heads of States initiative to increase public funding** for biodiversity conservation significantly towards the estimated **global need of 30 billion Euro per year** for protected areas on land and at sea⁹, including for community conserved areas and collaboratively managed protected areas, **engaging all developed countries** from 1st January 2009 - with **Germany** as the host country of COP 9 taking the first step by donating **new and additional 2 billion Euro per year**;
- To decide that protection of biodiversity shall be fully integrated into future climate change agreements, including agreements on the reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD);
- To develop a global mechanism to halt illegal logging by 2012;
- To stop perverse subsidies and mandatory targets for biofuels and develop ecological and social sustainability criteria for the production of biomass;
- To apply the precautionary principle by adopting a moratorium preventing release of genetically engineered (GE) trees;
- To integrate the UN Resolution on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples into all relevant decisions and to consult and cooperate in good faith with representatives of indigenous and local communities throughout the entire planning and decision making processes relevant to forest biodiversity;

Greenpeace is welcoming the findings of the in-depth review of the programme of work on forest biodiversity and the report of the **Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on the Review** of Implementation of the Programme of Work on Forest Biodiversity in preparation of the review and invites parties to **make better use of it's findings** on:

Financing Forest Protected Areas

- To provide sustained financing of forest protected areas and adopt innovative financial mechanisms for managing forest protected areas more effectively and establishing new forest protected areas with a focus on forest areas of particular importance for forest biological diversity especially large intact forests;
- The Greenpeace proposal **Forests for Climate** (www.greenpeace.org/forestsforclimate) would be able to provide funds to the greatest number of countries with tropical forests. **Forests for Climate is designed to become a crucial part of the** second phase of the Kyoto Protocol agreements on climate change in 2013. As the climate emergency requires urgent action, countries that commit to **Forests for Climate** could make funding available to protect forests as early as 2009.
- Industrialised nations would be able to meet a proportion of their overall emissions reduction targets through the purchase of cost effective “tropical deforestation units.” This “tropical deforestation commitment” would be additional to deeper cuts in their domestic energy and industrial emissions. A minimum mandatory commitment would ensure a steady and significant stream of funds. The billions raised would then be used to help developing countries protect their tropical forests.
- **Forests for Climate** recognises that carbon markets are important tools in climate protection. The cheaper tropical deforestation units would therefore not be directly exchangeable in the markets. This avoids the risk of them bringing down the price of carbon, and reducing incentives to invest in clean and renewable energy technologies.

Climate Change and Forests

- To preserve natural forests and minimise deforestation and forest degradation, applying the principles of ecological and socially responsible forest management and the ecosystem approach, including low impact logging and the rehabilitation of natural forests and forest landscapes as a major contribution to reducing both forest biodiversity loss and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions;

⁹ Balmford, A. et al. (2002) Economic reasons for conserving wild nature. Science 297: 950 – 953.

- To seek a commitment from the private sector most relevant for conversion and deforestation to halt any new conversion activities and to engage in a national or sub-national implementation process for the Programme of Work;
- To mitigate human-induced, uncontrolled/unwanted forest and wild-land fires, especially those caused by the agricultural sector, and strengthen relevant governance structures;
- To further integrate forest biodiversity aspects of climate change impacts and response activities into national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), and into national forest programmes and other forest related strategies, as well as support research to better understand the impacts of climate change on forest biodiversity;

Ecological and Socially Responsible use of Forest Resources, Illegal Logging and Related Trade

- To agree on common principles and criteria for good forest governance, building on the progress already made in various regional FLEG/T processes and the Amazon Treaty;
- To agree on a global mechanism to regulate timber harvesting and trade for the purpose of combating illegal logging and promoting ecologically and socially responsible use of forest resources.
- To request that parties adopt national legislation which prevents the sale of illegal and destructive timber and timber products on the market, incorporating deterrent sanction mechanisms, and to also make use of additional FLEGT options to prohibit the illegal logging and related trade.
- To recognise and strengthen the positive role of market based certification schemes and public procurement policies, which promote the use of timber and/or forest products from legally and environmentally responsible and socially just forest management, and to develop, adopt and promote such measures;

Biofuels and Conversion

- To bring an end to perverse subsidies and mandatory targets for biofuels and develop ecological and social sustainability criteria for the production of biomass;
- To adopt guidelines or standards for the production of bioenergy, which take into account the direct and indirect negative impacts of the production and consumption of bioenergy – in particular biofuels – and other causes of land conversion and forest degradation on forest ecosystems; and

GE Trees

- Recognising that the use of any GURTS will not remove the threat of genetically modified trees to forest biodiversity, call on parties to apply the precautionary approach and to adopt a moratorium on environmental releases of genetically engineered trees, including field trials.

UNEP/CBD/COP/9/3:

XIII/6 Biodiversity and climate change: options for mutually supportive actions addressing climate change within the three Rio conventions

BIODIVERSITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Recognising the strong interlinkage between biodiversity and the global climate system, particularly: the important role of biodiversity in both mitigating as well as adapting to climate change and the impacts of current and future climate change on biodiversity, States need to start negotiating a plan for joint implementation by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and Convention on Biological Diversity to reduce emissions from Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) in general and Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) in particular.

The destruction of terrestrial ecosystems, mostly of tropical forests, causes approximately 20 per cent of global greenhouse gas emissions. Achieving Zero Deforestation by 2015 is key to mitigating these emissions. The same destruction causes massive losses of biodiversity and threats to the livelihoods of indigenous and other local communities, issues at the heart of the CBD agenda.

Joint implementation of the conservation of tropical forests and other ecosystems by UNFCCC and CBD must make sure that greenhouse gas emissions are avoided while at the same time biodiversity losses are being stopped and community benefits including food security are achieved. Greenpeace has provided a proposal called *Forests for Climate* (at: www.greenpeace.org/forestsforclimate), which provides a basis for solution for the integration of all relevant aspects.

The 9th Conference of Parties in its High Level Ministerial Segment must make a **Call for Interaction** between CBD and UNFCCC with the goal of **joint implementation** and a **joint mechanism, REDD**, and the establishment of a **High Level Task Force** to that respect.

Particularly the joint mechanism and implementation plan must entail:

- National accounting of forest (and other terrestrial) carbon
- Financing of forest conservation through auctioning of industrial emission allowances, avoiding direct trading between fossil carbon and forest carbon
- Strong focus on reducing and preventing tropical deforestation and degradation. Carbon sequestration (e.g. in the form of reforestation) should only be considered in connection with the restoration of the native biodiversity of ecosystems (ecological restoration).
- Agricultural management systems (e.g. for bioenergy, feed etc.) must only be accepted if they create verifiable emission reductions and if they don't contribute to forest destruction, threaten biodiversity or local livelihoods at the same time.

In this regard the COP9 should give the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) guidance to prioritize biodiversity and climate related projects as well as projects linked to protected areas both for intact forests and oceans.

COP9 should specifically

- **Apply the ecosystem approach** in the implementation of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures considering the negative impacts of climate change on biodiversity and related traditional knowledge;
- **Adopt a moratorium on all ocean fertilization** activities in light of questions about the effectiveness of ocean fertilization for climate change mitigation and its potential adverse impacts on marine biodiversity;
- Welcome the priority given to the issue of reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in the framework of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC),
- Invite the Framework Convention to take full account of opportunities for its work to provide benefits for biodiversity including through **collaboration among the subsidiary bodies** of the three Rio conventions;
- Invite the Framework Convention to work to **ensure that traditional knowledge**, innovations and practices related to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are adequately addressed bearing in mind relevant provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- Recall decision 1/CP.13, para 11, on the Bali Action Plan, in which Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) agreed that this process shall be informed by the best available scientific information, experience in implementation of the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol, and processes there under, outputs from the Convention on Biological Diversity and insights from the business and research communities and civil society;
- **Provide biodiversity relevant input in a timely manner;**
- Establish in this regard a possible **Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Biodiversity and Climate Change with a mandate, to develop advice on biodiversity**, relevant to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) decision on the Bali Action Plan (1/CP.13) as well as the UNFCCC Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, drawing, inter alia, from the reports of the previous ad hoc technical expert groups on biodiversity and climate change and the relevant reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change;
- Request the Executive Secretary to convey the **report** of this Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group to the Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change for appropriate consideration;
- Decide about the **terms of reference** of a Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Biodiversity and Climate Change to develop advice on biodiversity relevant to the decision on the Bali Action Plan by the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) (1/CP.13), as well as that Convention's Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, in consultation with the secretariats of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification;
- Request the Executive Secretary to summarize **information on the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and the impacts of climate change and response measures on biodiversity** found within the existing documents, including the report of the Viterbo Workshop on "Forests and Forest Ecosystems: Promoting Synergy in the Implementation of the three Rio Conventions" (April 2004), the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, and CBD Technical Series Nos. 10 and 25; and provide this information to the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change with the intention that it be transmitted to that Convention's Subsidiary Body on Scientific and Technical Advice at its twentieth-eighth meeting for consideration in discussing the issue of reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation.

XIII/3. Options for preventing and mitigating the impacts of some activities to selected seabed habitats, and scientific and ecological criteria for marine areas in need of protection and biogeographic classification systems

MARINE BIODIVERSITY

Life on this planet began in the ocean and as much as 80% of it still lives in the sea. Almost half of the planet is covered by the international waters of the high seas. These waters beyond the limits of national jurisdiction are the least regulated and least protected places on Earth.

In the past, vast tracts of our seas were inaccessible to fishermen and other human activities, providing natural refuges for many marine species. As a result of developments in modern technology, fishing trawls, gillnets and longlines are now capable of penetrating depths of 2000-3000 metres. Fish are being removed at rates far beyond those at which populations are able to renew themselves. As a result populations of large fish, such as swordfish, tuna, marlin and sharks have plummeted, falling on average to one tenth of their abundance in the 1950s. Recent data published in the journal Science also shows that more than 40% of the world's oceans are heavily impacted by human activities, with few pristine areas remaining¹⁰.

Our oceans are not inexhaustible, but vulnerable, complex and finite. Destructive and unsustainable fishing practices, such as bottom-trawling, as well as illegal, unregulated and unreported (IUU) fishing, deep-sea mining and scientific and commercial exploration of deep-sea areas are all threatening vulnerable marine habitats. Combined with the unpredictable effects of a changing global climate, these pressures make the outlook bleak for the oceans.

The CBD's Programme of Work on protected areas requires States to address the shortfall of marine sites in the global network of protected areas by the end of this year. However, recent figures released by the MPA Global database,¹¹ housed at the University of British Columbia (UBC), reveal that marine protected areas cover just 0.65% of the world's ocean. Less than two years are left before the 2010 deadline by which Parties agreed to significantly reduce the global loss of biodiversity. And in just 4 years from now, States should have in place a global network of protected and well-managed marine areas spanning all of the Earth's seas and oceans.

With this in mind, we urge Parties attending the 9th Conference of the Parties (COP9) of the Convention on Biological Diversity to:

- **ADOPT the criteria and steps for the identification of marine areas in need of protection in open ocean waters and deep-sea habitats;**
- **URGE Parties and relevant organisations, including Regional Fisheries Management Organisations, to cooperate in applying these criteria, using existing political instruments and the best available scientific knowledge to identify and protect priority areas for conservation, in particular on the high seas; and**
- **RECOMMEND that states put a process in motion that will address the gaps in high seas governance and apply the precautionary principle and ecosystem approach to conserve and protect areas beyond national jurisdiction.**

The failure to adopt the scientific criteria and recommended steps for the protection of ecosystems that cover more than half of this planet by COP9 would seriously undermine and question the CBD's role and commitment to the protection of biodiversity. Provided the political will is there, and using the best scientific data currently available, an effective network of marine reserves can be established immediately.

¹⁰ <http://www.nceas.ucsb.edu/GlobalMarine>

¹¹ <http://mpaglobal.org>

The Pacific High Seas Enclaves – a case in point

There is already a sound body of scientific information that can be used in conjunction with the proposed criteria to identify key areas requiring protection. In 2006, Greenpeace practically applied a similar methodology and modelling system by commissioning a first review of available science, resulting in a map of marine areas in need of protection. The team of scientists, led by Professor Callum Roberts of the University of York, UK, identified 25 priority areas for protection.¹²

Amongst these priority areas are three high seas enclaves in the Western and Central Pacific, colloquially known as “donut holes” or “high seas pockets”, are of great ecological importance, featuring breeding and migratory routes for species such as the leatherback turtle, Yellowfin and Bigeye tuna. These are also important seamount areas and are rich in seabed resources such as polymetallic sulphides, polymetallic nodules and cobalt crusts. Sadly, these distinct high seas areas, which are entirely bound by the Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) of surrounding Pacific island nations, are also the scene of rampant overfishing by large-scale industrial fishing vessels as well as IUU fishing.

The livelihoods of Pacific Island Communities rely heavily on the oceans, and fish are a vital resource to their economies. However, this basic resource is in peril of being wiped out. Moreover, although the value of tuna landings is significant, very little of this money trickles down to the communities themselves.

Map showing the locations (in orange) of the three high seas enclaves proposed as marine reserves by Greenpeace



More than 90% of the tuna caught in the region is taken by foreign fleets. It is the same large powerful fishing nations that continue to ignore the scientific warnings issued by the West and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission that strong measures are needed to conserve the long-term sustainability of the tuna stocks. This will end in the collapse of tuna stocks in the Pacific and puts the future of local industries across the Pacific coastal States into doubt.

Closing the Pacific high seas enclaves to fishing would protect ecologically important and fragile open ocean and deep-sea habitats, and make it

significantly harder for unscrupulous fishing vessels to operate in the area without being detected. Of course, this does not preclude the need for other management measures, such as effort reduction in areas outside the marine reserve boundaries, but would be a significant contribution towards protecting biodiversity in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean and ensuring sustainable fisheries in the region.

The Pacific Forum Island countries have recognised the importance of protecting their marine environment. In 2006, Pacific Leaders issued a Declaration on the protection of high seas biodiversity from deep-sea bottom trawling, stating the need to “*preserve biodiversity, maintain the integrity of marine ecosystems and minimise the risk of long-term or irreversible effects of fishing operations*” as well as “*noting that it is in the mutual interest of all fishing nations active in the region, and the Pacific Islands, to protect and preserve the marine environment*”. More recently, the 2007 Vava’u Declaration also affirmed the Pacific Island countries’ commitment “*to the protection of high seas biodiversity and the conservation and management of non-highly migratory fish stocks in the Pacific Ocean*”.

In order to support the Pacific in ensuring the long-term future of their precious marine resources, it is important that the international community support the introduction of strong management and conservation measures, in particular the establishment of marine reserves in the region.

¹² C. Roberts *et al.* (2006), Roadmap to Recovery: A global network of marine reserves. The report presents a design for a global network of high seas marine reserves, covering 40.8% of the global oceans and including 29 candidate reserves. To achieve these aims the report brought together many different kinds of biological, physical and oceanographic data. The computer modelling tool Marxan was employed to help design the network which was refined with advice from over 60 leading marine biologists. <http://oceans.greenpeace.org/raw/content/en/documents-reports/roadmap-to-recovery.pdf>.

UNEP/CBD/COP/9/26:

The Potential Impacts of Biofuels on Biodiversity

UNEP/CBD/COP/9/3: Report of SBSTTA13

XIII/1. Review the implementation of the programme of work on agricultural biodiversity

XIII/2. Review the implementation of the programme of work on forest biodiversity

PRECAUTION ON BIOFUELS

International Action Required Now

Greenpeace welcomes the inclusion of the pressing issue of 'biofuels' into the negotiations of COP9 CBD and calls for strong, rapid and adequate decisions on that issue, due to the rapid unfolding of negative impacts of biofuels on biodiversity and depending on the crop sourced the impact on food security. The CBD and its three objectives provide a clear framework and *de facto* mandate to regulate the impacts of biofuel production and consumption. The international community has to act with a precautionary approach to biofuels: stop delaying and make strong decisions. New scientific evidence published since SBSTTA12 counters the argument by some countries that SBSTTA13 should not have made additional recommendations on biofuels and fully justifies holding a debate and taking precautionary decisions by COP9.

Biofuels should be part of the solution and not aggravate the environmental crisis

With the urgent need to address climate change now widely recognised, bioenergy is presented as one of many possible solutions for reducing greenhouse gas emissions (GHG). Greenpeace supports the development of alternative, climate-friendly energy sources, but insists that those alternatives must meet strict criteria that ensure environmental and social safeguards.

The biofuels sector must be regulated. Governments have failed to include the necessary environmental and social safeguards to address the impacts of biofuel production and consumption. There should only be governmental support for any bioenergy by way of incentives, tax exemptions or mandatory targets with a public policy framework in place that transparently guarantees that strict safeguards are fulfilled. This framework must ensure that biofuels do not undermine other central priorities such as food provision, nor do they threaten biodiversity and ecosystems that are the best guarantee for the future of life on earth.

Unfortunately, the current experience around the globe is that mainstream sources for biofuels from agriculture, do not meet appropriate social and environmental criteria and in many cases their greenhouse gas reduction is either non-existent or minimal.

Urgent Crisis

The scale of current and anticipated global biofuel (biodiesel and ethanol) consumption threatens not only the integrity of remaining biodiversity in the world, but could also compete and impact the availability of crops for food and feed, . For example, substituting even 10% of worldwide demand for diesel fuel for

road transport would require more than three-quarters of total current global soya, palm and rapeseed oil production¹³.

Meeting the growing demand for biodiesel is likely to take place through the expansion of palm oil plantations in countries like Indonesia and the region of Papua on the island of New Guinea. Major commodity traders are already planning significant expansion into the biodiesel infrastructure. Once established, this will increase the destruction of presently intact forest – that will also worsen climate change. Meeting only the EU projected growth in demand for vegetable oil through palm oil would require more than 15 million hectares of mature oil palm plantation. This is nearly three times the acreage that was under oil palm in Indonesia in 2005 and probably at the expense of the remaining intact forests¹⁴.

Alongside subsidies, it is the amount of mandatory targets for biofuels in transport fuels in many countries that is the main driver to the rush for agrofuels. For example, in early 2007, the EU endorsed a 10% target for biofuels in transport fuels by 2020. This almost doubles the target established in the 2003 Biofuel Directive (5.75% by 2010). The increased EU target was conditional on production being 'cost effective', 'second generation available' and – currently most important – 'sustainable'. But these requirements remain largely theoretical. Many countries have also adopted biofuels binding targets (US, Canada, etc.). The Chinese government expects that biofuels will meet 15% of its transport fuel demand by 2020¹⁵. India has set a target of securing 20% of its diesel from biofuels by 2012¹⁶. The US, currently using 6.8 billion gallons of biofuels, has a federal target for the use of 7.5 billion gallons by 2012, with a proposal to raise this further to 36 billion gallons by 2022¹⁷.

Solutions

There are two main types of bioenergy – biomass is used to produce electricity and/or heat; biofuels are used to fuel transport. Governments of developed countries increasingly support the use of biofuels for transport, whilst emerging research indicates that emissions savings from many biofuels are uncertain – most of the mainstream biofuels are significantly less efficient than the use of biomass in stationary applications such as cogeneration.

The use of biomass in stationary applications is acceptable when the feedstock is produced under strict criteria that ensure environmental and social safeguards. Potential examples are genuine agricultural and forestry residues, preferably used regionally and in cogeneration power plants. The production of biogas is an example of an efficient and potentially small-scale application that can help energy supply in remote areas, especially in some developing countries.

However, agriculture for biofuels can result in a number of unsustainable practices, including endangering natural ecosystems and local food security and even, in some cases, worsening the climate crisis. A number of governments, including Europe and the US, heavily subsidise biofuels in the transport sector and implement mandatory targets, but have no policies in place to address the negative environmental and social impacts.

COP9 can show leadership in assisting Parties and other international organisations to adopt the right policies and avoid the pitfalls.

¹³ Greenpeace (2007) Cooking the Climate.

<http://www.greenpeace.org/raw/content/international/press/reports/palm-oil-cooking-the-climate.pdf>

¹⁴ Greenpeace (2007) Cooking the Climate.

<http://www.greenpeace.org/raw/content/international/press/reports/palm-oil-cooking-the-climate.pdf>

¹⁵ GAIN (2006) China, Peoples Republic of: Bio-Fuels, An Alternative Future for Agriculture. GAIN Report Number: CH6049. <http://www.fas.usda.gov/gainfiles/200608/146208611.pdf>

¹⁶ Indian biodiesel mission. See, e.g. <http://www.jatrophabiodiesel.org/indianPrograms.php> for further details

¹⁷ Coyle, W. 2007. The future of biofuels: a global perspective. Amber Waves, Nov. Pub. by Economic Research Service, USDA. <http://www.ers.usda.gov/AmberWaves/November07/Features/Biofuels.htm>

Greenpeace urges parties attending CBD COP9 to:

Immediately adopt a precautionary approach by suspending the introductions of any new supportive measures for biofuels until the following safeguards have been implemented:

- End or avoid governmental support measures (e.g., subsidies, tax redemptions or mandatory targets) for any bioenergy without strict sustainability guarantees
- Oppose all unsustainable bioenergy production
- Adopt sustainability criteria for producing bioenergy that demonstrates, minimally:
 - Considerable positive net overall GHG balance of at least 60%
 - No direct or indirect degradation of natural forests and other natural ecosystems
 - Sustainable agricultural production (e.g. no GE crops, low chemical input)
 - No threat to local food security, in particular in developing countries
- Request Parties and all stakeholders to adopt policies that ensure all sources of bioenergy meet strict sustainability criteria
- Address the direct and indirect negative impacts (through full life cycle analysis) of the production and consumption of bioenergy (in particular biofuels, mass for energy and other causes of land conversion and forest degradation) on forest ecosystems, and ensure that guidelines or standards for the production of bioenergy, in particular biofuels, take any such negative impacts into account
- Prevent the leakage or displacement effect (expansion of one activity outside forests that pushes another activity into forests).

Greenpeace requests the Executive Secretary to:

- Assess the possible impacts on biodiversity of the use of cellulosic agricultural and forestry residues in second-generation biofuels (although residues are, per definition, limited) and the use of algae in closed systems as biofuel and to provide a report to the next SBSTTA
- Assess the options (e.g. capacity limitations) for producing bioenergy without conversion of forests, either direct or indirect

UNEP/CBD/COP9/ items 4.7 (Protected Areas) and 3.8 (Financial resources)

UNEP/CBD/COP9/8: Report of the Ad Hoc Open-Ended Working Group on Protected Areas on the Work of its Second Meeting

UNEP/CBD/COP9/16: Financial Resources and the Financial Mechanism - In-depth review of the availability of financial resources

Protected areas - organised in zones for sustainable use, buffer zones and no-take reserves - are the most important instrument to halt the loss of biodiversity. It is obvious that the UN 2010 Biodiversity target as well as the CBD's 2010/2012 Goals for Protected Areas will not be reached if Parties do not significantly accelerate the implementation of the Program of Work on Protected Areas and substantially increase financial resources for this implementation in the next couple of years.

Greenpeace therefore urges parties to prioritize the following issues:

- Prioritize the **speedy implementation of the programme of work on protected areas to reach the 2010 Biodiversity Goal and the 2010/2012 Protected Areas Goal**. A global network of protected areas will be a key tool in protecting especially the world's overexploited forests and oceans ecosystems.
- Emphasize the importance of protecting and respecting the **rights of indigenous peoples and local communities and assure their participation** in all activities regarding the programme of work on protected areas.
- Recommend that, **by 2010, at least 20% of the world's forests be effectively conserved in protected areas and protect, by 2010**, (according to IUCN categories I to VI) **at least 50% of forests that are ecologically and socially the most important** (including 'primary forests' according to the FAO FRA definition), containing all forest biomes and relevant forest types except plantations, as a significant contribution to meet the 2010 biodiversity target.
- Develop a **global mechanism to halt illegal logging by 2012** as one of the major threats to forest protected areas, and to **stop illegal, unregulated and unauthorized fishery techniques by 2010** as one of the major threats to marine biodiversity.
- Set aside **40% of the world's oceans as no-take marine reserves**.
- Recommend, with urgency, the **conservation of large intact ecosystems**, which are vital to the protection of the world's biodiversity, when establishing a global network of protected areas by 2010 on land and 2012 in the oceans; this should guide GEF priorities.
- Recommend parties **to use valuable tool kits** such as "**Intact Forest Landscapes of the World**: a method of identification of large unfragmented areas of natural ecosystems based on satellite imagery as core HCVMs"¹⁸ and "**Roadmap to Recovery**: a global network of marine reserves"¹⁹, when identifying priority forest and marine areas requiring protection. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) outlined that the size of protected areas will be critical in achieving

¹⁸ <http://www.intactforests.org/>

¹⁹ <http://oceans.greenpeace.org/raw/content/en/documents-reports/roadmap-to-recovery.pdf>

the 2010 biodiversity target and increasing the adaptation potential of ecosystems to climate change.

- Set up a process to **ensure that stakeholders can participate in the peer review of national reports**, focusing on the achievement of the goals and targets, best practices, obstacles to implementation and lessons learnt.

Financing Protected Areas

- **Prioritize the mobilization of funding to establish and manage a global network of protected areas as one of the most urgent activities** needed to avoid the impending failure of the 2010 Biodiversity target and therefore **substantially increase financial resources for Protected Areas**, thus making a direct contribution to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, which call for action to be taken to reverse the loss of environmental resources.
- Start with urgency and in accordance to CBD Art. 20 a **concerted financing initiative by developed countries to raise an extra US \$30 billion per year to finance the global network of protected areas** on land and at sea that Parties have agreed to establish by 2010/2012, including for community conserved areas and collaboratively managed protected areas, **engaging all developed countries from 1st January 2009**. The mobilisation of this money should no longer be postponed until, but must be started *in parallel* with the completion of country-level financial need assessments and financing plans.
- Prioritise the **development of an international financing mechanism by 2008 to generate new and additional financial resources for developing country parties** to ensure biodiversity conservation. Parties should in this respect decide that protection of biodiversity shall be fully integrated into future climate change agreements, including agreements on the reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD)
- Commit to undertake **immediate measures to eliminate perverse subsidies and other negative incentives** and to redirect these funds towards protected areas.
- Accomplish with urgency the **assessment of financial needs and gaps** in national and regional protected area funding, deliver **financial sustainability plans** for protected areas and address these unmet costs.

Implementation and Financing for Protected Areas NOW!

In 2004 Parties to the CBD committed themselves to develop jointly and individually a **global network of protected areas**, the backbone for achieving the 2010 biodiversity target. The timebound **goals and targets for 2008** include:

- identify gaps in the global network of protected areas
- establish mechanisms to address threats, such as illegal logging and related trade
- actions to address the under-representation of marine ecosystems in the global protected areas network
- establish mechanisms for sharing costs and benefits
- establish processes to ensure the full participation for indigenous and local communities
- review and revise policies and incentives
- secure sufficient financial resources
- significantly increase public awareness
- Adopt protected areas Standards, Criteria & Best Practices for Planning, Selecting, Establishing, Managing and Governing Protected Areas

Greenpeace recognizes that there has been some progress in several countries in achieving these targets, but is deeply concerned about the **lack of prioritisation this programme of work has been given in many regions and countries**. Major concerns include the lack of financial resources which could counterbalance destructive industries in the field of forestry, agriculture and fisheries. There are also few legal instruments in place to deter major threats (such as illegal logging) to protected areas or potential protected areas.

Climate change and biodiversity loss are intrinsically linked. Climate change is impacting negatively on the world's biodiversity, and land-use and land-use change is a major contributing factor to global warming (up to one third of greenhouse gas emissions). These linkages add further to the importance of ensuring the implementation of the Programmes of Work on protected areas, forest biodiversity and marine and coastal biodiversity.

The **2005 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment** concluded that the degradation of ecosystems caused by industrial exploitation has continued unabated, leading to further biodiversity loss and the destruction of peoples' livelihoods, particularly in the poorest countries. Protected Areas free from industrial extractive activities are a **key management and conservation tool** to ensure the long-term future of the livelihoods of local and indigenous communities, biodiversity, and the provision of essential ecosystem services.

There is a clear **need to mobilise additional long-term sources of funding for the implementation of the CBD**. The global nature of additional funding mechanisms is important. Biodiversity is not evenly distributed, and a number of important natural ecosystems produce goods and services that have regional and global benefits. This includes the regulation of water cycles, carbon sequestration and biodiversity conservation. Therefore, the international community has an obligation to fund, internationally, biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. Without substantial new flows of financial, technical and human resources it will be impossible to effectively implement the programme of work or avoid the impending failure of the 2010 target.

It is fundamental that countries ensure that **new and additional resources** are allocated. This is a precondition to ensure that the Programmes of Work on Protected Areas, Forest Biological Diversity and Marine and Coastal Biodiversity can be effectively carried out. Whilst countries are allocating further funds it is important for them to recognise that these programmes make a direct contribution to achieving the Millennium Development Goals, which call for action to be taken to reverse the loss of environmental resources. This is especially relevant for poorer countries that may be biodiversity-rich, yet require the most financial assistance.

The 2010 deadline is fast approaching. CBD COP9 is the last possibility to reach the UN 2010 biodiversity target. If this target and the CBD targets for Protected areas will not be met, the CBD as a whole has failed. Only urgent, courageous and concerted action by all parties to the Convention can prevent this failure.