

**Report of meeting of Commissioner Potocnik and NGOs in preparation for COP11
Meeting, 1 October 2012, 4-6pm**

Participants:

NGOs: Birdlife International, (pro natura), Wetlands International, WWF Deutschland, WWF Belgium, IUCN Europe

Commission: Janez Potocnik, Vesna Valant, Thomas Koetz (B2), Vassilis Koutsouris (E2)

The Commissioner started the meeting presenting his views on the key issues of COP11. He stated that on most of these issues common EU positions were yet to be found, what he would be presenting are his views and that of the European Commission.

The Commissioner emphasised the overall objective of this COP as 'keeping the good momentum of COP10', acknowledging that this will be difficult to achieve. He also flagged that on two important elements the EU has good news to bring: the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 and the European Commission proposal on the Nagoya Protocol. In addressing the main issues (resource mobilisation (RM), strategic plan (SP), and marine and coastal biodiversity (MC)) in more detail, he followed the briefing quite closely.

Unsurprisingly the focus of the discussion was mainly on resource mobilisation. On the side of the NGO, Birdlife International spoke the most (at least a felt 70% of the NGO speaking time) – and on RM issues almost exclusively. The Commissioner, in his first introduction to the issue, mentioned: the need to follow up on our commitments made in 2010; the need to engage in a constructive discussion even though basic methodological requirements had not been met; the EU's considerable contributions (3 billion); the need to be more consistent as regards harmful subsidies (within as outside the EU); the importance of Innovative Finance Mechanism (IFMs) to complete the picture; and the problem with the 10% increase ("doubling would be fine", but the habit of using percentages in budgetary discussions is ill advised and would result in a very unjustified treatment of the EU's contribution to the CBD so far). He also mentioned the MFF that will probably have much to offer on the matter, but which could unfortunately not be raised officially as it will be concluded only afterwards.

The NGOs in turn urged the EU to come to COP11 with a proposal that follows the commitment it made in 2012, reminding that it was the EU that pushed for postponing a decision on RM from COP10 to COP11. They further underlined the importance of agreeing on the 2 prerequisites for RM (reporting framework, baseline) as being the absolute minimum to get out of CO11 (Commissioner agreed and committed to do what he can to achieve this). Acknowledging that the issue of target setting would be difficult they nevertheless urged for a list of points made in their one-pager "Urgent Call to the EU and its Member States" that was delivered at the meeting (see attached). When pushed to say something about quantitative targets the Commissioner responded that he advised his staff to get the maximum out of the MS consensus in order to be constructive, but hinted to a range of MS that would make this a difficult ride. They further raised: the issue of harmful subsidies of the EU, pointing in particular to the CAP (which after having pushed them to be more precise the Commissioner answered that the proposed CAP Reform would address much of their concerns and that this is currently up for decision of MS and EP); the responsibility of BRICS in contributing financial flows as well (Commissioner referred to Rio+20 follow up and the need to discuss the concept of 'common but differentiated responsibility (CBDR) since things have changed since 1992); IFMs, TEEB follow up and the problem of 'commodification of biodiversity' (Commissioner defended the idea of valuing nature as otherwise it would not be taken into account at all, made reference to ETS, Green Infrastructure, No Net Loss Initiative and 2 RTD projects on this issue).

Other issues addressed included: the Strategic Plan and the need of the EU to engage in capacity building with regards to technical needs assessments with respect to its implementation (EU is already supporting NBSAPs) and a questions with regard to the revival of the idea of having 'milestones' introduced to the SP again (refused as really bad idea); Marine issues and whether the EU would be funding future progress on the EBSA process (probably yes); and on the EU's engagement in biodiversity policies in Overseas Territories; and the Nagoya Protocol and when to expect the adoption of the EU's legislative proposal for ratification (before COP11).



2012100219313...



CONSERVATION
INTERNATIONAL



The Nature
Conservancy
Protecting nature. Preserving life.



REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGY FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

Urgent Call to the EU and its Member States

for the 11th Conference of the Parties to the CBD, 8 - 19 October, Hyderabad

Agenda Item 4.1 (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/14; UNEP CBD/COP/11/14, ADD 1, 2, 3;
UNEP CBD/COP/11/4/2)

The group of NGOs consisting of Conservation International (CI), BirdLife International, The Nature Conservancy (TNC), and WWF commend the ongoing process to review and improve the implementation of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization (SRM).

We emphasize the importance and urgency of agreeing funding targets at COP-11 that will ensure meaningful progress towards adequately financing the implementation of the Aichi Targets. While precise figures are not available, existing financial needs assessments from national, regional and global levels already indicate that hundreds of billions of dollars per year are needed to implement the Aichi Targets successfully. We believe that the available data and interpretation are sufficient to generate meaningful targets for this investment.

We reiterate the Nagoya Deal at COP 10 and the attempt of the EU to postpone a decision on setting financial targets to COP 11. Now it's time for the EU to deliver in order to make progress in achieving the Aichi Targets. Therefore, we urge the EU to:

I. On Setting Meaningful Funding Targets:

- Commit to a 20% compounded annual increase in international financial flows from 2013 to 2020, as a minimum meaningful step towards closing the funding gap.
- Welcome the results of both the High-Level Panel global assessment and the funding needs assessments for the GEF-6 replenishment, and make use of the results to set meaningful targets to mobilize financial resources from all appropriate sources.
- Agree to a 10% compounded annual increase in domestic funding for achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets from 2013-2020, recognizing that significant increase of funding within the EU is also necessary.
- The EU should support developing countries to assess the available domestic biodiversity funding in order to adjust the domestic funding target at COP-12.
- Request the High Level Panel, supported by UK, to continue its work with a second phase to develop a more precise estimate of costs to achieve the Aichi Targets for further consideration at COP-12.

II. On Prerequisites for Resource Mobilization Targets:

- Endorse the use of the average annual biodiversity funding for the period 2006-2010 as the baseline for resource mobilization as the most appropriate approach.
- Adopt the revised reporting framework, as given in document UNEP/CBD/COP/11/ADD.1, with plans for its review based on experiences in its application by Parties, incl. the EU.

The full joint NGO Position Paper is inter alia available online at www.panda.org/cop11.

Brussels, 1 October 2012