

**Regional Preparatory Meeting for the CBD COP9
13-16 April 2008, LeVasa Resort, Samoa**

DAY 1

Introduction

1. The Pacific Regional Preparatory Meeting for the CBD COP9 was held at Le Vasa Resort, Samoa, from 13-16 April 2008. The meeting included participants from Fiji, Palau, Nauru, Cook Islands, Kiribati, Niue, PNG, Tuvalu, Tonga, Marshall Islands, SPC, SOPAC, FIELD, IUCN, USP, the Indigenous Peoples Council on Biocolonialism, O le Siosiomaga Society, IFAW and SPREP.

Preliminaries

2. The meeting opened at 8:30.
3. In the absence of a host nation representative, SPREP called for nominations for Chair.
4. Tuvalu were nominated and elected unopposed.
5. The Chair requested Cook Islands to lead the meeting in a prayer.
6. Cook Islands conducted the prayer.

PRESENTATION – COP9 Issues, Day 1, 9:00-9:30

7. Kate provided an overview of the CBD processes for those new to the CBD. The Powerpoint presentation will be provided to meeting participants on their flash drives.
8. Ana provided an overview of the WGRI meeting. Key issues were noted as:
 - A current focus on NBSAPs and their implementation and the status of NBSAPs across the Globe.
 - The need to mainstream biodiversity into national planning.
 - A call for new and additional financial resources both from the national and international sector.
 - A call for determining the value of biodiversity and using local financial and human resources and strengthening ties with the GEF and other biodiversity-related conventions.
 - In summary, formulation, implementation and monitoring were the main issues for discussion at the meeting.
9. Kate conducted a review of the Preparatory Meeting Agenda.
10. Kate stated that financial support to attend the CBD COP had changed and that it was now a first come first served basis. There is a need to communicate the nomination procedures within the PICs.
11. Kate noted the Island Biodiversity recommendations for the COP, in addition to the Biodiversity and Climate Change recommendations arising from SBSTTA 12 and 13.

PRESENTATIONS by Contracting Parties, Day 1, 9:30 – 10:13

12. The Chair asked the Contracting Parties to make presentations, in particular identifying key issues that relate to the COP agenda.

13. The representative for **Cook Islands** said the key issues relating to the COP agenda are:

- Invasive species
- Protected areas
- Ecosystems approach
- Financial mechanisms (particularly if they will enable funding of the IBPoW)
- Also question whether a proposal under GEF PAS on an integrated programme of work under the NBSAP IBPoW will cover ecosystem approaches and protected areas

[Question from SPC not heard]

14. The representative for **Kiribati** said the key issues relating to the COP agenda are:

- 3.1 agricultural biodiversity
- 3.2 global strategy for plant conservation
- 3.3 invasive alien species
- 3.4 forest biodiversity
- 3.8 financial resources and financial mechanism
- Thanked SPREP and other donors for arranging the meeting and Samoa's hospitality since arriving.

15. The representative for **Fiji** said the recent developments in Fiji included:

- Enactment of the Environment Management Act 2007, which highlights environmental impacts and assessment
- Cabinet endorsement of climate change policy in late 2007
- Cabinet policy on forest policy also recently developed [or passed?]
- NBSAP last year launched last in 2007
- Fiji noted that these policies (above) also have strategic action plans that define their implementation, however a lack of resources and capacity is an obstacle to implementation.

16. The representative for **Fiji** said the key issues relating to the COP agenda are:

- Invasive alien species, specifically:
 - Importance of information sharing and the transferring of information – noted that it would be nice to have a system where it's easy to access relevant information
 - Inter-island biosecurity issues, including capacity building for the quarantine department

17. SPC asked if Fiji had ratified the ITPGR.

18. Fiji apologised that she was unable to answer the question as was unsure if it had been ratified by Fiji

19. The representative for **Marshall Islands** said the key issues relating to the COP agenda are:

- Invasive alien species. Stated that a national invasive species strategy for Marshall Islands is in draft form (yet to be endorsed by Government). Aware of the regional invasive species strategy, although the national strategy focuses on national issue only.
- Sea level rise and climate change, and their effect on biodiversity
- Island biodiversity. Noted that extensive nuclear testing in recent decades may have caused potential long-term impacts on four atolls in the RMI that are now not populated and food sources from these atolls are not safe to eat.
- Protected areas. Noted that there are many current Protected Area initiatives in the RMI.
- Financial resources and financial mechanisms.
- Access and benefit sharing.
- There are many other issues, although these are the main ones.

- Thanked Samoa for their hospitality.
20. SPC asked if there was any progress in an NGO proposal to extend work on a coastal and marine analysis that it started in Majuro?
21. Marshall Islands responded that the RMI Government was still discussing this issue. Noted that the NGO didn't approach the correct focal point. The RMI Government response to this will be progressed in the next month.
22. The representative for **Nauru** said the key issues relating to the COP agenda are:
- Island biodiversity. Noted that Nauru will be finalising their NBSAP towards the end of this year.
 - Marine and Coastal. Noted that there are currently a number of fisheries projects currently in Nauru
 - Communication and awareness. Noted that this was a big issue, particularly in terms of biodiversity.
 - Thanked SPREP for organizing the meeting
23. The representative for **Palau** said the key issues relating to the COP agenda are:
- Ecosystems approach. Noted that Palau will support recommendations on this item
 - Financial resources and financial mechanisms. Noted that special consideration is required for SIDS, particularly relating to the GEF-PAS
 - Access and Benefit Sharing
 - Biodiversity and climate change
 - Protected Areas. Noted the Palau congress is currently debating a Bill that will require tourists to pay a 'green fee' of \$20 or \$30 to cover conservation initiatives. Also noted the Government of Taiwan has provided an initial \$100K for the Micronesia Challenge and there has been a \$200K private donation from an Israeli.
 - Island biodiversity. Noted that this is a particular area of importance.
 - Also stated that Palau had recently joined the Coral Triangle Initiative.
24. USP stressed that we need equal focus on smaller countries that are not necessarily part of a hotspot on biodiversity conservation. Added that we are looking too much at threatened species hotspots and not ecological hotspots, specifically around heavily urbanized areas. Suggested that maybe we should be focusing on urban biodiversity conservation.
25. Palau stated they had also nominated FSM to join the Coral Triangle Initiative.
26. The representative for **PNG** said the key issues relating to the COP agenda are:
- Protected Areas Programme of Work. Noted that the targets for 2010 and 2012 were of particular concern, as PNG is a big country and will not be able to meet the target. Added that in PNG most of the protected areas are declared on traditional or customary owned land and that to enable better capacity to meet targets PNG need better financial resources. Added there have been examples of protected areas in PNG being reduced to enable growth of the palm oil industry, so access to financial mechanisms to make sure this doesn't happen is essential.
 - REDD [statement not heard]
27. The representative for **Tonga** said the recent developments in Tonga included:
- NBSAP launched and have recently completed their third national report
 - Submitted biodiversity add-on to UNDP
 - Identified mainstreaming biodiversity as a priority
 - Tonga is hoping to meet targets by 2012
 - Highlighted importance of traditional knowledge and benefit sharing
 - Capacity building is a key issue

28. The representative for **Tonga** said the key issues relating to the COP agenda are:
 - Island biodiversity
 - Invasive alien species
 - Biodiversity and climate change
 - Also thanked SPRPE for organising the meeting
29. Tonga also stated that the EIA Act supports biodiversity and that Tonga has ascended to Kyoto Protocol. Added that Cabinet has agreed to establish a climate change committee at cabinet level.
30. SPC stated that in a recent trip to Tonga he noted that the survival of a particularly valuable tree species [didn't hear which one] was almost exhausted, although harvesting of it still continuing. SPC had advised Tonga that they should introduce a moratorium on the logging and start a regeneration programme.
31. The representative for **Tuvalu** said the key issues relating to the COP agenda are:
 - Biodiversity in general. Noted that this is very important in terms of food, traditional knowledge, medicine etc. However, while Tuvalu has not developed its NBSAP, it is hoping to progress it in the near future. Marine and coastal biodiversity is specifically important as all people in Tuvalu live on the coast, and we need to protect these resources from climate change and other impacts.
 - Climate change and biodiversity. Stated that in past years the climate variations are producing impacts, such as inundation.
 - Agricultural biodiversity. Noted that it is hard to grow crops on poor soils, which are prevalent in Tuvalu
 - Protected areas.
 - Invasive alien species.
 - Financial resources and financial mechanisms.
 - Shared others in thanking SPREP to enable meeting to be conducted.
32. SPC commented that in a recent visit to Tuvalu he noted one of the main issues raised by agriculture was a lack of peat in the swamps, which are dying because of salt spray. Suggested that Tuvalu develop an initiative to introduce a more resilient type of peat [not sure if this is an initiative that is currently being implemented by SPC]. Added that SPC are currently identifying what types of taro are most suitable to growing in Tuvalu to improve food production, such as a salt resistant species that is common in FSM.
33. Fiji noted the importance of biodiversity in the Pacific nations, and added that economic evaluations of biodiversity in countries would be a useful.
34. FIELD stated that the German Government economic evaluations for biodiversity of large industrialized countries, with a view to developing a global evaluation of biodiversity. Added that this issue is important to the German Government and it is like they will make an announcement at the Bonn meeting that they are progressing this issue. FIELD stated that the Pacific has very specific needs relating to economic evaluation of biodiversity. Added in summary that this issue is out there and is being pushed by several governments. Suggested the next tier below a global evaluation is a regional evaluation, and we should consider ways of encouraging our Ministers to progress development of a regional evaluation.
35. SPC added that national evaluations are also important as most of the successful implementation of initiatives based on economic evaluation of biodiversity is at the local level.
36. IUCM stated that IUCN is engaged in delivery of the Pacific Oceans 2020 Challenge. The idea of this challenge is initially to develop a report (similar to STERN) that will include economic evaluations. Added that the French would likely free some funding to territories to progress evaluations of biodiversity. Also added that at the end of May there will be a CRISP

workshop on economic evaluations, with the key focus on technical expertise, although it will include representation from end-users, as these are critical in implementation of conservation efforts that use economic evaluations as a component.

37. SOPAC added that from a practitioner perspective you really need information that is at the local level for many reasons. There was a global evaluation of biodiversity done a few years ago, which was good for raising profile at the global level, although without information at the local level implementation is difficult.
38. The Chair called for morning tea at 10:13 and asked that we resume at 10:30.
39. The group photo was taken during the morning tea break.
40. Meeting resumed at 10:45.
41. The Chair invited comments from the CROP Agencies and NGOs.

COMMENTS by CROP Agencies and NGOs, Day 1 10:45 – 11:43

42. **SPREP** Stated they will provide comment throughout the meeting.
43. The representative from **USP** thanked SPREP for this meeting and IUCN for providing funding to the Ramsar preparatory meeting last week.

Noted that USP is expanding its involvement in conservation of biodiversity, although they 'fall through the cracks' in terms of classification of CROP agencies, as different in that they undertake significant research.

In the past 15 years USP have really become an NGO in their outreach activities, and have been particularly active in the LMMA network. USP are very strong in teaching, research and consultancy, although they recognise they have gaps and keen to find out where the needs of the members are.

USP have been able to strengthen partnerships with other CROP agencies and NGOs across a number of initiatives.

USP has been main collaborator for the Pacific islands biodiversity transect initiative and have also worked closely with CENON and SPRIG [?].

USP's partnership with SPC and SPREP has been particularly good, specifically in relation to PaciNET, through which USP have been providing training. There are also a number of Masters students that are now out in the region that have trained at USP.

PILN is another example where USP have successfully collaborated with other CROPs.

USP are also involved in a Danish initiative to identify changes to biodiversity in the Solomon Islands over a 50 year time period.

Macarthur Foundation, Packer Foundation, NOAA, and French have been major donors to USP, while SPREP, SPC and SOPAC have also included USP in many initiatives.

USP have committed that by 2010, 10% of all graduates will contribute to initiatives under the CBD. Furthermore, USP have recently established a new Faculty of Islands and Oceans to focus on biodiversity. New programmes include biodiversity conservation, and biodiversity and climate change.

USP also has a community conservation training course.

USP is owned by 12 Member countries.

44. The representative for **SPC** provided a PowerPoint presentation to be provided to participants.

USP recently held a regional workshop on Forest Genetic Resources funded through AusAID PGSP, which developed a vision for 2020. This workshop identified priorities and strategies for research and development, and found that all activities are related (a summary of the strategy that was developed through the workshop will be provided to this meeting). The workshop also identified a group of priority tree species for attention by the regional tree seed centre. Critical enabling strategies include education and public awareness, capacity building and institutional strengthening, and forest policy and governance. Conservation will be difficult if these key points are not addressed.

45. The representative from **SOPAC** thanked SPREP for the invitation for attend meeting.

Said that SOPAC are mandated to conserve non-living natural resources, which provide habitats for many living natural resources.

There are three programmes in SOPAC – Oceans and Islands, Community Lifelines, and Community Risk.

In relation to biodiversity, the protection of the coastal environment is relevant to SOAPC, as is habitat protection through disaster management.

SOPAC is well known for 'hands on' role based on mapping and science, but has also moved into social and economic analysis.

SOPAC have developed a very brief paper that describes some of their work can assist implementation of NBSAPs. Some examples of work relating to science that may be of assistance to NBSAP work include:

- Detailed mapping of fisheries habitats
- Hazard mapping (changes in morphology) and their impacts on changing habitats
- Mineral and aggregate assessment
- Flood prediction relating to habitat destruction
- Rainwater availability through GIS analysis

An example of an economic analysis in Kiribati, which was given to the Government to assist in their decision-making process included:

- Mapping of coastal process around islands
- Causes of erosion and flood risk, such as coastal mining for construction
- Social assessment of coastal mining of aggregates
- Assessment of aggregate resources in the lagoon
- Hydrodynamic modeling
- Economic analysis of extracting aggregates from the lagoon

SOPAC noted there is some EU funding available to progress economic analysis of biodiversity.

46. USP said that he appreciated involvement in some work with SOPAC [unable to record rest of statement]. USP also noted that they have GIS programmes and encourage future collaboration using USP expertise relating to GIS, such as the recent successful GIS analysis of biodiversity in Nauru.

47. The representative of **WWF** said that WWF is the biggest sustainable development NGO in the world and will be a big presence at CBD. WWF said she would share information that she had today that could help members to prepare for some of the issues at CBD that WWF are most interested in.

WWF focus on working with the community in the region through support, capacity building, assessment of effectiveness of protected areas, and strengthening of governance (with governments).

WWF, which have been involved in the Pacific for 14 years have started to develop a programme on offshore fisheries, specifically tuna fisheries.

WWF is very aware that we are 'losing the war' on biodiversity conservation. A paper will be presented at CBD that looks beyond 2010 and the fact that we are still losing biodiversity. The paper will also focus on how we can increase our efforts to improve conservation outcomes.

WWF have a new Director General who used to be head of the Packer Foundation. In the future WWF will focus on key strategies such as the Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI), although most efforts to date have focused on increasing funding to the region. The CTI is a government led initiative, and the boundaries have now expanded to include Fiji, Vanuatu, Palau and FSM, while commitments have been made by GEF, ADB, and the US Government.

WWF believes the key issue is clearly the capacity of departments and governments and we need to build these into funding initiatives, particularly given the influx of funding through initiatives such as the CTI.

WWF also said that it will be very difficult to implement all aspects of the CBD and we need to work with NGOs on implementation where possible.

WWF stated that it's becoming clearer that the developed countries are not giving enough funding to conserve biodiversity in developing countries, and we should be pressuring the developed countries to provide more where possible.

48. The representative of **IUCN** said that IUCN don't regard themselves as NGO as much of the membership is from governments.

IUCN have recently signed an MoU with the Department of Environment in Fiji.

IUCN is committed to working in true collaboration in the Pacific and have an MoU with SPREP and are developing an MoU with SOPAC.

IUCN is the oldest and one of the largest environmental organisations – formed in 1948, although it doesn't see its role as competing with NGOs, rather complementing their work.

IUCN conduct a congress every four years where members meet to make decisions on key strategic areas. The next congress is in October this year, where the four key strategic areas for discussion are marine, freshwater, energy, and protected areas. The Pacific Ocean 2020 initiative will also be discussed.

IUCN noted that it is difficult to engage in the region without dedicated focal points.

IUCN also noted the clear link between CBD and Ramsar and encouraged participants to engage Ramsar through coral reef initiatives.

49. The representative of **FIELD** said that FIELD are a UK based, environmental law focused NGO.

FIELD have a long history of providing support and legal advice in the Pacific, particularly relating to biodiversity, CITES, and climate change.

FIELD wanted to convey that we shouldn't think of international process as top-down, and these regional meetings are a chance to influence decision-making from the bottom-up.

FIELD also noted that it is important not to have a silo mentality on biodiversity and to think beyond the CBD on biodiversity issues as there are other mechanisms out there that are related.

50. The representative of the **Indigenous Peoples Council on Biocolonialism (IPCB)** said that IPCB are based in Nevada and don't specifically work in the Pacific, although have had some engagement in assisting the preparation of briefing papers and workshops.

IPCB's particular focus in this region is on Access and Benefit Sharing in relation to conservation and economic evaluations relating to indigenous peoples. IPCB also notes the particular emphasis on ABS relating to marine resources, where there is not a dedicated approach to address this issue on a global scale although it is of particular importance to the Pacific.

The session ended at 11:43.

PRESENTATION – Invasive Alien Species, Day 1, 11:43 – 12:14

Presentation provided by SPREP (Dr Alan Tye). The presentation will be provided to participants on their flash drive.

51. Key points raised in presentation:
- Key issue on CBD agenda is to identify where the priority-shared areas are.
 - 'Guidelines for Invasive Species Management in the Pacific' (included in printed papers), and 'Statement to SBSTTA' (included on flash drive) will be important for the CBD COP. These guidelines are simple and comprehensive in tackling invasives.
52. The three questions this meeting needs to ask in preparation for CBD COP in relation to invasive species are:
1. Do we need to emphasise the special importance of invasives in the region?
 2. What are the shared priority areas?
 3. How do we present these positions?
53. A discussion followed focusing on if we need to elect a leader for this topic to assist establish a regional position and take it forward as 'at the COP.
54. Kate said that SPREP or the other support people can't talk on this at the COP, as it must be put forward by a member party.
55. USP said that if we choose a leader to present the issue at the COP we will still need to work with NZ and Australia as these are active players on this issue at the COP.
56. Alan added that timing was an issue and we need to progress this in the next couple of days.
57. Kate agreed with Randy but said perhaps we should develop a position and then work with NZ to take it forward at the COP. Kate emphasised that we need a point person to be able to

move this issue forward at the COP, and that the resource people (like SPREP) will be there to assist moving regional issues forward, although they can't actually present them. Kate said there was a list of resource people that will be at the COP in the handout notes.

58. Kate suggested that we could talk about this now, or perhaps we could get an idea of what sort of things the group here would like to see raised at the COP, and then perhaps Alan and a small group could form to discuss this in more detail and report back to the group.
59. Alan displayed a slide that summarised a number of potential key areas for invasive species and identified those that related to the priorities that participants put forward in their country presentations. These priority areas were:
 - International standards
 - Information services and sharing,
 - Economic impacts / valuation
 - Training
 - Internal quarantine / biosecurity
 - National invasives strategies
60. Alan said the last two points were quite likely national issues and maybe not relevant at COP9.
61. USP said that marine invasives are a developing issue, as we don't know too much about it and there is a serious potential impact, although Australia and US have done some work into this area.
62. Alan agreed that we don't know much about marine invasives.
63. IUCN said there was a workshop organised in Samoa last year that indicated that countries want assistance on the ground relating to invasive species (although workshops are important for identifying priorities). Added that Tony (SPREP) was organising workshop on SRIMPAC later this year and that if this is a priority in the region then IUCN are happy to help progress it.
64. Alan said that we need know where to put money in the marine invasives area.
65. USP said that we need information and initiatives on offshore small islands as these are very important for some species colonies.
66. PNG said that international standards were a priority area as there are some invasives that affect all rivers in PNG. This includes quarantine issues and risk assessments.
67. PNG added that economic impacts were also a key priority area.
68. IUCN stated that they are working on a project of the status of freshwater species in the Pacific (only Samoa, Tonga and Solomon Islands remain to be surveyed), and requested that interested participants keep in touch with IUCM on this issue as it also relates to control of the invasive talapia [not sure of spelling].
69. Kate said that we should be thinking about the recommendations relating to invasives, specifically international standards and [second point not heard] . Kate added that one of the recommendations means that the Pacific will no longer be able to export tropical fish to Europe and we need to think about the ramifications of the recommendations.
70. Alan said that there were no real references to risk assessments to base the recommendations relating to international standards on, and perhaps we could recommend

to the COP that changes to international standards are based on risk assessment, as they will have an impact on trade from the region.

71. Kate asked if there were any interested parties that wanted to form a focus group to progress this issue?
72. Alan requested that the focus group have one person that has experience in CBD COPs.
73. Kate said that generally this was how these sessions would operation – a presentation followed by formation of a small group that would discuss in detail and report back to the meeting. Kate suggested that the invasive species focus group could discuss the issue during the 2nd half of lunch.
74. Fiji, Marshall Islands, USP and Alan agreed to form the group. Alan asked if we could print out the relevant notes for the group to consider.
75. The Chair then called a break for lunch at 12:15 and asked participants to return by 13:30.

Meeting resumed at 13:40

PRESENTATION – Feedback from the Oceania Preparatory Meeting for Ramsar, Day 1, 1340-14:01

Presentation provided by SPREP (Vai) and IUCN . The presentation will be provided to participants on their flash drive.

76. Vai briefly outlined the outcomes of the preparatory meeting for the COP10, held in Samoa on 10/11 April, 2008.
77. Main points raised in presentation (by Vai):
 - Discussions at the Ramsar preparatory meeting included:
 - Reports on 36th meeting of the Standing Committee (SC) and STRP14
 - Technical presentations
 - Group discussions
 - Improving regional priorities
 - COP10 agenda and issues
 - COP10 participation
 - Issues for SC37
 - Election of new SC regional rep (2009-2001), which is the Marshall Islands
 - The main outcomes from the preparatory meeting include a statement that includes recommendations relating to:
 - Wetlands financing / funding
 - Promotion of the critical importance and appreciation of wetlands
 - Increased focus on coral reefs
 - Connectivity of island ecosystems
 - Continuation of the regional support position at SPREP
 - Need for on-the-ground capacity building
 - Better coordination and harmonisation of data
 - Streamlining reporting of MEAs
 - Need to update the wetlands inventory
 - Coral reefs and mangroves
 - Information sharing
 - Extractive industries

- Climate change
- Invasive species
- Promotion of cultural knowledge and methods
- The preparatory meeting report will be finalised in mid-May, prior to the SC37 in June 2008.
- A regional brief will also be developed from the preparatory meeting for COP10.

78. Main points raised in the presentation (by IUCN):

- The substantive resolutions for Ramsar COP10 relate to:
 1. Wetlands and human health
 2. Wetlands and highly pathogenic avian influenza
 3. Wetlands and climate change
- Possible other resolutions are:
 1. The conservation and management of urban resolutions
 2. Changwon Declaration
- Short resolutions to adopt the annexed guidance were also discussed, some of which have specific relevance to the region, and Philippe encouraged the meeting to work with their wetlands members to progress developing positions against the resolutions.
- Information Papers and/or Advisory Notes:
 - STRP report to COP10
 - Rationale for describing wetland ecological characteristics
 - A framework for data and information needs
 - Issues and options concerning detecting, reporting and responding to change in ecological character
 - Terminologies concerning ecosystem services
 - Response options in the Millennium Ecosystem assessment
 - Progress in developing a framework and guidelines for wetlands and agriculture
 - Review of utility of COP scientific and technical resolutions and guidelines
 - Examples of effectiveness indicator assessments
 - Needs for restructuring the Strategic Framework and Guidelines
 - Wetlands and extractive industries
 - Approaches to assessing the vulnerability of wetlands to hydrological impacts of climate change
 - Key messages on wetlands, water and climate change
- IUCN also outlined some of the 15 Technical Reports that will be presented at COP10.

79. Ana lead the members in an 'exercise session' to reinvigorate the meeting following lunch.

PRESENTATION – Protected Areas Programme of Work – Issues to be covered at COP9, Day 1, 14:05, 14:19

Presentation provided by SPREP (Kate and Ana). The presentation will be provided to participants on their flash drive.

80. Kate said the presentation is included as COP9/8 in the meeting papers.

81. Key points raised in presentation:

- COP7 established that Protected Areas were essential to achieving the CBD and MDG goals and therefore the Programmes of Work for Protected Areas (PoWPA) was adopted. A working group was also established to progress the PoWPA.
 - The PoWPA consists of 4 interlinked elements focused on:
 1. Planning, selecting, establishing, strengthening and managing Protected Area sites
 2. Governance and participation
 3. Enabling activities
 4. Standards, assessment and monitoring
 - The WG2 meeting reviewed implementation and drew up recommendations for improved implementation of the PoWPA. The review found that enhanced effort was needed to catalyse political will and commitment throughout society. Keynote address by the President of FSM was very well received.
 - The WG2 developed two recommendations:
 1. Review of implementation of the PoWPA
 2. Options for mobilising financial resources for its implementation
 - There is a lot of tension between the developed countries and developing countries relating to increasing levels of financing. Developing countries are calling for additional funding above current levels and more creating funding mechanisms. The considerable tension in the WG meeting led to Indigenous groups walking out of the meeting and not returning.
 - There are a number of bracketed recommendations relating to Protected Areas, and almost all of the recommendations relating to financial resourcing are bracketed. Developing countries are opposed to an increase in GEF funding under the PAS, and have questioned the emphasis on innovative funding. Some developed countries wanted to link Protected Areas initiatives to global efforts to mitigate climate change under the GEF-PAS. Even the recommendation title is bracketed.
 - At the global level there is an organisation called 'Friends of POWPA', which is running a series of capacity building initiatives across the globe, which will hopefully include Oceania next year. At COP9 Germany will initiative a \$40M (euro) programme to match voluntary commitments by States.
82. IUCN asked what is defined as a Protected Area to arrive at the figure of 11.2% of the world being covered by Protected Areas?
83. Kate responded that they include anything in the Protected Areas database and the figure is very unlikely to be accurate, as it doesn't include a lot of information.
84. Kate gave a presentation on PA in the Pacific. Key points raised in the presentation:
- The concept of Protected Areas in the Pacific has progressed over the past 23 years from governments enabling communities to protect their land in 1975, to conservation serving communities in 2007. Over these years the Pacific has seen a lot of activity on Protected Area development.
 - There is an objective in the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation relating to Protected Areas through conserving ecosystems.
 - The Pacific Protected Areas database is way out of date and we've got to the point where we don't actually know where our entire Protected Areas are in the Pacific.

- In 2007 the PIF reaffirmed their governments commitments to environmental conservation and called on CROPs, developed partners, NGOs etc to set up sustainable financing mechanisms to progress Protected Areas.
- There is more focus on marine protected areas than terrestrial protected areas, and in fact SPREP has recently appointed a Marine Conservation Analyst.
- In Pacific there is only 2% of combined EEZs protected in the Pacific, and we need to meet a 10% target for WSSD by 2010. We should meet the target by 2017 if we continue on with our current commitments.
- There are a number of Protected Area initiatives currently in place in the Pacific:
 - Micronesia Challenge (30% near shore, 20% terrestrial by 2020).
 - Coral Triangle Initiative – by 2012 50% increase from 2007 levels of coverage of MPAs
 - Phoenix Islands Marine Protected Areas
 - Fiji commitment to manage 30% of its waters as a network of MPAs by 2020
 - LMMA network
- There is a publication that analyses funding of Protected Areas, which is basically a book of case studies. Funding of Protected Areas is generally a mix of traditional funding (from governments etc) and innovative funding sources (green taxes, ecosystem services, trust funds etc). The book includes a case study of Palau that found that the cost of managing Protected Areas in Palau was approximately \$2000USD/Ha, which meant that managing Palau's existing sites was over \$1M USD, which doesn't include extending the network or research and development (including these it was over \$2M USD, which was a shortfall of over \$1.5M USD for what they had). To overcome this Palau now charge a \$15 USD departure and arrival fee as a green tax, although they still need an additional \$600K USD. A recommendation has been put forward to establish a \$12M USD endowment that will hopefully return 5% per annum and cover the shortfall.
- In 1997 there were 65 MMAs in the Pacific (including Hawaii), and in 2006 there were 210 MPAs, covering 1.7% of EEZs. In 2006 there were 4607 MPAs globally, covering 1.5% of the area within EEZs. In the Pacific, most of the LMMAs and CCAs are not documented.
- LMMAs in the Pacific largely rely on no-take zones. In Fiji LMMAs now constitute 27% of the inshore EEZ.
- Hugh McGovern is now looking at assessing the contribution of LMMAs/MMAs/CCAs to WSSD and CBD targets and what the estimated cost of up-scaling to meet the targets would be.
- UNDP GEF has \$14.3M in grants to support governments in implementing the PoWPA in the Pacific. Even though this is supposed to be fast to access, which it generally is for start-up grants, it is much more difficult to obtain funding for project implementation.
- With its huge marine domain the Pacific is well positioned to make a significant contribution to meeting global targets with 38.5M sq km of EEZ with huge ecosystem value.
- The CBD Secretariat estimates the total annual cost of effective management of the existing Protected Areas in developing countries ranges from \$1.1B to \$2.5B.

85. Fiji noted we had done so much work on marine protected areas and not on terrestrial protected areas. Added that the difference was disproportionate, as in Fiji the protection of terrestrial ecosystems has effects on the marine environment too.
86. Kate said she didn't know why but there are certainly more people employed on marine rather than terrestrial protected areas. We also have much better info on marine protected areas, although the only way it's going to get updated is if people in the countries actually do it themselves.
87. USP said that it's a shame we don't have representatives from the French territories here as they have developed some initiatives on protected areas.
88. Kate added that although the Pacific territories can't speak at the COPs, they attend the meetings and can assist in progressing regional positions. Added that while NZ were not here (had sent apologies) they are interested in assisting the region. Kate stated that the French territories were invited to this meeting.
89. IUCN said that WWF had organised an exchange relating to LMMAs in the region [unable to hear remainder of statement]
90. Kate said that as we can't provide French translation it is difficult for French Territories to attend.
91. Palau said that we should be able to get ourselves more organised as a Pacific block, and not necessarily rely on engagement from NZ, Australia or the French territories. If we can establish our priorities first, we could then engage NZ, Australia etc more effectively.
92. Kate agreed and suggested we should use this sort of meeting to establish regional positions.
93. Stuart said it's critical that we don't lose site of the conservation value of the protected areas we are conserving and the effectiveness of management while we are pursuing targets should therefore be a consideration. We need to ensure we're protecting the right areas and they're being managed properly.
94. Kate agreed and pointed to problems in PNG.
95. Stuart added that the Pacific may be heading in the other direction to the rest of the world in protection of terrestrial areas and we should take this forward to the COP.
96. WWF said the fact that Oceania is a leader in marine conservation should be really taken forward and plugged at COP and this may help engage NZ and Australia. Added that two of the biggest donors for LMMAs in the Pacific are the Packard Foundation and Macarthur foundation, and as the Packard foundation may start withdrawing from the region in the coming years then we need to engage NZ and Australia more. Also added that the Micronesia Challenge and Coral Triangle Initiative etc are all putting the spotlight on the Pacific and we should be selling the initiatives more aggressively.
97. IUCN added that integrated catchment management is critical for the region (ridge to the reef philosophy) and we've agreed it's a priority in the past.
98. Palau said that we should be engaging our leaders to bring these initiatives up at the PIF, which could help engage NZ and Australia in the future.
99. The Chair called for a short break at 14:58 and asked to return at 13:15.

Meeting resumed at 15:41

PRESENTATION – Report back by the Invasive Species Focus Group, Day 1, 15:41-16:02

Presentation provided by SPREP (Dr Alan Tye). The presentation will be provided to participants on their flash drive.

100. Key messages for the COP that were identified by the focus group are:
 1. International standards
 - We need to develop a unified convention to control the international movement of potentially invasive species
 - International standards for invasives relating to biosecurity, particularly the need to take into account proper risk assessment to avoid adverse effects on Pacific island economies
 - Strong standards controlling movement of invasive are particularly important for islands
 - Standards should cover all pathways
 - We need a mechanism to communicate risks between states
 - We need a dedicated funding mechanism for assisting SIDs to implement standards
 2. Funding and support
 - Worth re-emphasizing invasives are particularly threatening for small islands
 - The threat of invasives is greater on islands, but the opportunities for managing and demonstrating the benefits of effective management are greater on islands, so the Pacific can be used as a model in this area
 - Support is needed for international and internal quarantine and eradication
 3. Training and technical assistance:
 - SIDs do not have the human or financial resource to tackle all aspects of invasives
 4. Strengthening other international instruments and ensuring compatibility with CBD provisions on invasive species management
 5. CBD be asked to consider its relationships with other international treaties and instruments to ensure that invasive species management
101. Alan recommended that we need to include background on one impact on biodiversity, one impact on economies and one impact on biodiversity AND economies.
102. USP said that one thing that didn't come out is the critical importance of protecting offshore islands (not just small islands) from invasives. He said he believed the intent of the points is that we should focus not just on small islands, but particularly on small offshore islands. Also added that the need for support in island countries to understand the control and spread of invasives within their own countries is not stated strongly enough.
103. Kate said the level of detail in the summary was appropriate as the level of detail that people take to CBD depends on the issue. The key is: where is the most appropriate place to advocate the issue in the COP? Added that this information can be used as background information to identify where to most effectively make interventions during the COP.
104. FIELD said that in the negotiating arena you'll be sitting in a working group in the COP and that's the opportunity to make an intervention on specific language relating to decisions at the COP. However, there are a lot of ways of getting information out to parties including circulating a paper to the COP. Side events are another way of getting information across, although these are all booked out. Another way of getting information out is to ask the Secretariat to include a paper in the official documents. So it's worth keeping a reasonable

level of detail in the background, although use these to provide a simpler message where appropriate.

105. Palau suggested that we link in with other Conventions on invasive issues, such as Ramsar to help push the message out. Also suggested that given the good work in the Pacific region relating to invasives, we should push our success stories given the limited resources we have – in this way we can use this information to push for more funding with donors. Palau intended to make an intervention on this.
106. Kate said that CBD will be pushing for regional interventions and not single-country interventions. But firstly, we need to make sure we know what our priorities are, as we've received feedback that we're not prioritising as a region enough. Kate agreed that we should be selling what we've achieved in the past.
107. Kate suggested that Alan could develop a two-page Pacific brief that we can discuss on Wednesday at this meeting.
108. Palau said we should take the briefing back to our countries to engender support from our governments.
109. Kate asked if Palau would take the lead on this at COP.?
110. Palau responded that Sean would be representing Palau at the COP (?) and that he thinks this can be lead by him.
111. Kate said that we should try to engage NZ on this issue.
112. USP said that we also need to use this information to develop where we most need funding to support development of initiatives and perhaps we can develop information on where our main funding priorities are.
113. Kate said that no-one will read more than two pages of information at the COP, so don't circulate too much information.
114. Alan agreed to develop some briefing on the issues, including where funding is needed most that can be refined over email in the coming weeks.

PRESENTATION – Island Biodiversity Programme of Work, Day 1, 16:03-16:28

Presentation provided by SPREP (Ana). The presentation will be provided to participants on their flash drive.

115. Key points raised in the presentation:
 - Ana referred participants to COP paper 9/19, pp 15, which refers to the IBPoW. This document looks at progress on the IBPoW, and although there are no recommendations there are numerous initiatives included from around the world relating progress from the region.
 - The IBPoW is important as it is the Pacific's main platform in engaging with CBD
 - The IBPoW started at COP8 (started at COP7) and has 11 goals, 22 targets, 50 priority actions and 7 focal areas. [The presentation then proceeded to give an outline of the historical development of the IBPoW]
 - In the Pacific, the IBPoW is implemented by capacity through:

- Workshops on mainstreaming financial mechanisms
 - Community based conservation course
 - Financial assistance
 - Partnerships
 - Developing and implementing NBSAPs
- The IBPoW will be discussed on Day 1 at the COP so we need to be prepared from the start as this is an opportunity for us to contribute to the development of a draft text.
 - To input into the decision-making process we need to formalise and draw support for several key proposals from other islands states. If a decision or other text results, the Chair will send it to the high-level segment, where it is usually adopted without problems.
 - The GLISPA has a draft strategic plan that will be put forward to the COP, which will likely be followed by some discussion. We have an opportunity to input into draft text on the GLISPA as it does have an opportunity to provide funding to the region.
116. USP – asked if the COP was the place to suggest possible changes to the GLISPA strategic plan.
117. Kate responded that the GLISPA paper was an information paper, and people were still able to provide input into the GLISPA strategic plan.
118. USP noted that the paper doesn't mention capacity building and awareness.
119. Ana suggested that perhaps we could raise this issue at the GLISPA side event. [This comment was followed by some discussion on side events.]
120. WWF said that one of the aims of the GLISPA high-level side event was to gain support for the GLISPA strategic plan.
121. Kate said that it was unlikely that a high-level meeting would discuss details.
122. USP asked what the correct way was to provide input into the COP papers so USP [remainder of statement not heard]
123. Kate recommended that this meeting approve that we recommend that there is a better consultation process to include a more wide cross section of partners, such as USP.
124. Kate said that SPREP is on the GLISPA steering committee, which is useful to get insight into CBD as they view it as a good opportunity to implement the IBPoW.
125. Kate said the Pacific is having the first regional meeting for CBD COP9 and this provides a good opportunity to provide early input into the papers.
126. USP recommended that we include four recommended changes in our response to the GLISPA strategic plan:
1. Under steering Committee Key Functions, add:
 - Actively facilitate and fund capacity building and training to underpin the successful implementation of partnership commitments
 2. Under staffing, question for consideration:
 - Is there a role for, or can capacity building and training either as a major line item or within one of the three categories? [This point not recorded correctly]
 3. Under GLISPSA Milestones 2008-2010 (Assessment of 2005-2007 commitments), add:

- At least 10% increase in graduates from USP in Island Biodiversity-related fields
 - At least 20% increase in graduates from USP in Island Biodiversity-related fields.
4. Under Table 1 – Major Commitments & Key GLISPA 2010 Actions:
 - Under Invasive Species on Islands, include:
 - Development of course modules and a full course offerings on invasive species on islands
 - Under Global Islands Data Base and Portal, add:
 - USP/PACINET/PBIF as partners
 5. Under Annex 1 – GLISPA Partners, Membership Criteria, add:
 - USP to agencies and organizations.
 6. Under Annex 3 – Calendar of Major Island Events, add:
 - Ramsar COP10, 28 October – 4 November, Changwon, Korea meeting to this list
 7. Under Annex 5 – add:
 - USP to the Steering Committee members, with Bill Aalbersberg as the lead contact and Randy Thaman as the alternate contact.
127. At 16:28 the participants broke into groups to discuss aspects of the IBPoW.

[Evening sessions not recorded]

**Regional Preparatory Meeting for the CBD COP9
13-16 April 2008, LeVasa Resort, Samoa
DAY 2**

128. Meeting recommenced 8:46
129. The Chair welcomed participants for the 2nd day.
130. The Chair asked Kiribati to lead us with a short prayer.
131. Kiribati gave a short prayer.
132. The Chair asked the new participants to introduce themselves.
133. Seve Paeniu introduced himself as the SPREP Sustainable Development Advisor.
134. Joe Stanley introduced himself as the SPREP GEF Advisor.
135. The Chair asked SPREP to review Day 1 discussions.
136. Kate referred the participants to the handout that summarised the results from discussions from yesterday evening:
 1. Protected Areas work
 2. IBPoW work (summary not circulated)
137. Kate summarised that last night the meeting on protected areas identified accelerating implementation as the main priority. Kate said the protected areas summary would be further worked on in a focus group during today.
138. Kate also discussed the draft text that was developed from the session last night on COP9 agenda item 4 relating to IBPoW decisions. Kate said that this is still draft (one text is bracketed), and would be worked on during the remainder of the meeting [?].

PRESENTATION – Participating in the Convention, Day 2, 9:59-9:37

Presentation provided by SPREP (Clark Peteru). The presentation will be provided to participants on their flash drive.

139. Key points raised in presentation:

- There are some key documents that would assist participants with participating in COP meetings. These documents will be left with Kate in case anyone wishes to peruse them:
 - FIELD Guide
 - UNEP Glossary
 - Johnston & Barber
 - UNEP Negotiations
- A summary of membership to biodiversity related MEAs in the Pacific was discussed.
- There are five main biodiversity related MEAs – CBD, BP, CITES, CMS, Ramsar, World Heritage. Each MEA has a governing body, which Members are able to participate in, and this is the chance that members get to influence decision-making.
- Decisions that are made at COPs are binding on the contracting parties.
- MEAs are important because:
 - Ecosystems cross borders
 - Activities pass through different media
 - Pollution of the commons
 - Global scale of problems
 - International transport
 - Each contribution to positive or negative counts – we're living in a global village now
 - Better to formulate solutions in a comprehensive rather than on an ad hoc basis
 - Common concern of humanity
- MEAs won't work if some countries won't follow environmental rules
- Conventions come from:
 - An initial idea that seems to be widely shared, often governments, scientists and NGOs working together (important in the environmental area)
 - One or more states organise a conference to allow expression of common interest
 - Core elements of the agreement are identified and a process is established for implementation of the treaty
 - Draft text; depository identified; ratification
 - Enter into force after 'n' states have joined, this is when it becomes international law
 - States meet obligations imposed by the treaty
- Points to keep in mind in the lead up to, and during the COP:
 - Confirm attendance – can get funding from CBD
 - Check that you are properly accredited
 - Access SPREP website for more info
 - Two important docs are
 1. Annotated agenda
 2. Draft decisions (bracketed)
 - During participation, acquaint yourself with:
 1. The Convention bodies
 2. COP procedures

3. Coalitions including regional groups and interest groups. These are designed to make decision-making faster and are important to enable the region to influence decision-making. These are typically becoming groupings of developed, developing and least developed countries.
 4. Document codes
 5. When making interventions you will need to know how to address the Chair and the language to use if you are going to represent a Coalition in an intervention.
 6. Side events
 - Be aware that the COP will make decisions, so when you return home you must be aware of what the decisions are as you will be responsible for implementation. The MEAs are not static documents – they are amended during the COPs. There are also the creation of Protocols and annexes during COPs – and these are additions to the MEA. Conventions such as CITES regularly creates annexes.
 - Intercessional meetings between COPs target meetings that are important to you. SBSTTA may be a more critical meeting to decide issues as the substantive issues are debated there and put forward to the COP for approval, so expect that some issues will not be open for discussion at the COP as they are essentially decided during SBSTTA.
- There are many parties at the COP, not just the members, which are delineated by coloured badges. Traditionally only members have speaking rights, although this is flexible.
 - We are in the Asia-Pacific grouping, which generally has a caucus every morning. There may also be a Pacific sub-caucus. There are other meeting and side events during the day.
 - There are five UN geographical regions.
 - There are also other interest groupings such as the EU, G77 and China, Climate Change Umbrella Group, Alliance of Small Islands Developing States, SIDS. Each group puts forward it's own position. Sometimes at caucus meetings you won't always have time to speak, so your interest group can speak on your behalf, but you must have developed a group position for this to be possible.
 - The structure of the groups was outlined.
 - Other COP processes:
 - May break into two working groups to expedite work
 - Statements are simultaneously translated
 - Contact groups may be formed to resolve contentious issues
 - There will also be a Ministerial segment at this COP
 - There are a number of COP documents, including numbering systems, information papers, revised documents, numbering of COP decisions and informal. Daily summaries are good for developing briefing from when you return home and have to give a presentation of proceeding.
 - There's lots of pressure at COPs, but keep calm and manipulate the pace of negotiations to avoid burnout. Sometimes COPs are tedious but keep up with it as the discussions may require you to change your intervention. It's important to maintain your stamina so be prepared to forgo socializing if you have early duties the next day.
 - Lock in agreements – know when to give concessions to the other side if they also make significant concessions.

- Follow issues through so there are no gaps in your positions [?]
 - When making intervention (there is good info in the FIELD manual on this):
 - Don't be afraid to speak
 - Prepare a framework for your intervention ahead of time
 - Give a brief salutation to the Chair
 - Associate yourself with a larger group
 - Indicate you're speaking on behalf of a group
 - Say something positive
 - Then make your short and punchy intervention
 - Make a summary – reiterate why your intervention is important
 - Thank the Chair for the opportunity to speak
 - There is specific language when making interventions and if you make an intervention you will need to be aware of what particular words mean.
 - You must be aware that your country will be responsible for implementing decisions, and there are numerous tools for national implementation.
140. SPC asked if it was possible for SPC to get accredited for the CBD, and if so, what was the process.
141. Clark said to contact the CBD, state you're an IGO and ask how to get accredited for the meeting.
142. Kate said she can find out the right contact at CBD, although it's generally pretty informal for IGOs to attend. Kate added that SPREP probably wasn't in fact accredited to attend.
143. FIELD said that legally SPREP is probably accredited, following a resolution at COP8 that required accreditation, although IGOs the attended in the past generally don't need to accredit each year. Added that you don't need to justify your attendance, and that probably just need to let the CBD Secretariat know you'll be attending.
144. Clark said there are a lot of NGOs and sometimes we go to the Pacific NGO caucus to help progress issues that may be too sensitive to raise as a government representative.
145. Espen said that in UNFCCC SPREP is accredited through the Samoan Government.
146. USP said it was similar with USP for some COPs.
147. Kate said the CBD was a little different.
148. USP said that if we accredited universities then there would be an enormous number attend the COP and it's probably best for universities to work with other delegates to put their issues forward.
149. Clark – said that the Biosafety Protocol will be conducted in the week after the COP.

PRESENTATION – Biodiversity and Climate Change (including CBD interaction with the development of the Bali Action Plan), Day 2, 9:37-10:32

Presentation provided by SPREP (Espen Ronneberg). The presentation will be provided to participants on their flash drive.

150. Key points raised in the presentation:

- There is recognition of the very strong linkages between CBD and UNFCCC over the past years.
- Presented a slide on the carbon cycle – naturally carbon is emitted from some sources and absorbed in others. However, the enhanced greenhouse cycle results from the increase in emissions from industry.
- Greenhouse gases trap heat from the sun within the atmosphere.
- Climate change is already impacting the Pacific:
 - Increase in extreme events, including cyclones becoming more frequent, over a greater area, and for a longer period of the year.
 - Saline intrusion on atolls
 - Shifts in tuna stocks, meaning some EEZ have less tuna stocks
 - Increased coastal erosion
 - Coral bleaching
 - Anecdotal evidence is on the increase
- There are a number of impacts on biodiversity:
 - Increased sea temperatures, if sustained, will cause coral bleaching and loss of habitat. The more CO₂ there is in the atmosphere then the more is absorbed by the ocean, which prevents corals from growing.
 - Increase in algal growth further deteriorating coral.
 - Broken reefs remove protection for coastal ecosystems and lessens tourist appeal
 - Over a longer period of time the increase in sea temperatures will have an impact on the overall tuna stocks and breeding patterns, which will affect overall food security in the region. Higher sea temperatures may also increase chance of invasive species to spread, and the chance of increased spread of diseases (such as dengue, which thrives in excessively wet and dry conditions).
- Protection of biodiversity can assist us to respond to climate change through:
 - Protecting forests that can be used as carbon storage
 - Planting new forests removes carbon from the air and restores degraded land, which can fix the soil carbon in place.
 - Healthy forest ecosystems assist in storing soil peat, flood control and watershed management, and is more resilient to climate change than monoculture cropping
 - Biofuels can be used as a mitigation response.
- Issues before CBD COP9 that relate to climate change:
 - Island biodiversity should recognise particular vulnerability of PICs. I was an achievement getting this issue onto the agenda and it will steer the CBD Secretariat to look at issues that are important to us.
 - Invasive alien species – as ecosystems are degraded by climate change, then there is an avenue open for invasives to enter. This is important to include in the final conclusions of the COP.
 - Forest biodiversity – types of forests you are planting should not adversely affect the climate change response. In Solomon Islands they planted short term rotation crops in an immediate response to climate change, which were in fact highly invasive tree species (acacia's, eucalyptus etc).
 - Marine and coastal biodiversity through survival of coral reefs. We have an opportunity at this COP to strongly advocate the importance of coral reefs for SIDS.
 - Would also be good if the Micronesia Challenge could get a mention in the resolution on Protected Areas.

- Items on biodiversity and climate change at the COP:
 - We must continue close cooperation between FCCC and CCD and we need to ensure that interventions are not detrimental to other MEAs.
 - Similarly, we need to ensure that decision-making on climate change has to have a logic to it and does not impact adversely on other aspect of the CBD, such as indigenous rights etc.
 - We also need to ensure that adaptation measures do not adversely affect other aspect of ecosystems (ie a vertical sea wall will not dissipate the sea's energy, it will transfer it and cause issues elsewhere). There are, of course, alternatives to sea walls such as sand discretion devices, which work well in some areas.
 - We should try to get more work undertaken on multiple benefits from initiatives, such as conservation that supports mitigation.
 - We need to stress the cost of climate change impacts to the region. Maybe use an example of when Tropical Cyclone Heta hit Niue, in terms of health, environment, and loss of traditional information (destruction of 90% of museums items).
 - Early action on climate change will not destroy the world economy. The longer it's left the more expensive it will become to address.
 - A photovoltaic grid has been used to generate coral growth in areas where it has been destructed. This electrification also makes corals more resilient to rising sea temperatures. This has been successful in Maldives, Indonesia, Thailand and the Caribbean. It takes a number of years to grow the coral, and the procedure is also being used to grow coral as an alternative sea wall, which is in its early stages.
 - There is a Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change.
 - A regional roundtable on climate change will also be established to provide governments with an opportunity to voice regional issues on climate change.
 - The SPREP statement to the Forum Economic Ministers Meeting that was put forward by the President of Palau was also discussed.
151. Vai highlighted that there has been some work done on the vulnerability of mangrove systems in the region with the UNEP regional seas initiative.
152. Espen said that coral reefs were very sensitive to rising temperatures, but were OK with sea level rise. Mangroves however, are generally very resilient, except they can't cope with sea level rise.
153. Fiji asked what the different types of forests were that were good for mitigation and if coconuts absorbed carbon effectively?
154. Espen said that there were many factors that effected how effectively trees absorbed carbon, but that he coconuts were OK at absorbing.
155. WWF asked if the carbon is released when you chop a tree down.
156. Espen said that a tree holds carbon throughout its entire structure, and that it also holds carbon by stabilizing the soil around it. When a tree is cut down the release of carbon will occur when it either burns or decomposes.
157. USP asked of there was any reason the Pacific Council of Churches wasn't invited here, and are they going to attend the COP as they have a lot of initiatives relating to climate change. USP also asked why agricultural biodiversity wasn't included in the presentation as

in some PICs this is the main ecosystem. Noted that the most important factor is protection of mangroves and forests – protection of existing systems is far more important than trying to regenerate ecosystems. Also stated that acidification of the reef is partly CO2 and partly something else [unable to record rest of point]. Added that the breakdown of the stratosphere [not sure of this point] is impacting....[unable to record rest of point] Also added that we have to consider the multi-causality of impacts, such as all the reasons why coral is bleaching.

158. Espen said that his presentation was meant to remain simple and that USP had raised many more complex and valid issues. Not sure why Pacific Council of Churches wasn't here, but that they were engaged. Kate said that SPRPE had an MoU with the Council and had done a presentation a couple of years ago.
159. Espen said that he was giving a presentation on agricultural biodiversity this evening.
160. Espen agreed that protection is the first adaptation option.
161. Espen agreed there were multiple stresses on coral reefs, one of which was climate change.
162. Espen said he hasn't had time to research the impact of atmospheric depletion on biodiversity.
163. Espen agreed in USP's statement on multi-causality, although recognised that this is very, very complex.
164. IUCN said they have a climate change project with the Council of Churches. Added that the loss of freshwater biodiversity is evident in the dryness of the waterfalls in Samoa, and many areas will become drier and drier, which with reduction of forest cover will make cyclones more destructive.
165. Espen said that the impact on rainfall in the region will be an increase in some islands and decrease in others, and it's an important issue.
166. IUCN said that perhaps universities could start doing more research on the change in rainfall in the region.
167. Espen said he's not sure to what degree this is being monitored.
168. FIELD said that there three climate change recommendations at COP9:
 1. The IBPoW already contains climate change information
 2. [Second point not heard]
 3. The third is biofuels and biosecurity.
169. FIELD said not to get hopes up about what could be discussed at COP9 as these are basically the only issues that will be raised and have already been set. While some of the issues we have discussed today are interesting, it is very unlikely they will be discussed.
170. Espen agreed but said we should work on getting some of this information to people at the COP.
171. Kate said the issue of biofuels was very contentious and was coming up in just about everything.
172. Espen said that it would be good to get some conclusions from this meeting to go to the UNFCCC Pacific preparatory meeting.

173. Kate suggested a small group of people could get together to:
1. Look at how the recommendations and presentations we've had and develop priorities.
 2. Look at what this meeting would like to convey to the UNFCCC Pacific preparatory meeting.
174. FIELD, Marshall Islands, Palau and SPC agreed to meet Espen to discuss this in more detail.
175. The Chair called a break for morning tea at 10:32.

The meeting resumed at 11:07

PRESENTATION – Financial Mechanism Issues, Day 2, 11:07-12:00

Presentation provided by SPREP (Seve Paeniu). The presentation will be provided to participants on their flash drive.

176. Seve said the presentation will look at finance available to biodiversity, how effective this has been, a discussion of a resourcing strategy, and finally a draft recommendation. Will also discuss the funding that is becoming available over the coming years.
177. Key points raised in presentation, relating to the draft Strategy for Resource Mobilisation:
- The draft Strategy for Resource Mobilisation was developed at COP8. There is a recommendation that this be adopted at COP9, and that a message is developed for the Doha conference at the end of this year.
 - The draft strategy assists parties in establishing targets, goals and objectives as well as actions and timeframes to implement the financial provisions of the CBD at all levels. The draft strategy is included in the meeting handouts.
 - The draft strategy aims to double international financial flow for biodiversity by 2015 and has guiding principles
 - There are 7 goals and objectives in the draft strategy, which are provided in the handout.
 - The draft strategy seeks to enable countries to develop and implement a national strategy for resource mobilisation, and hopes that a resource mobilisation focal point will be established in each country
 - GEF will provide support to parties and the COP will review implementation of the strategy.
 - South-to-south means cooperation between developing countries, whereas south-to-north means collaboration between developing and developed countries.
 - A draft message on biodiversity and finance was developed at a conference in Monterrey (Mexico) to table at the Doha conference. The meeting in Doha will review implementation of the 0.7%GDP target for ODA. Key points of draft message included the need to:
 - Substantially increase financial resources (this is a general comment in the draft message and doesn't include a specific target).
 - Mainstream biodiversity into national development as well as donors.
 - Design and adopt an international regime on ABS.
 - Develop mechanisms to promote conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

- Engage the business community.
 - Encourage south-south cooperation.
- Some of the major funding initiatives in the region in the coming years target improving the ability of countries to access resources and increasing the capacity of countries to implement actions using the resources. Some funding initiatives include:
 - GEF Pacific Alliance for Sustainability (GEF-PAS), which is a package of \$100M USD on environment related initiatives over the next four years. Those projects relating to biodiversity account for about \$38M USD and include the Micronesia Challenge, invasives, protected areas initiatives, the Coral Triangle Initiative, enabling activities, Phoenix Island Protected Areas and integrated community biodiversity conservation.
 - EC capacity building for MEA implementation in ACP, which is about \$21.45M (Euros) for the globe. SPREP is the regional hub for the Pacific for this programme and UNEP are coordinating the programme globally. An MoU will be signed between UNEP and each of the hubs. This will hopefully commence in July-August this year following EC approval and will be followed by a detailed needs assessment to establish budgets etc.
 - Other funding initiatives includes Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund (\$7M over 5 years), the Australian Government's Global Initiative on Climate Change (\$200M), the Australian Government's Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate (\$100M), Japan Cool Earth 2050 (\$10B USD, of which \$2B is a grant basis), and the EU Global Climate Change Alliance (\$50M Euros), EDF10 PRIP (\$95M euro), and the German LeifWeb (\$95M Euros).

178. Seve handed over to Joe Stanley to continue discussion on financial mechanisms. Joe didn't provide a PowerPoint presentation.

179. Key points raised in the presentation:

- GEF-PAS is still being developed, so the development of the framework will not be able to draw on the experiences of the GEF-RAF.
- The hybrid approach to developing financial frameworks is a practical approach that uses input-output methodology, which hopefully we'll support it.
- Training and sustainable development appear only once in the COP9 guidance [?], and we should argue to have it featured more prominently.
- The GEF is the designated financial mechanism for the CBD, however under the RAF there is no special consideration for SIDS. So we need to argue that the RAF doesn't take into account the guidance given to the RAF by the GEF [?], which doesn't include the lessons we have learned as the GEF-PAS framework is still in development [not sure about accuracy of this recording].
- The seven decisions under article 21 only account for climate change and won't be helpful in developing GEF5. We need to be careful that we aren't disadvantaged by delays that have been created through the development of the GEF-PAS, as the implementation of GEF-PAS may overlap with GEF5 allocations.

Key point relating to the other paper Joe was asked to comment on [not sure which paper]:

- Not sure how [missed point]... The region has a problem with the 80/20 terrestrial/marine breakdown as we have extensive marine areas.
- GEF are considering extending the RAF to GEF5.

- Examining the benefits for biodiversity doesn't consider the lack of information on marine biodiversity. There is only one variable for marine biodiversity – either it exists or it doesn't.
 - The paper states that we need to be aware of innovative financial mechanisms. A lot of Trust Funds were set up in the early 1990s, particularly in Asia, some of which were successful and some of which were not. The Pacific has experience with successful Trust Funds, and we should pursue this option provided they are well managed.
 - The GEF Office review of the RAF is complicated as we share our constituency with parts of Asia, and while the Terms of Reference for the review are comprehensive we aren't able to provide really good information due to a lack of information on the effectiveness of past programmes.
 - The review of the allocation of resources in the developing world under the RAF will be very hard to develop.
 - The paper suggests we approach the climate change group and share ideas and develop a common approach to developing a joint voice to improve our chances of increasing resources. However, the issues are so interwoven that it's difficult to pull out specific to focus on. Joe suggested we identify what avenues exist in climate change funding that relate to biodiversity and to look at how we can assist in accessing these.
 - The RAF is extremely important, as it's the only avenue for biodiversity funding under the GEF. However, past SID representation to the GEF Secretariat seems to have been ignored, as there is no special consideration of SIDS, which is reflected in marine only getting a 20% allocation.
 - Joe suggested we make noises through the CBD COP to get the GEF Secretariat to listen to the seven guiding principals that haven't been addressed.
180. Comments relating specifically to GEF-PAS:
- GEF-PAS is the GEF Secretariat's response to the fact that Pacific SIDS hasn't been allocated their fair share of resources, which has been verified through various studies.
 - Joe questioned whether we had the capacity to implement \$100M worth of actions in the next 4 years, considering it will have co-financing of at least another \$100M.
 - The GEF-PAS will go to the GEF Council next week. After this, PICs will work with the implementing agencies to develop detailed project plans.
 - If we are unable to implement the GEF-PAS because of capacity it will likely work against us with the GEF as we have worked hard to get the GEF-PAS in place. However, this is complicated by the fact that capacity for implementation is generally low given that in the past we haven't had resources to build capacity.
181. WWF asked if the formula (80/20) was used for terrestrial and not marine which is a concern for the region as it is not equitable.
182. Joe responded this will hopefully be part of the review of the RAF.
183. WWF asked if we could influence if the formula is included in the review.
184. Joe responded that the consideration of the formula would be included in the review of the RAF.

185. Kate said that it would be included because the SIDS fought hard for it at COP8. Kate added that she would circulate the Masters thesis that examined the equity of the 80/20 split on the Pacific.
186. IUCN asked if these issues were raised when GEF CEO visited last year.
187. Kate responded that these issues have been raised for years, but that some of these issues are not within the mandate of the GEF, but are more the will of the donors particularly the US. Some countries like PNG get a lot of resources from the RAF, whereas others don't, and the GEF-PAS will hopefully start addressing this. We will need to point out at COP9 that we don't know what the impact of the RAF and GEF-PAS methodology are at the moment.
188. Kate added that this is a critical issue and part of the problem is that we take our eye off the ball in the COP. Kate asked for nominations of people that would be able to cover this issue only at the COP. Added that SPREP will have specific people at COP that will cover these issues.
189. Kate said we were now going to break into two groups to look at what input we will give to specific recommendations at the COP from the discussions this morning. The two groups will be financial mechanisms, and climate change.
190. The meeting broke into groups at 12:00.
191. Issues discussed at the climate change working group:
1. Points to be raised in statements from the floor at the CBD COP:
 - Climate change is already impacting the islands and there are strong examples of its effect, which affecting the livelihoods of people.
 - Coral reefs, mangroves and coastal literal forests are critically important, and while we need to bear in mind that there are other factors impacting on the health of coral reefs, the premise remains that healthy coral reefs are an effective carbon sink.
 - Biodiversity has the ability to help us adapt to climate change and we need to identify those ecosystems that are resilient to climate change. So we should focus not only on the negative biodiversity impacts of climate change, but also the positive aspects, such as how biodiversity conservation can assist climate change.
 - Protection of climate change from ecosystem to individual species is the best form of protection against the impacts of climate change, as a healthy climate change ecosystem enables other ecosystems to be healthy.
 - Replanting forests with diverse species is better for developing climate change, but it is more difficult to calculate contribution to carbon sequestration.
 - The link between climate change conservation and climate change adaptation is paramount in enabling MDGs to be met.
 - Ensuring that positive incentive schemes benefit people at community level is critical.
 - There are potential negative as well as positive connotations to biofuel production.
 - There are multiple benefits and functions of reefs.
 - Current financing of biodiversity is inadequate. The target of 100% increase in funding by 2015 requires a 50% increase in national financing (put in by the country itself) and may be difficult for some PICs to implement. This is complicated as it binds members to increase their national allocation, but does not guarantee an increase in co-financing form the international sector.
 2. Analysis of the draft text that was developed at the SBSTTA (recommendation 12/5):
 - Needs addition of a pre-ambule that describes why this is done, what has been the process to get to this point, and the particular vulnerability of small islands.

- Also needs description of how it will be funded (need to ensure that the financing mechanism picks up anything that relates to PICs).
- 1(a)(i): need to retain the text that has been bracketed as it focuses on the impacts rather than the action. Must be prepared that Brazil will fight to exclude this text and we should be prepared for this. As we don't have deposits of fossil fuel this is particularly important to us. Perhaps we need to suggest an alternative text:

Indications or predictions of climate-change impacts, and response activities and their potential impacts on relevant ecosystems

- Suggest for all bracketed text we include the alteration to the above suggested text.
- 1(c) and 1(f) are similar and we should ask the Secretariat to reword them.
- 1(e) that climate change experts include both climate change and biodiversity
- 1(f) includes 'mangroves' in terms of adaptation (as peatlands have been included in mitigation). FIELD is not sure if we can get the focus on mangroves here as peatlands were specifically included in the past COP as being important, but maybe we should include another paragraph on mangroves.
- We need to highlight the importance of the fresh-and-salt-water-lens on small islands.
- 1(g) needs a serious redraft as reducing deforestation doesn't necessarily reduce emissions as forests are a nil-carbon emitter. Espen agreed to redraft this point by the end of the day.
- 2(c) is awkward. FIELD said this whole paragraph may be included elsewhere and should be removed altogether as it shouldn't be in the decision-language at all.

192. Espen agreed to make changes to the text and circulate on email for comment.

[Need to insert similar information for the financial mechanisms focus group]

193. The meeting broke for lunch at 12:50.

194. The meeting resumed at 13:42.

195. The Chair invited Steve Percival to make a short comment.

196. Steve Percival said he is developing a database to update a list of all people in NGOs in the Pacific that are interested in, or active in, traditional environmental knowledge. Steve asked participants pass on the contact details of anyone they knew who would be interested in being included in the database and a possible future symposium.

PRESENTATION – Streamlined reporting by PICs to the Biodiversity-related MEAs, Day 2, 13:45-13:53

Presentation provided by SPREP (Tepa). The presentation will be provided to participants on their flash drive.

197. Tepa handed out a summary of the presentation.

198. Key points raised in the presentation:

- Reporting on MEAs is a burden and there is a need to harmonise and streamline reporting.
- The Australian Government is piloting a consolidated reporting template for the five biodiversity related MEAs in collaboration with SPREP. The project is funded through AusAIDs Pacific Governance Support Programme.
- To date, the idea has been endorsed by SPREP and five countries have volunteered to take part in the trial.

- The project is now looking at the detail of what can be included in the consolidated reporting. Hopefully a trial template will be out with the five countries for trial in the next two months
 - The project aims to reduce the reporting burden on PICs.
 - Findings of the trial will be presented to the SPREP meeting this year.
 - For more information contact Melissa Jaques at DEWHA on +61 2 6274 1056, or at Melissa.Jaques@environment.gov.au
199. Espen said that initiatives to link biodiversity and climate change issues has also looked at joint reporting, although there will be some complex issues related to this.
200. The Chair asked for new participants to introduce themselves.
201. Olive introduced herself as the officer for IFWA.
202. Paul Anderson introduced himself as the Marine Conservation Analyst at SPREP.

PRESENTATION – Access (to Genetic Resources and Traditional Knowledge) and Benefit Sharing, Day 2, 13:55-15:00

Presentation provided by Le'a Malia Kanehe Esq.. The presentation will be provided to participants on their flash drive.

203. Key points raised in the presentation:
- Le'a has worked with SPREP on indigenous issues, and at CBD COPs in the past.
 - Protection of biodiversity is inherent in traditional cultures.
 - Some of the technical issues can get bogged down in legal terminology, which can disengage indigenous people.
 - There has been a lack of participation from Pacific island people on this issue in the past.
 - There will be an increase in interest in accessing marine genetic resources in the future, although many PIC governments haven't developed laws governing the use of genetic resources. This issue could be included as a Protocol in the CBD, which would be the most appropriate single vehicle for controlling the use of genetic resources in the future.
 - This presentation will look at the Working Group on ABS, and Article 8(j) and related provisions.
 - ABS is focused on accessing biodiversity for commercial activities, including medicines.
 - The 3rd Objective of the CBD (Article 1) describes fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources.
 - (Article 15) relates to recognising the sovereign rights of States over their national resources and that the national governments have the authority to determine access to genetic resources. Access to genetic resources shall be subject to prior informed consent of the contracting parties providing such resources.
 - Article 8(j) states relates to indigenous knowledge, innovations and practices. This means that contracting parties must protect traditional knowledge and promote its use.
 - The Article on ABS gets its mandate from the COP. Most of the negotiations have taken place in the ABS Working Group.
 - ABS has been progressed in the CBD since 2001 with the draft Bonn guidelines on ABS.
 - There are differing positions from the 'south' and 'north' on this. 'South' generally want a new binding treaty on ABS as soon as possible that covers derivatives and a certificate of origins with national law systems as a key component. 'North' users want consistency with WTO and WIPO treaties and do not want derivatives covered. Biotechnology industry users want IPRs secured and prefer bi-lateral contracts with provider countries.
 - There are a number of key documents relating to ABS that are included in the participant handouts. The Working Group reports summarise the discussions, although the recommended draft decisions are included.

- Key issues for future negotiations include objectives of the regime, scope, nature and main categories of elements.
- The objective of the international regime for developed countries is to facilitate access to genetic resource, while the objective for developing countries is to regulate access, prevent misappropriation of traditional knowledge, and ensure biosecurity.
- The scope of the regime includes genetic resources, traditional knowledge, benefit and sharing. Co-Chairs text: 'All genetic resources, and associated traditional knowledge, covered under the CBD and the benefits resulting from their use'.
- The nature of the regime is the most contentious, because this is where it will be defined if the regime will be legally binding, non-binding or a combination of both.
- The main component is on fair and equitable benefit sharing, which relates to both monetary and non-monetary (intellectual property, capacity building etc).
- The Working Group has broken information into issues that 'need further elaboration' and issues that need 'further consideration' (the second one is where most of the really contentious issues are).
- Compliance is broken into encouraging compliance, monitoring compliance, enforcing compliance and other (which includes compliance with customary law and local systems of protection).
- Most of the proposals around the protection of traditional knowledge fall into the category of non-binding elements, which is not good, although it is indicative of the influence of developed countries. Similarly the ethical code of conduct is non-binding, as they are only subject to national legislation, so where there is insufficient legislation then these issues can't be legally enforced.
- Pacific specific issues include (which can be advocated by PIC governments, although they haven't really taken them up to date):
 - Marine genetic resources
 - Trans-boundary resources and trans-boundary knowledge
 - Rights of people (customary land title and owners of traditional knowledge)
 - Customary law
 - There regional model law
 - Capacity building in negotiations, national legislation development, and monitoring and enforcement
- UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People was adopted by 143 states (4 against and 11 abstentions) is relevant. The key provisions in this declaration include:
 - The rights of indigenous people to their resources
 - The rights of indigenous people to own their own land and resources
 - States shall give legal recognition and protection to these land and resource rights
- It is likely that a GR declaration on ABS will not be retrospective – GR taken prior to a declaration will not be subject to it regulations.
- It is planned that a declaration will be finalised by 2010.
- Part of the Operative text is inviting parties to input into the process. This is an opportunity for PICs to put forward their points of view on this issue. However, it's unlikely their will be a consultative process run in the Pacific, although we have an opportunity to encourage consultation.
- There is also an opportunity to invite GEF and UNDP to strengthen capacity building efforts this in the future.
- Recommendations for PICs at COP9:
 - Develop and present an opening statement
 - Follow the discussions in Working Group contact groups
- The Pacific should plan for work up to COP10:
 - Attend WGABS and WG8j
 - Identify focal points on ABS
 - Develop a team of negotiators/experts (SPREP training opportunity)
 - Identify key issues for the Pacific

- Develop operative text for written submissions prior to, and during, Working Group meetings
 - Invite regional consultation with Co-Chairs
204. Clark commented that they are trying to develop the two model laws for PICs relating to culture, and biodiversity.
205. USP asked what additional funding was being put into developing the model laws.
206. Clark responded that in the past there hasn't been enough funding to develop the laws, although the funding is now becoming available from WIPO.
207. Le'a added that an inter-governmental committee has met through WIPO on this issue a number of times in the past, although PNG was the only PIC at the 10th meeting and there were no PIC representatives at the 12th meeting.
208. Fiu asked what New Zealand's position on the international law issues (binding etc) were.
209. Le'a responded that the issue is whether we have a right to use these for commercial use. New Zealand has an outstanding treaty claim in the Waitangi agreement that means that New Zealand is not positioned to progress a position on international law at the moment.
210. Ana asked how many more Working Group meetings there are prior to COP10?
211. Le'a said there were probably going to be two, and one for 8j. So should be at least 3 meetings.
212. The Chair called for an afternoon tea break at 15:00.
213. The meeting resumed at 15:20.

PRESENTATION – Marine and Coastal Biodiversity, Day 2, 15:20-15:58

Presentation provided by FIELD (Linda Seigle). The presentation will be provided to participants on their flash drive.

214. FIELD thanked SPREP and Fiu for enabling her to attend the meeting and said the presentation will on COP9 agenda item 4.9 – Marine and Coastal Biodiversity, particularly recommendation 13
215. Key points raised in the presentation:
- In the context of issues beyond national jurisdiction, COP9 will specifically look at:
 - Preventing and mitigating the impacts of some activities to selected seabed habitats, and
 - Ecological criteria and biogeographic classification systems for marine areas in need of protection
 - Why is this important to CBD if it's outside national jurisdictions? Because what goes on outside jurisdictions have a direct impact on the health of EEZs. Additionally, COP8 agreed that the application of tools beyond national jurisdictions should consider the effect they have within EEZs.
 - This is largely a governance issue given the impact of climate change on oceans.
 - It's not clear if the recommendations refer to areas beyond national jurisdiction or the deep seabed.

- The WSSD (2002) mandate stated there would be a representative network of marine protected areas by 2012. This was taken up in 2004 CBD COP (decision VII/28). So this is where the mandate to establish MPAs originated.
- The relationship between UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and CBD is relevant as all issues relating to the sea are governed by the UNCLOS, although CBD has jurisdiction where activities on the high seas have an impact on EEZs (countries that carry out the activities are held accountable). So the CBD really takes a supportive role on this issue.
- The UN General Assembly meets every year and always issues a resolution on 'oceans and the seas', and another one on 'fishing'. MPAs are included in these resolutions as a way of managing ecosystems.
- UNICPOLOS (law of the sea) considers ecosystems management, and use of genetic resources.
- There is another UN body that looks specifically at marine biodiversity beyond national jurisdictions. This is a relatively new body and Linda encouraged participants to make contact with their country representatives, as some of the issues they discuss are very relevant to CBD.
- We don't yet know all the genetic resources that are in high seas or their commercial value, but it's important that we don't destroy their habitats before we know what their values are.
- There has been a workshop to identify ecologically or biologically significant marine areas. There was scientific guidance developed in this meeting, although this is in very draft form as scientist can't decide if this relates to all MPAs or only some MPAs.
- At SBSTTA 13 negotiations scientific criteria were a major source of contention. Some parties were willing to accept them and others weren't, and all annexes were bracketed. The key issue is that parties are still calling for urgent action and more research preventing and mitigating adverse impacts on deep seabed habitats. Very little has been done on this since COP8.
- Parties have agreed on some aspects and not others. This information has been included in the presentation.
- Potential Pacific positions on this issue include:
 - SBSTTA recommendation is very narrow BUT activities on the high seas around selected habitats directly impact EEZs.
 - There is a real and urgent need to protect the high seas
 - PICs could suggest a compromise between language, such as 'adopts' or 'takes notes' to try and break the log-jam of the parties. Another suggestion is 'accepts as important guidelines'
 - Inter- and intra-national coordination is particularly important, especially the UNCLOS process, but also with CROP agencies
 - What are the key messages that we're going to send to our Ministers, as most of them will be at the COP. PICs have a number of initiatives around these types of issues, and a number of obligations with MPAs such as the Micronesian Challenge, the Coral Triangle Initiative, Phoenix Island, and PIF have acknowledged that MPAs are a mechanism for enhancing sustainable development.
- *OUR OCEAN OUT WEALTH*

216. SOPAC pointed out for those countries that are looking to extend their EEZ, that this is a particular issue. It is relevant as there is a lot of potential wealth tied up in this issue.

217. Espen said there is a lot of detail in the annexes, and what one person considers 'unique and rare' might be very different to another person's view. Maybe we should look to include some Pacific examples under some of the annexes.

218. Fiu said this has to do with the issue of governance and he is quite concerned with the issue of trade. 90% of trade is on oceans and this poses potential impacts/disasters in

some of these high seas areas. Capacity is also an issue, as PICs are not geared to enforcing what happens so far from the shores.

219. FIELD agreed these were very relevant issues that aren't well addressed at all in the recommendations. Added that these provided room to move in the recommendations for input from PICs and the recommendations established a way of creating MPAs outside national jurisdictions, although they don't really look at implementation or compliance.
220. Joe Stanley noted that traditionally in PICs the Law of the Sea has fallen within the Minister of Fisheries portfolio.
221. FIELD agreed these were typically key players in this issue.
222. Ana asked how many pockets of high seas are relevant in the Pacific.
223. Espen – responded there are about three enclosed high seas areas between EEZs, although there are more high seas areas to the north and south.

PRESENTATION – Agro-biodiversity: foundation for food, energy, health and livelihood security in the Pacific, Day 2, 15:59-16:31

Presentation provided by USP. The presentation will be provided to participants on their flash drive.

224. Key points raised in the presentation:
 - Agro-biodiversity is the foundation for sustainable living.
 - Agro-biodiversity often falls into the cracks between biodiversity conservation and agricultural development, and as such it is one of the most threatened forms of biodiversity.
 - Agro-biodiversity is diversity of all our ecosystems and the services they provide.
 - CBD has a definition of Agro-biodiversity that is all components of biodiversity related to food and agriculture.
 - Agro-biodiversity is probably most important on atolls.
 - There are many, many aspects to Agro-biodiversity.
 - Our mission is to ensure a sustainable future for island life.
 - We are moving from a traditional to modern (or Eurocentric) development theory.
 - Conclusion: the loss of Agro-biodiversity is a major problem and we need to input into this issue where we can.
 - Some new international initiatives were presented.
 - There are also a number of crosscutting and emerging issues in the COP.
 - A suggested Pacific islands statements on agro-biodiversity was presented that could be put forward at the COP.
225. Tasi said that the way the miner bird was brought into Samoa to assist in ecosystem processes, but it has since nearly destroyed all other birds in Samoa. Also the government of Samoa was bringing together all land titles in Samoa, and the information on agro-biodiversity would have helped retain some traditional aspects of land tenure.
226. USP agreed that invasives are a critical issue in agro-biodiversity. Added that development of freehold land has been an issue in making the rich richer and the poor poorer and has had an impact on traditional use of land. Stated that consideration of agro-biodiversity would have helped in making sure that land systems are the most appropriate.

227. Fiu said that 'what used to work in countries is pertinent', and we need to consider how we can push this at the COP. Secondly, plantations are accepted as part of forestry and we seem to be being crucified in the definitions that are being used.
228. USP said that if we work hard at COPs we can influence the language and definitions that are used, and in this way we can influence the outcome of the meetings. We have to ensure that conservation at the COP is reflective of conservation in the Pacific context. If we can develop biofuels in a way that protects agro-biodiversity, watersheds etc, then we won't rely so much on the importation of fossil fuels.
229. Tasi asked what the rights were [missed remainder of this point]
230. USP responded that the issue of agro-biodiversity should be a basic human right.
231. Joe Stanley – [missed this point, but it was related to targets for agro-biodiversity and inflating our progress against it to report to the GEF-RAF.]

PRESENTATION – Agricultural Biodiversity, Day 2, 16:32-16:42

Presentation provided by SPC. The presentation will be provided to participants on their flash drive.

232. Key points raised in the presentation:
- Agricultural biodiversity means [missed remainder of this point]
 - UN FAO has a definition of a forest that states the minimum size of a forest is 0.5Ha.
 - Review of SBSTTA recommendation 13 (there are 3 major recommendations for agricultural biodiversity):
 - Development issues including sustainable food management, food security, reforestation, climate change, traditional knowledge, community agro-forestry, invasive species, market development, endangered species, and environmental services.
 - Crosscutting issues including funding and resources, capacity building and institutional strengthening, enhanced education and public awareness, improved forest policy and governance, germplasm supply and exchange, and M&E.
233. USP commented that there are a lot of good things on this issue in SBSTTA, but it's very difficult for smaller islands to relate to it as [missed remainder of this point]. Added that it might be best to include this work under the IBPoW.
234. Kate called a break in the meeting until 18:30 when we will return for a half hour session (presentation of REDD), followed by dinner, and then the presentation on biofuels will be after that.

Housekeeping

235. Ana said there would be a floorshow tonight at 19.30 tonight and that we may be asked to say a few words about where we are from.
236. The Chair called for the evening break at 16:46.

237. The meeting commenced at 9:14.

238. Ana said that participants had to check out of their rooms by 13:00, and to bring their belongings to the fale, where we will continue our sessions.

PRESENTATION – Indigenous Issues and the CBD, Day 3, 9:15-9:48

Presentation provided by Fiu Matasese Eilsara. The presentation will be provided to participants on their flash drive.

239. Fiu thanked SPREP, and Kate in particular for being part of the meeting. Stated that it is not often indigenous people are part of inter-governmental meetings, but through this we are becoming part of the work. Fui also thanked Le'a and FIELD for the important insights they have provided. Fiu recognised Chairman of the Board, Joe Stanley for the expertise and drive he provides. Also thanked Tewa, also a board member.

240. Key points raised in the presentation:

- 70% of resources through the UN system in Samoa are used for greasing their own wheels, and the UN should be removed from Samoa.
- The primary client for all of us is the community, as they are the stewards of the natural resources.
- The reality of the use of natural resources in the Pacific is that we now have to ask to use the resources even though they mostly belong to the indigenous peoples of the Pacific.
- So the Pacific needs trusted and responsible leadership, which can come from all of us.
- Biodiversity is so rich in the Pacific and that we must retain it.
- Lands in Samoa have been lost to the Church, development and conservation, and we need to get back to the principle of sustainable use.
- The Pacific Plan has four components: vision, economic growth, good governance and security.
- The Pacific Plan vision is well intended, although implementation has been unraveled. While they still advocate the principle of sustainable development the thrust of the plan is economic development and this compromises the notion of sustainable development. And to whom is the good governance targeted at – in the current climate, good governance is driven by the UN and is more about money and business. The Pacific Plan policies don't recognise the good governance that has worked in the Pacific for generations. This is similar to the issue of security, which is more about building police and the military, and not about the security that has been operational for generations.
- The Pacific is largely in the stewardship of the Church.
- When the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP) was signed last year, FSM was the only PIC to sign and in fact most of the PIC delegates were not even present at the vote, even though 95% of peoples in the Pacific are of indigenous origin. Why then didn't more sign the declaration? More didn't sign probably because of pressure from developed partners.
- In the global dialogue the PICs haven't really been vocal in support of indigenous peoples, and it is only the government representatives that can advocate issues on behalf of the people and other Pacific organisations.
- There are a lot of issues in COP9 that don't recognise indigenous peoples, even though the decisions that are being made will affect the natural resources that belong to indigenous peoples.
- The Australian Government White Paper on Pacific 2020 is about land reform and is largely about taking the land away from the indigenous peoples. We need to learn what has happened to the Maori and how long it has taken them to get their land rights back. The RHD issue in Samoa is a diversion to the implementation of the Land Registration Bill that will remove the rights of indigenous people to their land. This Bill will also be about land taxes and will remove the rights of Matai's.

- At the Working Group on Protected Areas in Rome in February 2008 the indigenous peoples had no choice but to walk out due to a very unfriendly Chair. But some governments such as Italy [?] and Canada are advocating the rights of indigenous peoples. Following the 'walk out' the NGOs really benefited as they had free time to air their positions. We must keep this in mind for COP9.
- There are particular issues in CBD that indigenous peoples are concerned about, including the preamble, Article 8(j), Article 10(c), Article 15, Article 16, Article 17(2), and Article 18(4).
- We must work together.
- We really need to start using the UNDRIP. Implementation of the PoW should be based on the UNDRIP.
- Indigenous peoples need to be treated on an equal basis. It's not about money, it's about the rights of the indigenous peoples. Most of the national reports do not consult with communities, even during the development of the Pacific Plan – the PIF only had one day of formal consultation in Samoa, and this is for a plan that will drive so much of our future development.
- Without spirit equity is compromised.

Review and agreement of the final draft positions and strategies, Day 3, 9:48-11:35

241. Kate said we were going to break into three groups now and consider the draft positions, interventions and alterations to recommendations relating to:
- ABS
 - Marine and Coastal
 - Agro- and forest-biodiversity
242. Kate asked that the groups look at the draft text and suggest alterations for the next hour and then report back to the meeting.
243. The meeting broke into working groups at 9:50.
244. The meeting returned to session at 11:16.
245. The working groups reported back to the meeting.
- 246. Marine and Coastal**
- Key points raised (presented by FIELD):
- The group discussed SBSTTA recommendation 13(3) that will be discussed at COP9 in terms of its impact and strategies for influencing it.
 - It is not clear where the jurisdictional issues lie (non-EEZ or high-seas).
 - We will need to ask our governments if we want the recommendation to include areas inside our EEZs, or only those areas outside our EEZs. Once this has been established we need to ensure the wording is representative of our position.
 - We need to consider the wording of the scientific criteria. We should take the scientific criteria from the three annexes back to the stakeholders in our governments who are developing MPAs and see if we should support its adoption.
 - The other part of the recommendation is about options for addressing activities that could affect seabed habitats. We could potentially seek to strengthen the message relating to destructive activities.
 - The references to capacity building should be strengthened.
 - Some parties want to exclude regional organisations. However, these organisations are critical to the Pacific and we need to consider if we want to support this.
 - We need to consider whether EIA beyond areas of national jurisdictions is something we want to support.

- There is work required between now and COP9 in terms of establishing the position of our governments.

247. Palau asked if these points could be circulated.

248. FIELD responded that she would send the points to Kate, who would circulate next week.

249. ABS

Key points raised (presented by Le'a):

- Initial discussions focused on the needs in the Pacific in terms of:
 - Development national ABS legislation, including awareness raising of the issue with governments.
 - Developing a framework for the Pacific, which would include identification of who the main stakeholders are.
 - The need for capacity building and training on ABS.
- Specific COP9 recommendations:
 - Palau agreed to make an opening statement on specific needs in the Pacific relating to ABS, assisted by Le'a and FSM.
 - Le'a will also make a list of bullet points that will assist with questions that will likely rise in the working groups.
 - We should strongly support Co-Chair consultations in the Pacific.
 - We should strongly support development and implementation of national workshops that will build into development of international information. This will provide an opportunity to get funding for a regional workshop on how traditional knowledge relates to ABS, which can also feed into an international experts meeting.
 - We should support calls for GEF and UNEP to support capacity building.
 - While these are important issues for the COP9, the issue of national legislation development and understanding is probably more important.

250. Palau said that these points would be circulated prior to the end of the month and encouraged people to read them and engage with their governments to establish positions.

251. Agro- and forest-biodiversity

Key points raised (presented by SPC):

- The group addressed an agro-biodiversity document and a forest- biodiversity document, both of which were provided by USP (these will be circulated by SPREP).
- The recommendations covered most of the concerns of the Pacific relating to capacity building and governance.
- Only some of the provisions have funding [?], which should be highlighted as issues.

252. Fiu said the question of funding for biofuels and REDD was important, but we must consider the impacts that were presented by Espen last night.

253. Biofuels

- Kate said that it would now be useful to have a discussion on biofuels and REDD.
- Ana handed out a page of notes from the climate change focus group, the protected areas focus group, and the financial mechanism focus group.
- Kate said that we can provide comments on these during this afternoon.
- Kate put up Espen's presentation on biofuels for information.
- Messages that the Pacific that can put forward on biofuels:
 - SPC – said that economic issues, specifically how we balance needs are the priorities.
 - Palau – said that we are interested in biofuels from the waste component perspective. We generate enough used cooking oils to use as biofuel, and Palau received a grant to convert the used cooking oils to diesel power. At the same time

Palau are looking at alternative energy and we are considering biofuels as a source of CDM, which includes coconuts, solar etc. Palau would support use of biofuels for local energy needs, but not necessarily for commercial use.

- Marshall Islands – said that there was a pilot project on one of the islands that collected coconuts for use in biofuels, however they didn't have the capacity to take the next step and now they are back to reliance on diesel (pilot lasted for about six months). The price of coconuts went up last week from 11c/pnd to 21c/pnd.
- Kate – said in PNG and Solomon Islands where forests are being replaced for oil palm, the cost of coconuts is probably a significant issue.
- PNG – [couldn't hear point, but related to endemic species]
- Kate – asked if we needed to recommend that more research is done on the effects of biofuels on biodiversity as there are bits and pieces of studies at present that don't enable us to develop a clear vision.
- Palau – said we need to highlight the clear need for synergy in the implementation of FCCC, CCD and CBD.
- PNG – encouraged biofuels that use existing plantations, but does not encourage biofuels development where it requires establishing a new plantation.
- Fiji – said that we need to circulate information on biofuels before we can develop a consolidated position, such as some of the information that was presented last night.
- Fiji – said that we also need to consider the services that biofuels provide [not sure of accuracy of this point]
- Kate – said that what we've really identified is a lack of knowledge on this issue and added that we should also consider this issue beyond biodiversity as it may have an impact on global food process, and that we should take these back to our governments.
- Fiji – said that sustainability of these options is not well understood and perhaps we could [missed rest of point]
- Kate – said the issue of biofuels should really be brought up at a Pacific inter-governmental meeting.
- Kate – said that SPREP will try to identify what information is out there and where the gaps are, and circulate this information to participants.
- SPC – said that we need to have a definition of what a biofuel is as it's not clear, particularly relating to commercial use.
- Kate – agreed this was the crux of the issue relating to biodiversity and is a big issue in Brazil's position.
- Palau – asked if biofuels would be on the agenda at the COP9 for decision.
- FIELD – said that it was identified as an emerging issue at SBSTTA12, although due to opposition it was not included as an agenda item and that biofuels have been identified only as an issue that we need to know more about.

254. REDD

Messages that the Pacific can put forward on REDD:

- Kate said that we face much the same problem as for biofuels with a lack of information meaning we can't develop positions.
- Kate added that the position of Pacific on REDD may be different.
- Kate asked participants to follow this up with their governments.
- Kate said SPREP would set up an email list in the near future to circulate information on these issues, and to establish a regional position prior to COP9.
- IUCN said that IUCN have worked on the issue relating to funding [not sure of accuracy of this point], and said that he can summarise the information they have and circulate it to the participants.

255. Kate said the key point from this session is that SPREP needs to seek more information on these issues and circulate it to the participants.

256. Invasive Species

- Kate asked participants to have a look at the revised position on invasive species for five minutes and raise any questions they have.
- Alan said that the document was not in the proper briefing format, but contained the relevant information.
- Key points raised on the invasive species draft position paper:
 - Alan said the paper has not changed much from what was on the screen on Monday, although the order has been changed a bit.
 - Alan said he will send out the electronic copy of this and make changes from feedback.
 - Palau asked if SPREP could dedicate an Internet area where these documents could be downloaded from to ensure that documents are not lost in email.
 - Kate responded that SPREP would do this, and would also ensure that the documents are numbered correctly.
 - Fiji said we should include the point that development of biofuel production could encourage the spread of invasives, either through creating a vacuum, or the by the fact that some biofuel matter could actually become an invasive.

257. Financial Mechanisms

- Kate said that the main point of the focus group on financial mechanisms is to ensure that references are made to developing states, in particular SIDS, throughout the document. Kate will include this information on the website, and would include all the feedback from the focus groups on the website as this will form the basis of the briefing material. The PICs should then use this information as the basis for discussions on developing positions in their countries.

258. [Fiji raised a point on an example on Protected Areas that I was unable to hear]

259. Kate asked participants what type of support the PICs require from SPREP leading up to and including the COP, and added that while we have a lot of work over the coming weeks, the participants should be proud of themselves for the volume of work they have achieved this week.

260. The Chair called for a lunch break at 12:11.

261. The meeting resumed at 13:27.

262. The Chair handed over to Ana to facilitate the wrap up session.

263. Information available from this meeting:

- Presentations on flash-drives
- Meeting papers
- Information on output documents that will be made available on the SPREP website
- This information is intended to assist consultations within PICs.
- Ana – asked when the information on website should be made available.
- Palau – requested that SPREP make the information on the website available no later than the end of this month, but preferably next week.
- Ana – said that was likely, and that an email list will be set up to distribute the information.

264. Who's going to the COP?

- Ana asked who was going to the COP:
 - Marshall Islands – said that someone from foreign affairs would be attending, and hopefully the Minister.
 - PNG – not sure who is attending.

- Fiji – still awaiting confirmation from CBD Secretariat, but likely Seraki [?]
- Tonga – will be attending.
- Kiribati – will be attending.
- Ana – said it would be good to discuss what the PICs that are attending will be doing at the high-level event:
 - Palau – said that the event will be held on the 28th. The main purpose is to highlight the Micronesian Challenge and to kick-off the Caribbean Challenge, and to identify potential donors. TNC are working with the Government of Palau to develop the logistics of the event.
 - Tonga – said they are still to confirm attendance at the high-level event.
 - Palau – said it would be good to know who is attending the high-level event from the Pacific and where they are staying, as this is an opportunity to highlight the Pacific. Palau requested the PICs to support and attend the event.
 - Ana – asked if we could keep in touch regarding this and to let Palau know who is attending the event

265. Side events:

- Ana suggested SPREP could circulate information on the side events to the meeting participants.

266. Draft meeting statement:

- The idea is to circulate this document to our stakeholders.
- Ana – said that invasive species hasn't been included in the document, but will be added in the next draft.
- The draft meeting statement was put on the projector.
- Comments on draft statement:
 - SPC – 6th paragraph from bottom on page 1 should include reference to financial assistance (as well as technical assistance)
 - FIELD – the two paragraphs on capacity building say very similar things and could be included as a single paragraph.
 - SPC – we should add another paragraph recognising the importance of forest ecosystems in addressing climate change both in mitigation and adaptation.
 - SPC – last paragraph on page 1 should delete the word 'and' to make it read that security relates to all aspects.
 - Ana – add 'CBD' and the date of this meeting in the title.
 - Palau – alteration to paragraph 3 to remove Caribbean Challenge, as this is doesn't relate directly to the Pacific.
 - FIELD – on page 2, first paragraph, add 'recognising the wealth of...'
 - Kate – added paragraph on invasive species.
- The meeting adopted the Meeting Statement.

267. Draft meeting report

- Ana thanked the rapportuer
- The draft meeting report should be made available to participants next week sometime.

268. Meeting evaluation:

- Positive aspects of the meeting:
 - Palau – communication in getting here was the best so far in coming to Samoa
 - Marshall Islands – the venue being out of Apia minimised distractions
 - Tonga – accommodation
 - Palau – food and bar
 - PNG – presentations were excellent
 - Palau – technical experts such as FIELD being able to attend
 - Palau – resources people from SPREP were excellent
 - SPC – support of NGOs

- PNG – regional organisations attending
 - Marshall Islands – focus groups were good, and working into the evenings
 - Palau – shows that SPREP is listening to the PICs
 - Tonga – great tour guides (Tau and Randy)
 - Ana – Randy’s tour
 - Palau – staff at the resort
 - FIELD – inclusion of indigenous groups
 - SPC – addressing global issues
 - Palau – DSAs
 - SPC – absence of terrorism on the agenda
- Delta aspects of the meeting:
 - SPC – more discussion time
 - Kate – too hot
 - Fiji – conference room was uncomfortably hot
 - PNG – limited information
 - WWF – should have been more focus group discussions
 - FIELD – better if all 14 PICs could have attended
 - Fiji – another regional representative from outside the Pacific would have been useful to learn from
 - Fiji – moving hotels between this and Ramsar meeting disruptive
 - IUCN – need to engage territories

269. Chair’s closing remarks:

- Thanked staff from SPREP and everyone for the meeting.
- Grateful that we have completed a successful meeting under the guidance of SPREP.
- Thanked other CROP representatives, NGOs and FIELD for their efforts.

270. Kate thanked everyone for their participation and noted that it was hard to get funding to conduct the meeting and we need to bear this in mind for the next one. Expressed disappointment that the host Government didn’t attend.

271. Kate sincerely thanked all the resource people for their commitment in attending this meeting, as there is a lot of information to get across.

272. Kate asked if anyone has meeting photo’s they can share with us.

273. Kate thanked Maggie for her amazing job in organising the logistics of the meeting, noting that this was the first time she had taken the lead in this.

274. Kate thanked the Chair and rapporteur.

275. Kate also thanked Ana, and hoped to see us all again in two years.

276. The Chair invited any closing statements:

- SOPAC – thanked SPREP and Samoa for hosting the meeting [couldn’t hear rest of remarks]
- FIELD – also thanked SPREP, in particular Kate and Ana for their amazing job.
- Palau – on behalf of participants thanked Kate, Ana, FIELD, SOPAC, WWF and the rapporteur. Meetings like this are vital to the Pacific and very helpful. Also thanked management and staff LeVasa. Strongly encouraged exchange of information on email. Also strongly encouraged us to meet as PICs at the COP to look at the issues again. And also thanked the Chair for a fantastic job.
- Palau – advised that if we make an intervention then we need to preface it by saying that we ‘support’ each other in our statements, such as ‘I agree with the comments from ...’

277. The Chair asked Fiji to lead us in a closing prayer.

278. Fiji delivered the closing prayer.

279. The meeting closed at 14:19.