

[Opening][Interim][Closing]

Statement to COP 8 on Behalf of the Not-Always-Entirely-Like-Minded Mega Mega Diverse

[see below]

STATUS: TOP SECRET PENDING HIGH LEVEL MINISTERIAL APPROVAL



Mr. Chairman/Madame Chair/Chairperson/Chair/Excellency/Excelencia,

I have the [signal][dubious] honour of speaking to you on behalf of [myself] [and/or] the Not-Always-Entirely-Like-Minded Mega Mega Diverse (or, for convenience, NAELMMMD). The Not-Always-Entirely-Like-Minded Mega Mega Diverse is [[an] [amalgamation] [agglomeration][abomination] [or] [, as appropriate] [, at a push] [, and subject to national legislation] [, and/or personal inclination][.] [a Group]].

Mr. Chair/Madame Chair [etc.] as this is the first time that [I][we] have had the opportunity [[have been capable [organised][and/or] [coherent] [enough]] to take the floor [I][we] would like to express [my][our] [congratulations] [consternation][outrage] upon your election as Chair of our [deliberations][arguments][contestations] [confusions]. Mr Chair/Madame Chair [etc.] we are in your [capable] [catastrophic] [and /or] [frankly terrifying] hands.

Mr Chair/Madame Chair [etc.] the NAELMMMD is the outcome of intense [discussions][infighting][bewilderment] initiated during the debates surrounding an international regime on [access and] benefit-sharing during 2003, but the origins of NAELMMMD stretch back to COP5 and thus the ancient and inequitable past. As this is the first time that [I][we] have been [see above] [I][we] would like to [belatedly] congratulate the Chairs of COP5, COP6 and COP7 [and all intervening working and contact group chairs] upon their [election] [holidays] [retirement].

Mr Chair/Madame Chair [etc.] NAELMMMD is [as our name suggests] a mega mega diverse [group][entity] [embodiment] that [claims][encompasses][involves] [and regularly volunteers] members of such well known groupings as the european communion and its compendium states, our distinguished sister grouping the LMMDC, the G77 [plus or minus China depending on the day of the week], JUSCANZ, the Africa Group, and indigenous [peoples] and local communities embodying [traditional] [omnivorous] [vegetarian] lifestyles.

In common with our distinguished [members] [friends][volunteers] [occasional victims] from JUSCANZ we do not [cannot] [are incapable of] speak[ing] with one voice. However, in the course of our intense [late night] discussions we have [almost] [[and in a spirit of [compromise] [frivolity] [irreverence]] arrived at [consensus][a common misunderstanding] on the following ten [[elements] [ingredients] [footnotes] as [fundamental][important] [enjoyable]] features of a successful COP:

1. Sun
2. Shopping
3. Receptions
4. Refreshments
5. Gossip
6. Fashion
7. Dancing
8. Sightseeing
9. Partnerships [~~gender balancing~~] [~~nocturnal recreation~~] [~~reproduction~~]
10. More shopping

[Mr. Chairman/Madame Chair [etc.] in considering the [mind bogglingly] heavy agenda and difficult issues that lie before us [or behind us] at [from] COP8 [I][we] invite all members of the NAELMMMD to join us in recalling we are [or were] here to defend and celebrate biodiversity. To do that we must also celebrate life itself. As this is the last occasion upon which I am likely [to be organised enough/coherent enough/ or allowed] to take the floor, I would invite fellow members of this ad-hoc open-ended agglomeration to [[regularly] [as necessary][when inappropriate]] take the floor on behalf of NAELMMMD to ensure that we remember these fundamental truths.]

Thank-you for your kind [in]attention,

Dr. N.D. Bracket
 [~~Permanent~~][~~Interim~~] [Temporary] [Elected]
 [Self-appointed][~~Chair~~] [Executive] [~~Secretary~~][Typist]
 NAELMMMD Secretariat [~~the broom cupboard~~]
 Curitiba, Brazil



Protecting Biodiversity without being “Protectionist”: 'Incentive measures' and the relationship between CBD and WTO

Heike Baumuller, International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development

After heated debates at COP-7 and various SBSTTA meetings, incentive measures have again been placed on the COP agenda. On this issue, the relationship between CBD and WTO, again, creates a contentious divide among Parties to the Convention. In particular, in the discussions on agricultural subsidies, the divisions mirror those in the Doha negotiations at the WTO, where “agricultural liberalisers”, in particular members of the Cairns Group of agricultural exporting countries, such as the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina and Brazil, pressed for significant reductions in agricultural subsidies. In contrast, “protectionists”, such as the EU countries, would like to maintain a higher degree of protection of their agriculture sector. They highlight the ‘multifunctional’ role of agriculture related, for instance, to environmental protection and rural development.

CBD negotiations on incentives

Article 11 of the CBD calls on Contracting Parties to “adopt economically and socially sound measures that act as incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of components of biological diversity.” *Positive incentives* commonly refer to economic, legal or institutional measures designed to encourage beneficial activities, while *perverse incentives* can induce unsustainable behaviour that destroys biodiversity, often as unanticipated side-effects of other policies.

Argentina – supported by other Parties, in particular countries that are members of the Cairns Group, like Brazil and New Zealand – has repeatedly raised concerns in CBD discussions related to the use of positive incentives for mitigation. The Parties fear that these measures could be used by some countries to justify the provision of agricultural subsidies, and argue that efforts should first focus on eliminating perverse incentives.

WTO negotiations on agriculture and fisheries

Agriculture is among the most heavily subsidised sectors in many countries. Agricultural subsidies can be regarded as perverse incentives from a biodiversity perspective in many cases, for instance, where they lead to the conversion of natural habitats to high-tech, intensive agriculture. Under the so-called “green box”,

subsidies that are only minimally trade-distorting are exempt from reduction commitments (e.g. support for agri-environmental programmes). Green box criteria are up for review in the Doha Round where agriculture continues to be a politically sensitive issue for both developed and developing countries.

With regard to fishing industries, inadequately designed subsidies – estimated to amount to at least US\$15 billion per year – have been widely recognised as one of the key economic drivers of over-fishing. Negotiations are underway in the WTO to develop fisheries subsidies disciplines to address this problem. The talks have been driven by the “Friends of Fish” group (among them CBD Parties like Argentina and New Zealand) and Brazil. Other CBD Parties like Japan and Korea put up the strongest resistance to negotiating disciplines specifically for fisheries subsidies, arguing that the principal cause of stock depletion was inadequate management of fisheries resources rather than subsidies. However, the countries have slowly come to acknowledge the need to at least address subsidies deemed to directly cause serious harm to the resources.

A role for the CBD and WTO?

In light of these cross-cutting issues and the similarities of countries’ positions in the CBD and WTO negotiations, observership for the CBD in relevant WTO negotiations is imperative to ensure synergies between the two processes. Moreover, in addition to its work on perverse subsidies, the CBD should clarify the criteria for economically and socially sound, well-designed positive incentives for the effective implementation of its three objectives. It is well known that, in the past, not all subsidies governments declared to serve environmental purposes really were successful in doing so. On the side of the WTO, a “mutually supportive” clarification of its green box criteria, taking into account CBD criteria and the 2010 target, would make CBD work and decisions on incentives “trade-proof”. It also would be one step towards making trade safe for biodiversity. For further information, see

http://www.trade-environment.org/page/infoxch/CBD_COP8.htm

Islands biological diversity – time to rethink tourism

EQUATIONS, India

At the seventh Conference of Parties, it was decided to make island biodiversity a new issue for in-depth consideration at this (eighth) meeting (decision VII/31). As a result, an ad hoc technical expert group was convened in the Canary Islands, from 13 to 17 December 2004. The expert group prepared a draft program of work and submitted it to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) at its tenth meeting as one of its main items for discussion. SBSTTA subsequently adopted its recommendations.

The recommendation under ‘indicative list of supporting actions for parties for the implementation of the programme of work on island biodiversity’ has identified tourism as a key area under goal 5 & priority action 5.5 & 6.1; it suggests:

- ♦ Promotion of sites with potential for ‘added-value’ tourism
- ♦ Support pilot tourism projects that favor local biodiversity conservation

- ♦ Promoting ‘non-consumptive’ (!) ecotourism

A careful reading of the above 3 aspects of the recommendations shows they basically suggest approaching such forms of tourism similarly to how ecotourism is practiced.

Firstly, it is not clear what ‘added-value’ tourism is. In fact, ecotourism has been *the* value addition *to* the tourism industry. Thanks to the international year of ecotourism 2002 the tourism industry has been able to green-wash all its operations with little change in how tourism is practiced, besides the advent of new markets! Islands have become a ‘natural’ choice for new market development. The recommendations, by suggesting pilot projects, have only secured new areas for tourism development.

Moreover, ecotourism has been labeled “non-consumptive,” but it has been shown that ecotourism is *not* non-consumptive. No matter how low volume or low infrastructure, ecotourism will have an impact on biodiversity and ecosystems.

Can we really trust the 'private sector'?

Reports from Zacharias Bezerra de Oliveira, FBOMS and James Rowe

Industry is increasingly presenting itself as a 'partner' in biodiversity preservation – as evidenced by multiple side-events organized by institutions like the International Finance Corporation. Moreover, many corporations insist that industry self-regulation should take the place of enforceable – or for them 'restrictive'—environmental regulations.

But how committed are corporations to achieving the three objectives of the CBD?

The below stories about Syngenta – a major agri-business corporation -- serve as good reminders that parochial profit-seeking is industry's primary interest. This is no subversive secret. Economist Milton Friedman – central intellectual architect of neoliberalism -- is famous for declaring that "the social responsibility of business is to increase its profits" (New York Times Editorial, 1970).

But the corporate pursuit of economic wealth through the perpetual privatization of our inherited commons has only diminished natural wealth. And business is providing no compelling reasons for us to think otherwise at COP 8 -- witness their efforts to lift the de facto ban on Terminator Technology.

As the below articles indicate, binding environmental regulations enforced by national and international bodies, coupled by a vigilant global civil society, are currently our best hopes for biodiversity preservation.

Syngenta é multada em um milhão de reais

A invasão da multinacional Syngenta Seeds, em Santa Tereza do Oeste, Paraná, ocorrida no último dia 16, por membros do Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra (MST) e da Via Campesina, já rendeu os seus primeiros resultados. O Ibama multou a empresa em um milhão de reais e embargou o plantio de sementes transgênicas nos 12 hectares que estão incluídos na zona de amortecimento do Parque Nacional do Iguaçu.

Marino Eligio Gonçalves, superintendente do Instituto Brasileiro do Meio Ambiente e dos Recursos Naturais Renováveis (Ibama),



no estado do Paraná, informou, em entrevista coletiva, que a multinacional Syngenta Seeds foi multada em um milhão de reais por ter sido confirmada a denúncia da ONG Terra de Direitos, a cerca da existência de plantio de sementes transgênicas -

Organismos Geneticamente Modificados (OGMs), para fins de experimentação, em área incluída em zona de amortecimento do Parque Nacional do Iguaçu, Paraná. Esta prática, explica Marino afronta o artigo 11, da Lei 10.814/2003, que proíbe o plantio de organismos geneticamente modificados em unidades de conservação (UC) e em suas zonas de amortecimento.

A ação tem o objetivo de denunciar os experimentos com sementes geneticamente modificadas no entorno do Parque Iguaçu. O superintendente explicou que a Syngenta ainda pode recorrer da decisão nas instâncias administrativas estadual e federal do Ibama e, por fim, ao Ministério do Meio Ambiente. A multa poderá ser paga em dinheiro, que iria para o Tesouro Nacional, ou amortizada em forma de serviços de melhoria para a conservação ambiental, que poderão ser feitos pela própria empresa.

Syngenta is fined to a tune of R\$ 1 million

At a recent press conference Marino Eligio Gonçalves, Head of the Brazilian Institute of Environment and Natural Renewable Resources in the state of Paraná, confirmed the report made by the NGO *Terra de Direitos* that Syngenta had illegally planted GMOs for experimental purposes in an enclosed damping area in Iguaçu National Park, Paraná. He also announced that Syngenta was being fined R\$ 1 million for its transgressions.

These GMO trials, Marino explained, contravene article 11, of Law 10,814/2003, prohibiting the plantation of GMOs in conservation and damping areas. Syngenta's fine can either be sent in cash to the National Treasury, or submitted in the form of environmental improvement services provided by the company.

The government's response only came after members of MST (Landless People's Movement) and Via Campesina invaded the illegal GMO plantation last week.

“Let's be honest: in the world of adults, its all about money”

Stefan Krug, Greenpeace

This was one of the messages Clara, a 23 year old from the “Kids for forests,” left with delegates at the CBD opening session last Monday. And indeed, looking at the CBD discussions - from the fight over the “benefits“ of genetic resources, to the shortfalls in financing the protection of biodiversity – it is money that is setting the agenda.

Financial resources are desperately needed for saving the world's biodiversity. The implementation of the Global Network of Protected areas on land and sea alone would require an estimated 25 to 30 billion dollars per year. Is this a huge amount? Not for the protection of life on earth, and the well-being of future generations. OECD-countries spend these 29 billion dollars every month subsidising their agricultural and food production. Another

example? Take a look at the 850 billion dollars spent every year worldwide for subsidies harmful to the environment – 2.3 billion every single day!

Not to mention that 31 billion dollars spent on ice-cream in Europe and North America each year. Ice-cream or the planet -- not a difficult decision!

It is obvious that the 3 billion dollars constituting the budget of the CBD's Global Environment Facility (GEF) for the 2002-2006 period is shamefully small. But apparently even woefully small budgets can be cut even further! In his budget plan for 2007, US President Bush proposed a 50 % cut of the US contribution to the GEF - from 107 to 56 million dollars. *Continued pg. 4*

Notes from the C O P

Greenpeace announces *Bola Murcha* (Flat Ball) Award at CBD COP8



In the year of the football worldcup, Greenpeace announces the *Bola Murcha* (Flatball) Award for the most destructive government delegation at CBD COP8. At the end of the conference this price will go to the country that is 'taking the air out' of any progress towards achieving its core goal, to significantly reduce the loss of biodiversity by 2010.

Governments delegations will be nominated as candidates everyday during COP8, with the final award presented at the end of the confrence. The *Bola Murcha Award* is a deflated original size football with a map of the world's last intact forest landscapes printed on it. This map and a global map to create marine reserves on the high seas were launched on Tuesda 21st of March by Greenpeace.

Nominee for March 23 is AUSTRALIA for insisting on field trials with terminator seeds.

Australia can pick up its' nomination at the Greenpeace booth in the exhibition hall of COP8. "We are waiting for the delegation of Australia and hope that they will stop deflating progress at COP8 and start inflating energy, dedication and constructive contributions to this important conference to save life on earth." says Greenpeace campaigner Dr. Christoph Thies..

Existential Quote of the Day:

2(b), is not to be –
Malaysia on behalf of G77 + China



...*Ecotourism and Islands* continued from p. 2

Almost as an afterthought, the recommendations suggest that an understanding be developed on how biodiversity is affected by economic activities like tourism -- effects intensified on small islands (priority action 6.1). The recommendations also suggest, under 8.1, the development of alternatives that can prevent habitat loss and overexploitation of natural resources driven by *inter alia* tourism.

The recommendations indicate that CBD tourism guidelines were taken into consideration. But it must be noted, the tourism guidelines were adopted despite the fervent requests of indigenous groups. Tourism development has only raised their anxieties since tourism has targeted, commodified and exploited lands inhabited by indigenous peoples. The preparation process for the guidelines lacked the meaningful participation of indigenous peoples. Analysis of the guidelines also shows that the impact assessment processes have been diluted. There are inconsistencies between the tourism guidelines and the Akwe:Kon Guidelines.

The International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, an advisory body to CBD, has strongly objected to the lack of full and effective participation of indigenous & local communities (ILCs) in the program of work in island biodiversity, and has demanded the precautionary principle's application for tourism on islands.

A case in point is the Andaman & Nicobar Islands group of the Indian Ocean that are being targeted for large scale tourism development, which will prove disastrous to their fragile ecosystems and endangered biodiversity. The Indian delegation to COP-8 has so far not made a single comment on protecting the islands' biodiversity from tourism activities. It seems they are tacitly agreeing to imperil island biodiversity by allowing such consumptive activities like tourism.

Whether the concerns raised by indigenous and local communities will be taken on board is a critical area to watch out for. For more details contact Liyakhat on liyakhat.s@equitabletourism.org

Financial Incentives from p. 3

Instead, he wants to set up a new 40\$ million annual program called the "Asian Climate Initiative" with the US, Japan, China, South Korea and Australia. Great - the climate criminals now working together to undermine not one, but two international agreements: both the Climate Change Convention and the CBD!

Meanwhile, "perverse subsidies" continue, causing further degradation of biodiversity. Examples are: payments for "modernizing" fishing fleets with even larger ships capable of catching and processing even more fish and cheap forest logging licenses. In their Report "Deadly subsidies," Greenpeace shows how these and other environmental harmfully subsidies hurt not only biodiversity, but society as a whole.

Biodiversity is not evenly distributed around the world - but everybody enjoys its benefits. So, it is not a question of good will, but an obligation for the global community to fund the conservation of biodiversity, as clearly stated in Article 20 of the CBD. It is simply not enough to rely on state budgets in our quest to prevent the loss of biodiversity. And depending on the good will of private donors or companies and voluntary "partnership" agreements is also no solution.

If the CBD wants to reach its goals, new sources of funding and new instruments of financing must be found. Another Greenpeace study has analyzed how international environmental taxes could help. Modest carbon taxes on air tickets, on the use of air corridors, or on emissions of planes and ships offer huge sources of income. Also, taxes on the international timber trade, especially taxes on currency and financial transactions can provide enormous amounts of money for the conservation of biodiversity. International environmental taxation could easily fill the gap to finance a worldwide network of protected areas.

It's not just about budgets. When debating financial mechanisms and incentives for biodiversity conservation, CBD delegates should bear in mind that there are many ways and means to shift existing funds and raise new sources of financing. It is not a question of possibilities – it is a question of political will: to end perverse subsidies and to channel financial resources towards conserving the diversity of life on this planet that keeps all of us alive. (Both Greenpeace studies can be found under www.biodiv.org/meetings/cop8mop3/cop-08-table-ngo.shtml?greenpeace)

