



Brussels, 24 October 2014
(OR. en)

14664/14

ENV 850
AGRI 648
DEVGEN 228
FORETS 74
PI 118
PECHE 495
RECH 406
WTO 280
ONU 123
CADREFIN 117

NOTE

From: General Secretariat of the Council

To: Delegations

Subject: Main recent international meetings

- Twelfth Conference of the Parties (COP 12) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea, 6-17 October 2014)
- Seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP MOP 7) (Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea, 29 September-3 October 2014)
- First meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (COP MOP 1) (Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea, 13-17 October 2014)

= Information from the Presidency and the Commission

Delegations will find attached an information note from the Presidency and the Commission on the above subject, which will be dealt with under "Any other business" at the Environment Council meeting on 28 October 2014.

**Twelfth Conference of the Parties (COP 12) to the Convention on Biological Diversity
(Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea, 6-17 October 2014)**

**Seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties
to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP MOP 7)
(Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea, 29 September-3 October 2014)**

**First meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to
the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (COP MOP 1)
(Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea, 13-17 October 2014)**

- Information from the Presidency and the Commission -

Chapter 1: Convention on Biological Diversity

Introduction

1. Under the theme, “Biodiversity for Sustainable Development”, the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 12) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) was held from 6-17 October 2014, in Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea, following the seventh Meeting of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP MOP 7) held from 29 September to 3 October. COP 12 adopted 32 substantive decisions on many different strategic, substantive and financial issues. The COP meeting also served as the first Meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-Sharing (COP MOP 1).
2. A High-level Segment was held from 15-16 October 2014, which included panel discussions on "Integrating Biodiversity into the Sustainable Development Goals and Post-2015 Agenda", "Integrating NBSAPs into National and Local Development and Poverty Eradication Strategies and Planning Processes", "Nature-based Solutions to Global Challenges", "Biodiversity and Creative Economy", and "Peace and Biodiversity".
3. The discussions took place in the context of negotiations of proposed Sustainable Development Goals and the post-2015 Agenda, currently underway at the United Nations, and in this regard the High-level Segment adopted the "Gangwon Declaration on Biodiversity for Sustainable Development".

4. Emphasising the relevance and key contribution of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the vision for 2050 to the post-2015 Agenda at all levels, the "Gangwon Ministerial Declaration"- adopted following two days of talks - welcomes the importance given to biodiversity in the outcome document of the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals, and invites the United Nations General Assembly to further mainstream and integrate effectively the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets in the post-2015 Agenda. The Declaration also makes a link between the implementation of the post-2015 Agenda and other relevant processes such as the UN Development Assistance Framework process, and the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs).

Overview of the main decisions adopted

5. The fourth Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO 4), the flagship assessment report of the CBD, was launched at COP 12 and set the context for discussions by stressing that achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets by the end of the decade as foreseen is still within reach, but substantially greater efforts are required to do so. At CBD COP 12, Parties therefore agreed on steps to accelerate the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets.
6. A number of important decisions were adopted on GBO 4; the mid-term review of progress towards the goals of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets; enhancement of capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation and other initiatives to assist implementation; the Strategy for resource mobilization, and the Financial Mechanism; marine and coastal biodiversity; synthetic biology; climate change and biodiversity; invasive alien species; Convention Article 8(j) on traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities, and in particular the use of the terminology "indigenous peoples and local communities" in future decisions; cooperation between international agreements and with various stakeholders; ecosystem conservation and restoration; biodiversity and sustainable development; health and biodiversity; the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation; and several other ecosystem-related and cross-cutting issues. Parties also addressed operations of the Convention, and administrative and budgetary matters.

7. The Pyeongchang Roadmap, collecting those Decisions which were adopted on six major issues related to the further implementation of the Strategic Plan, will support the effective implementation of the CBD and the Aichi Targets. It will help putting in place the right policy frameworks and governance structure, and contribute to a significant increase in financial, human and technical resources from all sources.
8. The Republic of Korea announced four new initiatives in support of the Pyeongchang Roadmap and Parties' efforts to implement these and other decisions of the Conference of the Parties: the Biobridge initiative in support of technical and scientific cooperation; the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative (FERI); and the peace and biodiversity initiative in support of transboundary cooperation; as well as further support for the Sustainable Ocean Initiative.
9. On the crucial issue of resource mobilisation, a good and balanced agreement was reached. It reaffirms all the elements of the Hyderabad package, and adopts the international target, whilst also stressing the importance of domestic resource mobilization and the need for all CBD Parties to mobilise resources, and to increase efforts to mainstream biodiversity across their policy frameworks. The EU and its Member States, alongside other CBD Parties, reaffirmed that they commit, together, to contribute to doubling total biodiversity-related financial resource flows from a variety of sources to developing countries, in particular least developed countries and Small Island Developing States, as well as countries with economies in transition, by 2015, using as the reference level the average of annual biodiversity funding for the years 2006-2010, and at least maintaining this level until 2020. During EU coordination on-the-spot, the Commission reiterated its statement on resource mobilisation (see Annex).
10. Parties also agreed to increase domestic financing for biodiversity and identified a set of actions to allow the increased mobilization of financial resources from all sources. These decisions echoed and responded to the conclusions of GBO 4, which indicated that while progress was being made in conserving biodiversity, governments needed to increase efforts if they were going to end the loss of biodiversity.

11. The COP also adopted "milestones" for the full implementation of Aichi Biodiversity Target 3 on incentives. The decision includes a timetable and concrete activities for the elimination, phasing out or reform of incentive policies that are harmful to biodiversity, as well as the promotion of positive incentive policies.
12. Progress towards the resource mobilisation targets and their adequacy will be reviewed at the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
13. The revised Financial Reporting Framework was adopted. Exploration of the contributions of collective action and indigenous peoples has been introduced next to Biodiversity Financing Mechanisms.
14. The COP Decision on the Financial Mechanism of the Convention deals with synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions and the fourth review of effectiveness of the Mechanism (the Global Environment Facility, GEF). It incorporates the guidance received from discussions on other substantive COP agenda items, and from the meetings of both the Parties to the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols. Furthermore, it includes terms of reference for the assessment of funds needed for the seventh replenishment of the GEF. The EU and its Member States played a crucial role in the negotiation process, ensuring, inter alia, the full consistency of the decision with the rules and role of the GEF.
15. In undertaking a mid-term review of progress towards the goals of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, COP 12 took note of general GBO 4 conclusions and noted that Aichi Target 10 (coral reefs and associated marine ecosystems) will not be achieved by 2015. To improve reporting by Parties on the implementation of the Convention, COP requested the Executive Secretary to develop a proposal on guidelines for the sixth national reports, taking into account the types of information from the fifth national reports, and encouraged Parties, other governments and relevant organizations to disseminate GBO 4.

16. In the framework of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, COP 12 requested the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with Botanic Gardens, Conservation International, members of the Global Partnership for Plant Conservation and other partners to continue, among others, supporting capacity-building activities on plant conservation and to facilitate technical and scientific cooperation and to promote collaborative research.
17. As part of the review of progress in providing support to implement the objectives of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and enhancement of capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation and other initiatives to assist implementation, COP 12 reviewed progress in revising/updating and implementing NBSAPs and submitting fifth national reports, as well as communication, education and public awareness and the UN Decade on Biodiversity; and in enhancing support in implementing the objectives of the Convention and its Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.
18. COP 12 took a decision on sustainable development directed towards the United Nations post-2015 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals, stressing the need to support the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and to tackle the underlying drivers of biodiversity loss. The decision, inter alia, requests the Executive Secretary to continue the collaboration with key partners, to promote biodiversity for poverty eradication and sustainable development. COP 12 encouraged Parties to integrate biodiversity and nature's benefits to people into national budgeting processes as well as into poverty eradication and development strategies and vice versa and requested the Executive Secretary to assist Parties in utilizing the "Chennai Guidance for Implementation of the Integration of Biodiversity and Poverty Eradication".
19. On biodiversity and human health, COP 12 decided that the Executive Secretary should carry out relevant activities for the development of indicators on biodiversity and human health, further strengthen collaboration with other relevant organizations, prepare a synthesis of available information on the inter-linkages between biodiversity and emerging infectious diseases such as the Ebola virus, and promote further research on the relationship between biodiversity and disease outbreak. COP 12 also recognized the relevance of the cross cutting initiative on biodiversity for food and nutrition for the linkage among biodiversity, food, nutrition and health, as per Decision VIII/23.

20. On gender mainstreaming, COP 12 decided that the Executive Secretary should support the implementation of the Gender Plan of Action, including at national level, for the purpose of better integrating biodiversity in national gender policies and action plans. In this framework, Parties are requested to report on actions undertaken to promote gender and biological conservation.

21. In the decision on Article 8(j) and related provisions, COP 12 decided, inter alia, to use the terminology "indigenous peoples and local communities" (IPLCs) in future decisions and secondary documents under the Convention, as appropriate, while confirming that use of this phrase in future decisions and secondary documents shall not affect in any way the legal meaning of Article 8(j) and related provisions. The decision states that the use of "IPLCs" may not be interpreted as implying, for any Party, a change in rights or obligations under the Convention and that the use of "IPLCs" shall not constitute a context for the purpose of interpretation of the CBD.

22. In relation to marine biodiversity and the identification of ecologically or biologically significant areas (EBSAs), COP 12 decided, broadly in line with the Environment Council Conclusions of June 2014, to include the summary reports prepared by the 18th meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA 18) in the EBSA repository and to submit them to the General Assembly of the United Nations and in particular to its Ad Hoc Open-ended Informal Working Group to study issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction (BBNJ). COP further requested the Executive Secretary to present the reports to the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole on the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socioeconomic Aspects. It also recalled that the sharing of outcomes of the EBSA process does not affect the right and the jurisdiction of coastal States, or of other States, and requested the Executive Secretary to continue to facilitate the description of areas meeting the criteria for EBSAs through the organization of additional regional or subregional workshops. Finally, COP 12 encouraged Parties and other Governments to make use of the scientific information regarding the description of areas meeting EBSA criteria when carrying out marine spatial planning, development of representative networks of marine protected areas, and application of other area-based management measures in marine and coastal areas.

23. COP 12 also adopted a second decision on marine issues that addressed relevant marine threats such as the impacts on marine and coastal biodiversity of anthropogenic underwater noise and ocean acidification, priority actions to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Target 10 for coral reefs and closely associated ecosystem, and marine spatial planning and training initiatives.
24. On invasive alien species, COP 12 followed the recommendations from SBSTTA 18 (June 2014) and adopted the voluntary "Guidance on devising and implementing measures to address the risks associated with the introduction of alien species as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, and as live bait and live food". COP called for the promotion of the use of the Guidance for the development of regulations. Furthermore, in reviewing work on invasive alien species and considerations for future work, the COP requested the Executive Secretary to enhance the implementation of actions to achieve Aichi Target 9 by facilitating the development and implementation of regional projects to manage pathways and invasive or potentially invasive species that have been identified as priorities at the regional level; developing decision-support tools for assessing and evaluating the social, economic and ecological consequences of invasive alien species as well as by promoting cost-benefit analyses for eradication, management and control measures and for examining the impacts of climate change and land-use change on biological invasions; and developing a user-friendly guide to existing decisions of the COP on invasive alien species and the relevant guidance and standards developed by other relevant organizations. In this context, the EU and its Member States proposed to collect experiences in the use of biological control agents against invasive alien species, in particular the release in the wild of alien species for this purpose, including also positive and negative cases and cases of the application of appropriate risk assessment. This new proposal was adopted as a COP decision.

25. Discussions on synthetic biology were held both during the 7th meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and at COP 12. The COP recommended a coordinated approach since the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol may also apply to living organisms resulting from synthetic biology. The COP decided to urge Parties, based on the precautionary approach, to establish, or have in place, effective risk assessment and management procedures and/or regulatory systems to regulate the environmental release of any organisms, components or products resulting from synthetic biology techniques consistent with Article 3 of the CBD. It also urged Parties to approve organisms resulting from synthetic biology techniques for field trials only after appropriate risk assessments have been carried out in accordance with national, regional and/or international frameworks, as appropriate. The COP called for carrying out scientific assessments with regard to potential effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, taking into account risks to human health and addressing other issues such as food security and socioeconomic considerations. The EU and its Member States succeeded in getting the COP to agree to establish an Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on synthetic biology with balanced representation of Parties from all regions and representation of indigenous and local communities and all relevant stakeholders.
26. The decision on climate change and biodiversity-related issues, adopted by COP 12 expresses concern about the findings and conclusions of the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and urges Parties, other governments, relevant organizations and stakeholders to take steps to address all biodiversity-related impacts of climate change highlighted in the IPCC Report, and to further strengthen synergies with relevant work under the UNFCCC. It also encourages Parties and other governments to promote and implement ecosystem-based approaches to climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction, and to integrate these into their national policies and programmes in the context of the "Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015" and the revised Framework to be adopted at the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction.

27. The COP decision on ecosystem restoration acknowledges the need to develop a monitoring system for ecosystem degradation and restoration as well as the inclusion of the marine sphere in the development of spatial planning approaches for the reduction of habitat loss and the promotion of restoration. Moreover, the document recognises the essential role of indigenous and local communities in the conservation and management of biodiversity and the importance of protecting and restoring coastal wetlands as crucial for biodiversity, ecosystem services, livelihoods, climate change and disaster risks reduction. The COP acknowledged the function of private protected areas, in addition to public and indigenous and local community managed areas, in the conservation of biodiversity, and encouraged the private sector to continue its efforts to protect and sustainably manage ecosystems for the conservation of biodiversity.
28. On cooperation with other Conventions, COP 12 decided, subject to the availability of resources, to establish a regionally-balanced informal advisory group, selected by the COP Bureau on the basis of nominations by Parties, to prepare, prior to the first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI), a workshop on options for a possible roadmap for Parties of biodiversity-related conventions to enhance synergies and improve efficiency among them. It also invited the Liaison Group of the Biodiversity-related Conventions to participate in the informal advisory group.
29. The EU and its Member States played a particularly active role in the negotiations on improving the efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention. COP 12 agreed to the establishment of the SBI (to replace the Working Group on the review of Implementation) and the organization of concurrent meetings of the COP of the Convention and the COP MOPs of the Protocols over a period of two weeks. This will be very important in changing the dynamics of future CBD meetings and will allow a better integration of Cartagena Protocol considerations in the overall work. The number of decisions will need to be reduced in the future if they are to be negotiated in two rather than three weeks; and this should help to focus work. Other aspects of this decision included a proposal for a pilot voluntary peer-review of the preparation and implementation of NBSAPs; the retirement of decisions; and relations with the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).

30. In relation to the Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPOW) of the COPs up to 2020, the EU and its Member States actively participated in the identification of appropriate strategic issues to be dealt with in future COPs (2016, 2018, 2020). Main issues will relate to the final assessment of the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, including consideration of the implications of the IPBES global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services; and related means of implementation including resource mobilisation. This will also include COP 15 to determine the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2021-2030 and funding needs to inform the GEF 8 replenishment for the 2022-2026 cycle.
31. The budget decision was less controversial than in recent years although Parties had to tackle a much wider range of issues than suggested by the Secretariat documents which failed to take account of the legal need to prepare a separate budget for the distinct costs of the Nagoya Protocol; since it is an established principle of international law that non-Parties should not pay for instruments to which they do not belong. The eventual outcome was a two year budget for CBD alone totaling \$28.6 million to which the EU as a whole will contribute 35%, including a assessed contribution for the EU itself as a Party of \$0.6 million. This represents a 7.7% increase in expenditure for the Convention over the current biennium, including a one-off 2.5% increase to give the Secretariat greater protection from late payment of subscriptions, and a 3.8% increase in the contributions from Parties. The increases are less than at COP 11 even though, at the insistence of the of the G77, for the first time in many years the basic costs of the four major meetings of the Convention (the two meetings of SBSTTA, the SBI and the Article 8(j) meeting) were all put into the core budget. In addition, the COP agreed a voluntary budget of \$28 million to finance the Secretariat's role in implementing decisions, and another \$4.5 million to allow participation by poorer developing countries in the meetings. The activities' budget was not subjected to much scrutiny due to lack of time.

Next steps

32. The proposal by Mexico to host CBD COP 13 (to be held in Los Cabos) in the second half of 2016 was accepted. CBD COP 13 will inter alia undertake another interim review of progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the achievement of the Aichi Targets. Funding needs to inform the GEF 7 replenishment for the 2018-2021 cycle, implications of the post 2015 United Nations development agenda and Sustainable Development Goals, and of other relevant international processes for the future work of the Convention, will be addressed as well, among other issues.

EU role in the negotiations

33. The European Union and its Member States played an active and decisive role in the negotiations, and confirmed their leading role in supporting the conservation and sustainable use of global biodiversity.
34. Outreach activities were conducted at expert level on the specific subjects under negotiation in the Working Groups and Contact Groups throughout the COP, as well as at ministerial level with a number of key countries, including (at high level) with the Republic of Korea and with Brazil.
35. Biodiversity policies can only be successful when they are integrated into a whole range of other policy areas, including economic and social policies at global, regional, national or local level. This underlines the crucial catalytic role of the Convention in reaching out to a wide range of stakeholders, including the private sector, NGOs, indigenous and local communities, as well as local authorities. Enhancing synergies with other UN organisations and multilateral environmental agreements and in particular biodiversity-related conventions is also a priority. Successful implementation of the Convention and its Strategic Plan depends largely on such mainstreaming and synergies. The EU and its Member States will do their utmost to maintain the momentum and fully implement the successful COP 12 outcome.

Chapter 2: The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

36. The Conference (COP MOP 7) was conducted through a plenary session and two working groups which dealt with most of the items on the Agenda. One issue on cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives was discussed exclusively in the plenary while a special session on implementation was held on the first afternoon and the budget was dealt with in a special Contact Group.
37. Working group I debated the report of the compliance committee, guidance to the Financial Mechanism (the Global Environment Facility), the Nagoya–Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on liability and redress, socio-economic considerations, monitoring and reporting, and the third assessment and review. Working group II debated the Biosafety Clearing House, handling, transport, packaging and identification, risk assessment and risk management, unintentional transboundary movements and contained use.
38. The special session on implementation focused on an exchange of views on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biodiversity, specifically on the integration of biosafety into relevant national plans and programmes, and potential strategies identified for overcoming the challenges regarding this integration. Such challenges include: the need for assistance, both technical and financial, and the lack of capacity, specifically in the field of public awareness and participation, risk assessment and risk management, and monitoring of laboratory work.
39. The meeting adopted 14 decisions. The main substantive issues were related to socio-economic considerations; risk assessment and risk management; handling, transport, packaging and identification. The two existing Ad Hoc Technical Expert Groups (AHTEG) have been extended while, as requested by the EU and its Member States, a third AHTEG on Assessments and Review has not been established. Instead, the task of assessment and review of the Protocol has been entrusted to the relevant subsidiary body (the SBI) which will take account of contributions from the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building.

40. On budgetary matters, the Parties agreed on a budget that in real terms leads to an increase in contributions of 5.5%, yet allows for the total contributions of EU and its Member States to fall by 4.2%, due to changes in the UN General Assembly assessment scale. As with the CBD and Nagoya Protocol, the budgetary reserve available to protect the Secretariat against late contributions has been increased. The COP agreed to the request from the MOP that the Trust Funds to help developing country representatives participate in meetings of the Cartagena Protocol and the Convention should be merged and should also cover participants in Nagoya meetings. This merger will make it easier to cover participation in concurrent meetings.
41. Institutional discussions also focused on improving the efficiency of Structures and Processes under the Convention. The Parties agreed to hold future ordinary meetings concurrently with CBD COP and COP MOP meetings in a two-week period, and decided that the Supplementary Body on Implementation will also serve the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as well as the Nagoya Protocol. The EU regretted that the Functional Review of the Secretariat requested by COP 11 and aimed at increasing effectiveness and changing the Secretariat structure from one based on the different instruments to one based on functions such as 'capacity building' had not been completed as requested and that it therefore had not influenced the budget proposals. This theme was also taken up in the subsequent COP discussions and the Bureau has been asked to follow progress closely as the work is completed over the coming year.
42. On socio-economic considerations, Parties agreed to further develop conceptual clarity, to work on an outline for guidance on this matter and to extend, subject to the availability of funds, the AHTEG for this purpose. The commission of a study on international agreements that may have relevance to socio-economic considerations was also agreed.

43. On risk assessment and risk management, Parties welcomed the results of the testing of the Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms and agreed to have a revised and improved version of it by COP MOP 8. The Open-ended Online Expert Forum was extended, as well as the AHTEG, which was also expanded to include five new members, an additional member from each region. The AHTEG will work primarily online and, subject to the availability of funds, through a face-to-face meeting. On the issue of synthetic biology, Parties recommended a coordinated approach with the COP, taking into account that the provisions of the Protocol may also apply to living organisms resulting from synthetic biology.
44. On handling, transport, packaging and identification, the Parties decided, upon an EU suggestion, that a further review of the need for a stand-alone document is not required, unless explicitly requested by Parties in the future.
45. The European Union and its Member States welcomed all decisions adopted, which are in line with the Environment Council Conclusions.

Chapter 3: The Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing

46. On 14 July 2014, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity reached the required number of ratifications for its entry into force on 12 October 2014. The following day, therefore, the first Meeting of the Parties serving as Conference of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol (COP MOP 1) officially started its session (from 13 to 17 October 2014) in Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea, concurrently with the 12th Conference of the Parties to the CBD. The session was preceded by a Workshop on capacity building for the Access and Benefit-sharing (ABS) Clearing House, aiming at finally testing the on-line platform managed by the Executive Secretariat.

47. As for Cartagena, COP MOP 1 was led through a plenary session and two working groups dealing with the items of the agenda, focusing on the Nagoya Protocol specific issues while issues related to the budget and the programme of work for the biennium 2015-2016 for the Protocol were discussed in the plenary joint session of the COP 12 and the COP MOP 1, as well as during the review of progress in the two Working Groups and in the budget contact group.
48. Working Group I debated the ABS Clearing-House and its modalities of operation (Art. 14), the monitoring and reporting system (Art. 29), the guidance to the financial mechanism (Art. 25) and resource mobilization, the CBD cross-cutting item on improving efficiency of structures and processes under CBD and its Protocols, the measures for capacity-building (Art. 22) and awareness raising of the importance of Genetic Resources and Traditional Knowledge (Art. 21).
49. Working group II dealt with the compliance issue, model contractual clauses, voluntary codes of conduct, guidelines and best practices and/or standards (Art. 19 and 20), the need for and modalities of a global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism (Art. 10) and the cooperation with other international organizations, conventions and initiatives.
50. Due to the good preparation of the COP MOP 1 at the third meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol (ICNP 3), only two issues were expected to be problematic during the venue, i.e. the compliance issue and the possible discussion on a global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism (GMBSM).

51. On cooperative structures and institutional mechanism to promote compliance, the negotiations, even though challenging and very intensive, reached a successful outcome relatively quickly. A Contact Group had been established already under COP, co-chaired by Kaspar Sollberger (Switzerland) and David Hafashimana (Uganda), which met twice before the start of the MOP. General interventions on the main issues still pending were heard since the ICNP 3 and succeeded in removing a number of brackets, forwarding a revised text to the COP MOP 1. The Contact Group was re-established under the same co-chairmanship under COP MOP 1 to finalise the compliance procedure's text and develop further a draft decision. On 15 October, the Contact group ended its works removing all the remaining brackets in the text which was forwarded to the Working Group and the Plenary that adopted it with no modifications. The structure of the compliance procedures and mechanisms and its rules reflect the EU and its Member States' position on this item, so the agreement reached can be considered a major achievement of the negotiations. The new Compliance Committee will have a facilitative non-adversarial character and will be composed of 15 full members plus 2 representatives from ILCs as observers who can participate fully in all parts of the Committee's work apart from decision making. Decisions can be taken as a last resort by a $\frac{3}{4}$ majority. Beyond systemic issues, the Committee can get active on individual cases, based on a Party triggering or based on information from national reports, the Clearing House or information provided by ILCs after filtering by the Secretariat. In line with the EU and its Member States' position, no ombudsman office was established. The reached compromise includes a mandate for the Compliance Committee to consider further, before COP MOP 2, the need for and modalities of support to provide advice and assistance to developing countries and ILCs to address cases of non-compliance. Therefore, it is to be expected that the ombudsman issue may come back at COP MOP 2, based on the recommendations of the Committee, which are to be complemented by views from Parties and stakeholders.
52. In Plenary, nominees for the Compliance Committee for membership from the regional groups (15 full members, plus alternates) and for observer status from the ICLs were elected: from the WEOG was nominated Kaspar Sollberger (Switzerland), Alejandro Lago Candeira (Spain), Helge Elisabeth Zeitler (EU) and alternate Gaute Voigt-Hanssen (Norway). Elzbieta Martyniuk (Poland) was elected among the CEE group.

53. The other item on the agenda expected to be difficult – the Global Multilateral Benefit-sharing Mechanism (GMBSM) – proved not to be problematic. Despite the initial announcement in the opening Plenary by Uganda on behalf of the African countries that they would like to see 'an immediate pilot phase for GMBSM established', this was not followed in statements and submissions delivered during the WG. Establishment of such mechanism would be against the EU and its Member States' position, which firmly endorses the view that first experience needs to be gained in implementation of the Protocol prior to engaging in any discussion on developing mechanisms complementary to the Protocol. The overall agreement of ICNP 3 was not questioned and the outstanding issue of 'subject to availability of the funds' of the study and expert group meeting, which are to look at the need for and modalities of developing such mechanism, was solved by retaining the text (to be funded from voluntary funds by Norway).
54. Regarding the ABS Clearing House, which is crucial for the functioning of the Protocol and which is now operational for the mandatory elements, the EU and its Member States contributed greatly to the quality of the decision taken. The mostly technical interventions by EU and its Member States resulted in preparation of a revised CPR and were supported in the WG by Switzerland and not questioned by other Parties. Also on reporting and monitoring, the EU and its Member States had submitted a vast amount of comments on the draft decision, the draft guidelines and the draft-reporting format for the interim national report, due by the end of 2017. Most of them were in view of avoiding duplication of submission of information vis-à-vis the information provided already under the ABS Clearing House.
55. Further, other major points of the agenda were also smoothly adopted and largely reflected the EU and its Member States' position (the strategic framework for the capacity building and development, the awareness-raising strategy, the guidance to the financial mechanism directly addressing the GEF 6 and the resource mobilization). As far as it concerns the CBD cross cutting items, such as efficiency of structures and processes under the CBD and its Protocol, please refer to the CBD section of the current report.

56. The decisions taken at COP MOP 1 will allow the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing to become operational, facilitate its effective implementation and promote adequate resource mobilisation in support of implementation. With this, the first Aichi target (Target 16) has effectively been reached one year ahead of time.
57. The CBD Secretariat requested a two year core budget of \$2.1 million for the Nagoya Protocol budget but since only 7 Parties will initially pay the bulk of it, this had to be reduced by relying on voluntary donations for three of the four staff posts in the first year and one in the second year, when there should be many more Parties to share such costs. As a result, a two year core budget will be paid by assessed contributions of \$1.2 million, including a capped contribution from the EU of \$34,000, and voluntary pledges of \$425,000 from the Commission and smaller amounts from Switzerland and Norway that will meet the additional staff costs. Further voluntary funds of over \$1.5 million will be needed to implement the agreed work-programme.

The documents that were presented to the final plenary for adoption are available at:

<http://www.cbd.int/cop12/insession>

Documents relating to the final plenary of the Nagoya Protocol can be found at:

<http://www.cbd.int/npmop1/insession>

Commission statement on resource mobilisation

"For the EU and its Member States, the preliminary target of doubling biodiversity-related international financial resource flows to partner countries by 2015, compared to the baseline of the average of the years 2006-2010, as agreed by the 11th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, is to be understood as a global target which does not imply any specific burden-sharing agreement between Member States and/or the EU."
