



COP 10 Honour Roll

Most gracious host: Japanese Civil Network (JCN) and the Japanese government. Arigatou Gozaimasu! ありがとうございます! (a thousand times). Have a long, well-deserved sleep when we are gone.

Life of the Party Awards: The Philippines, Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Doris the Dodo Bird.

Lifetime under-achiever Award: Canada (why do you continue to disappoint? On this see ABS assessment next page)

Party Crushers: UNFCCC

Party Crashers: USA (also runner up for the Invisible Hand Award)

Biggest Success: Geoengineering moratorium. Multilateral precaution prevails!

The biggest question: What *is* the economic value of the TEEB report? Discuss.

Bare knuckled award / Most likely to fight a pack of lions with her bare fists award: Bolivia

The future of “conservation” (we sincerely hope not): Chair of side event on business and biodiversity says to an IUCN speaker: “I keep forgetting if you are wearing your Rio Tinto hat, or your IUCN hat!” Perhaps ‘Church and State’ are not the only two things that should be separate.

Best Quote: The reason we need COPs is because we have Robbers. (In reference to ABS, of course)

The (not-so) Invisible Hand Award: Columbia and Canada for rewriting and adding text without consulting anyone and then trying to bamboozle people into accepting it.

Voice of Sanity Award: Norway, in relation to Target 18 on traditional knowledge and practices, who not only supported the IIFB’s text suggestion, but also stated outright that they *should* guide the way on this target, since it is Indigenous Peoples for whom this matters most.

Most disingenuous term of the term ‘in the spirit of compromise’: Brazil, in biofuels, “in the spirit of compromise, I would like ... [insert their own national interest and position here]

Biggest contradiction: Japan promotes the Satoyama-Satoumi Initiative, but builds a nuclear power plant in the inland sea, destroys an ecological hot spot for a US military base in Okinawa, and turns a blind eye to the destruction of Satoyama.

Continued next page

Honour Roll continued

Another big question: Where are all the crusts from the sandwiches? This place is a child's dream!

Yo Yo issue: Farmers in or out of agricultural text. Thankfully they are in!

Most likely to (mis?)quote previous COP decisions: Brazil, Switzerland

"Best" new term: "ecopreneuers".

Talking too much award: Brazil (and see below)

... award: Brazil and Philippines (in reference to their long, dramatic pauses – watch out Harrison Ford!)

We Assess the results...so far

Civil society reflects on some of the outcomes of COP 10. When this goes to press much is still going on: discussions on financial resources, the strategic plan, and of course, ABS. The balance remains delicate.

Access and Benefit Sharing

Developing countries will either get a meaningful benefit sharing protocol under the CBD now or do the right and necessary thing by other means, as appropriate.

Remember the good old days when Canada could/would do the right thing and joined hands with the civil society groups that founded the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, to launch the Ottawa Process that resulted in the historic Mine Ban Treaty in only 15 months.

[Strategic Plan]

[Discussions between biodiversity rich and economically rich countries resembled a game of chicken, with both sides waiting to see who veers off course first, rather than focusing on what will be necessary to halt the loss of biodiversity in this, our ["Decade of Biodiversity".] The current draft is insufficient to accomplish the difficult task at hand. The last remaining questions all concern the level of ambition in relation to the loss of habitats, the cover of protected areas, and perhaps most critically, by how much do we increase funding to implement the plan and the CBD more generally.

Financial Resources: Apply the Precautionary Approach to increase funding

We are close to setting ambitious targets to halt the loss of biodiversity in the Strategic Plan, but failing to set similarly ambitious targets for increasing the financial resources needed to meet the obligations of the Conventions in general and of the Strategic Plan in particular. Instead a procedure is proposed to develop an assessment of existing funds, baselines and funding gaps and only *then* to set financial targets in 2014 at COP12, or maybe - if we are fast - in 2012 at COP11. All of that while we are all fully aware that the lack of adequate funding was a major reason why we failed to fulfill the 2010 targets. Let's apply the Precautionary Approach not only to biodiversity but also to funding, and make a clear commitment to provide increased funding - even if we don't know yet how much it is. If too much money might be become available, we can always give it back, right?

Geoengineering.

The consensus decision significantly expands upon an earlier moratorium on ocean fertilization adopted at the Biodiversity Convention's last global meeting in Bonn, Germany in 2008. We think that this is a great success!

Agricultural Biodiversity

Agricultural biodiversity risk neglecting the central role of smallholder farmers and ILCs in safeguarding and enhancing ecosystems and the biodiversity they contain. But fortunately,

thanks to the support of some parties, small holder farmers and their contributions to biodiversity through in-situ conservation is well acknowledged in the text. There is still work to be done to get parties to move away from a food system based on industrial agriculture, in favor of biodiversity based ecological agriculture.

Biofuels

In the two years since COP 9, many of the problems that were predicted for biofuels have become a reality, yet COP 10 produced a text that is weaker than the SBSTTA recommendations and which came close to losing all reference to the precautionary approach. In addition it almost became confined to agriculture alone without reference to wider biodiversity, including forests. It still promotes biofuels. What we needed was a clear warning of the impacts of biofuel production and an insistence on applying the precautionary approach. Parties failed to achieve this.

Marine and Coastal Biodiversity

After hours and hours of discussion, and going around in circles, there has finally been modest progress on the scientific criteria to identify ecologically and biological significant areas (EBSAs). A decision was made to establish a repository for scientific information and experiences in relation to EBSAs, as well as for regional workshops to facilitate the identification of areas that meet the CBD criteria. These workshops must be open and transparent, and include the participation and input of civil society, especially indigenous peoples and local communities. Critically, some progress was made in including ILC participation and traditional knowledge in the PoW. The Parties could have taken a much bolder approach, especially considering countries will need to significantly increase action to adequately address this issue.

Synthetic Biology

The bracketed recommendation from SBSTTA was a moratorium on the release into the environment of synthetic biology organisms, based on the application of the precautionary approach. At COP 10 Parties needed to **strengthen** the moratorium, suspending commercial releases. We also needed countries to understand the risk of dramatically increasing the use of biomass -and thus land and water- that synthetic biology will lead to. Instead, thanks to the pressure of countries that have industrial interests in synthetic biology (like Brazil and the US) and the EU that reversed the precautionary approach. The proposal from SBSTTA was weakened, now only calling to apply the precautionary approach. However, the discussions have been important to put a spotlight on the dangers of synthetic biology.

Continued next page

Assessment continued

Climate change and biodiversity?

We spent three days on the language around the relation between the CBD And UNFCCC avoiding any risk of the CBD having an influence on the UNFCCC. Not the outcome we were looking for, as we hoped that the CBD would take a bolder role in ensuring that the UNFCCC (or other

international organizations) respects biodiversity conservation as well as the associated livelihoods that maintain it.

CEPA

The draft CEPA decision was revised in accordance with many of our aspirations, endorsed by Parties. The new decision recognizes the important role of Indigenous Peoples and of NGOs.

Is India ready to host COP 11?

Neema Pathak Broome, Kalpavriksh, India

While there were high-level negotiations fighting for words such as “urging” and “inviting” within the confines of various conference rooms in the Nagoya Congress Centre, just outside there were dozens of Japanese citizens trying to bring to the notice of the COP delegates and others the violation of biodiversity integrity by the Japanese government. They were highlighting the decade long struggle against the proposed Kaminoseki Nuclear Plant that will destroy an ecologically important marine habitat; destruction of the last “Satoyama” in Nagoya city (a concept being proudly displayed by the Japanese government within the walls of CoP 10); threat to Yoshino-gawa River Estuary from construction of a highway; and many others (see box). As the baton of COP is passed on from Japan to India (see next page on this) one cannot help drawing parallels in India.

Destructive fishing, aquaculture, construction of ports, and other infrastructure that will destroy best fisheries and turtle sites (see box); mining projects in ecologically and culturally sensitive zones of the Western Ghats, states of Orissa, Chhattisgarh and others; hundreds of dams in the sensitive Himalayan belt all the way from Himachal Pradesh to Arunachal Pradesh.... The government’s insistence on going ahead with these despite evidence of legal violations by the proponents and the government agencies, scientific evidence on how these will affect the local and downstream biodiversity, livelihoods of local people and have a devastating effect on local cultures. Areas being impacted include the surrounds and parts of protected areas, for example Sariska Tiger Reserve;

Sacred Natural Sites for example the Djongu Valley in Sikkim; Sacred Rivers which have brought spiritual peace and life to millions of Indians such as the Ganga and Brahmaputra.

India also has an obligation to follow the principles of equity, good governance, participation of local and indigenous communities in the establishment and management of PAs under the Protected Area Programme of Work (PoWPA) of the CBD. Back home, however, 100,000 families are proposed to be relocated from various Tiger Reserves in the country, in most cases without acknowledgement and recognition of their traditional rights.

Hosting CBD should mean a commitment on part of the host country towards conservation of biodiversity and respect for human rights of indigenous and local communities. If India truly wants to show this commitment it will need to do much work back home. The government will have to take up the issue of violation of its own environmental and social laws to push for development projects in the face of mass agitations; it will have to review a number of such development projects which have been given a permission to go ahead; it will need to ensure that ecologically and culturally sensitive sites remain “no go” zones for destructive industry. It will need to stop the dilution of relatively strong environmental provisions such as the Coastal Zone Regulation and so on. It will need to build on and move towards participatory and inclusive conservation of ecological habitats, learning lessons from its own rich and vibrant tradition of community conservation. Essentially the government of India will need to take a strong look at its environmental governance to assess whether it truly takes into account the interests of the biodiversity and those dependent on it. It can then say that it is indeed seriously committed to targets agreed upon in CBD.

Indian fishworkers call for All-India Fisheries Strike on 29 October, 2010

Chandrika Sharma, International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF)

The National Fishworkers’ Forum (NFF), a federation of state-level organization representing fishing communities in India, has called for an All-India Fisheries Strike on 29 October 2010 to reject the draft Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ) Notification 2010 put forward by the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF). The NFF is rejecting the notification for two main reasons:

- It does not offer adequate protection to the sensitive coastal ecosystem and its biodiversity
- It does not recognize the inalienable right of fishing communities to their habitats and to be represented in decision-making

As India prepares to host COP11 of the CBD in 2010 it would do well to ensure that two important principles of the Convention—conservation of biodiversity and issues of equity and respect of the rights of indigenous and local communities—are reflected in the CRZ Notification 2010 that is to be brought out in the coming months.

Okinawa + Biodiversity

We would like to direct your attention to destructive plans taking place simultaneously in hotspots of Okinawa Island, Japan. The plans to construct a US military airbase in Henoko and Oura Bay and six helipads in Yanbaru forests are well underway. (The construction plans of US military facilities in Henoko/Oura Bay and in Yanbaru forests are well underway). The reclamation plan is about to resume in the Awase tidal flat. These plans will devastate the island ecosystems and push endangered species of the area into extinction. The plans ignore the voices of indigenous Okinawan people and international calls against them. In solidarity with the Okinawan people and international calls, we call for the stoppage of the plans.

Intervention at High Level Segment, COP 10

Made by Silvia Ribeiro, ETC Group on Thursday October 28

Biodiversity is in crisis with respect to both nature and culture, and the two are deeply linked. And although the CBD was created to respond to these crises 18 years ago, biodiversity loss has not decreased, it has actually accelerated. Why? Governments – particularly those who bear the largest responsibility for ecological and climate debt -- lack political will. The most serious crisis of biodiversity is therefore the refusal of wealthy countries to address the root causes of this devastation.

Rather than adopting realistic and effective strategies to preserve biodiversity, COP 10 has bought the dangerous illusion of "innovative" financial mechanisms that insist in putting a price on the priceless. Carbon offsets for forests and biodiversity, or proposals such as the new "Green Development Mechanism" commodify nature. Instead of "valuing" and protecting biodiversity, these market mechanisms debase nature.

During this COP, we've talked about many important aspects of biodiversity, and we have also talked about the urgent need for an ambitious strategic plan and improved financing. But this is not what is happening.

By the end of this week we may see the adoption of a new Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing. It will be more fanfare than substance. As it now stands, the Protocol is so full of holes that it will end up legalizing biopiracy and giving primacy to intellectual property over the rights of indigenous peoples, peasants and other local communities. These negotiations take place in meeting rooms where everything is exclusively in English– inaccessible to the vast majority of indigenous peoples and UN countries.

Industrialized countries are pressuring us to shift our focus from the CBD and biodiversity to the market-obsessed Climate

Change Convention (UNFCCC), which neither knows nor cares about biodiversity and where all ecosystems are reduced to tradable carbon sinks. In the UNFCCC, biodiversity becomes biomass. We must oppose this logic.

We need to end biodiversity loss, deforestation, overfishing and the destruction of natural areas. The market will not deliver that change, for the market created the crisis we are in. We need to end unsustainable production and consumption, which lie at the root of these problems. Industrial agriculture, including GMOs, aquaculture, bioenergy and livestock factories must be stopped. Ecological production, agricultural biodiversity, peasants and small producers, artisanal fishers and other local communities who can really maintain biodiversity and cool the Earth, must be supported.

COP 10 needs to put a stop to all new technologies that threaten biodiversity, especially geoengineering, synthetic biology and Terminator seeds. Protected areas must be strengthened with the full participation and respect for the rights of indigenous peoples, local communities and women.

The Biodiversity Convention can make a difference. As an example, COP 10 is now crafting a global moratorium on geoengineering, the large-scale high-risk manipulation of climate. This will prevent a handful of powerful actors from controlling the globe's thermostat on our behalf.

Governments must return to the core principles of this Convention and not be seduced by the quick-fix, market-based approaches.

That means protecting biodiversity by ensuring our rights to dignity and wellbeing and protecting the livelihoods of present and future generations.

Mother Earth is not for Sale.



Hands joined across the world in support of a strong CBD. On the left, a representative from the NEW host NGO organization, the Bombay Natural History Organization (from India), in the middle, a representative from the Japan Civil Network, and on the right a board member of the CBD Alliance. They are holding the passed on 'baton' first passed on by the German host organization – the German Forum on Environment and Development – at COP 9.

ECO thanks Swedbio, Oxfam-Novib, The Christensen Fund and JCN-CBD for their support! And the most amazing translators of ECO into Japanese! And the Japanese Civil Network for everything they have done. We have been in the most generous and supportive hands for the last 3 weeks. Arigatou Gozaimasu!

ECO is currently being published at the 10th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in Nagoya, Japan coordinated by the CBD Alliance. The opinions, commentaries, and articles printed in ECO are the sole opinion of the individual authors or organisations, unless otherwise expressed.