

## Civil Society Opening Statement

*Excerpt from CSO opening statement made on behalf of many organizations meeting between the 15-17 October.*

Addressing the root causes of biodiversity loss and social injustice requires a re-animation of the CBD. We need to articulate a bold vision, and forge a new path towards biodiversity justice.

... We urge Parties to fulfil their obligations. Parties must agree to a strong and ambitious strategic plan. This plan must contain specific time-bound targets.

Parties must:

1. Halt loss of biodiversity by 2020.
2. Integrate biodiversity and its pivotal role in ecosystem functioning and resilience in international institutions and agreements, and across sectors at national level.
3. Protect and defend the rights and livelihoods of small-scale producers to address the fundamental inequities that underpin poverty and biodiversity loss.
4. End deforestation, overfishing and destruction of natural habitats by 2020.
5. Achieve a fully representative system of protected areas—especially marine protected areas—based on full and effective participation of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, and women. All their rights must be respected, including free, prior and informed consent.
6. Stop unsustainable agriculture and land use, including reclamation and conversion, and reduce nutrient loading below critical load levels.
7. Halt the expansion of destructive industrial agriculture and aquaculture, bioenergy, biomass and other commodities.
8. Ensure that by 2020 any utilization of wild flora and fauna is ecologically sustainable, legal and traceable.
9. End current unsustainable production and consumption patterns.
10. Defend, and increase genuine representation in decision making of, local conservers, users and developers of biodiversity.
11. Eliminate subsidies, and perverse national and international incentives and projects harmful to biodiversity by 2020.
12. Increase government finance to support the above, rather than turning to market instruments.

Parties must:

- adopt a legally binding ABS Protocol that will have strong enforcement and compliance measures that can stop biopiracy, respects and protects the rights of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, and reject the primacy of intellectual property rules.

*Continued next page*

## IIFB Opening Statement

*The following is an excerpt from the IIFB's opening statement. Nearly 200 Indigenous and local community participants are in attendance.*

Our delegations of Indigenous Peoples of the world, being very pleased to meet on this occasion in Japan, wish to thank the Ainu, the Indigenous Peoples of Japan. We are extremely pleased Japan has now officially accepted the Ainu as Indigenous Peoples of this land. We also acknowledge the Okinawans/ Ryukyuans as Indigenous Peoples ...

In 2007, the United Nations General Assembly recognized and affirmed that Indigenous Peoples have equal rights and freedoms to all other peoples of the world. We have the right to self-determination, and that means we have the right to make our own decisions regarding the access to our lands, territories, waters and natural resources. We are the owners of our territories and fully responsible for the biodiversity, and biological materials and resources belonging to our territories. We have the right to exercise the same power freely enjoyed by other peoples of the world, i.e. the power of free, prior and informed consent when OUR territories and resources are being accessed.

Our status and our rights, as Indigenous Peoples, are universally recognised and must now be respected and implemented by the Parties to this Convention. On these rights there can be no compromise. The era of entrenched domestic domination by some States over Indigenous Peoples is finished.

Indigenous Peoples lives continue to be inextricably linked to nature and its laws. We are necessary to reversing the loss of biodiversity and safeguarding the natural and spiritual wellbeing of mother earth.

We also emphasize the integral and necessary roles indigenous women have in the protection and maintenance of our Mother Earth, genetic resources and traditional knowledge. The participation of Indigenous women in the process of the Convention on Biological Diversity has significantly contributed in the negotiations under the Convention. Our elders as holders of ancestral knowledge are important experts in the scope of the Convention.

Indigenous youth will hold future responsibilities for our lands, territories, waters, and resources and the maintenance of our traditional knowledge so we must ensure their full and effective involvement in current decisions and actions.

We acknowledge that yesterday, 17 October, was the International Day for the Eradication of Poverty. For Indigenous Peoples poverty is brought about by the loss of our lands, territories and waters. Without our territories and resources we are at extreme risk to lose our cultures, traditional knowledge, livelihoods, rights to development and spiritual identity.

*Continued next page*

## Civil society continued

Parties must

- adopt the Ethical Code of Conduct for respecting the Cultural and Intellectual Heritage of Indigenous Peoples and Local communities that enshrines the right of prior informed consent.
- establish a definition of forests and sustainable forest management that excludes monoculture tree plantations.
- adopt and uphold moratoria on the development, testing, release and use of new technologies which pose potential threats to biodiversity, including geoengineering and synthetic biology.
- avoid risky, unproven approaches like forest carbon offset markets, biodiversity offsets and the Green Development Mechanisms.
- focus on implementing decisions by developing compliance and enforcement mechanisms.
- adopt the proposed United Nations Decade of Biodiversity.

Parties must recommit to the primacy of the Convention's core principles: sustainable use, ecosystems approach, precautionary principle, and uphold the values of equity, justice and participation. The primacy of these principles is being eroded by other international mechanisms, Conventions and UN agencies that promote market-based approaches and quick-fix climate change solutions. Environmental rights are now embedded within the normative human rights framework. Each of you has the moral and legal duty, not only to implement the CBD, but also to do so by ensuring human dignity and well-being, of present and future generations.

Mother Earth is not for Sale. No to the greed economy. Yes to equity, justice and biodiversity.

## IIFB statement continued

We do not want Parties to this Convention to dismiss our relevance or importance. When the Convention was negotiated and adopted in 1992 it did not take due account of our existence and importance as Indigenous Peoples nor our responsibilities for our own territories. Much has occurred in these past two decades to bring our issues to the fore so we do thank the Parties for that partial progress to date.

... We now call upon COP 10 to consider and incorporate the rights, interests and needs of Indigenous Peoples into all decisions of this Conference. We must have full and effective participation from the beginning in planning, decision-making and implementation, and this role must be explicitly reflected in the text of decisions. COP 10 must ensure that, at this crucial stage of implementation of the Convention, Indigenous Peoples must be involved whenever the CBD issues touch upon our rights and interests.

## Marine Protected Areas: Size Does Matter!

*Nathalie Rey, Greenpeace International*

Our oceans give us life – they provide us with oxygen and food, and they contain over 80% of all life on Earth. In exchange, we plunder them of fish, choke them with pollution and heat them up through climate change. Despite the critical role that oceans play in our lives, they are still the least protected areas of our planet. Currently less than 1% of our seas and oceans are protected.

Marine protected areas (MPAs) are one of the most powerful tools we have to rebuild fish populations and revitalize ocean ecosystems. Nations pledged at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in 2002 to establish a global network of marine protected areas by 2012. This means that we now have less than two years to meet this target to create this global MPA network – a necessary step to restoring our oceans to health and ensuring that they can continue to sustain life on Earth. Given the oceans crisis we are facing, we need commitments to create a network of marine reserves covering 40% of the world's oceans, and for the CBD to agree here in Nagoya to meet half that goal (20%) by 2020. Both these goals are realistic and consistent with scientific as well as international political recommendations from the UN Millennium Development Goals and World Parks Congress.

The FAO has shown that 70% of the world's fisheries are nearing the state of collapse. If we want healthy oceans, we need strong MPA commitments here in Nagoya. At a time when ocean ecosystems all over the world may be reaching tipping points, establishing networks of large-scale marine reserves becomes an indispensable tool to building resilience in ocean ecosystems against the impacts of climate change and ocean acidification.

More marine protected areas will also play a key role in reducing poverty and increasing food security. The recently published study "The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB)" investigated the economic impacts of ecosystem destruction and the results are staggering. In its conclusions, the report named fisheries restoration as one of the strategic priorities for policymakers. The economic value of ecosystem services can only be estimated – and current estimates are in trillions of dollars. In sub-Saharan Africa alone, over 10 million people rely on fishing for their income, mostly in small-scale fisheries. Other economic studies have shown marine protected areas to increase fish catches, tourism and benefits to women. Conserving 20-30% of global oceans through a network of MPAs could create a million jobs and sustain a marine fish catch worth US\$70-80 billion/year.

The CBD needs to keep its own promises. The WSSD targets to significantly reduce biodiversity loss, as well as create a global network of MPAs were endorsed by the CBD. However, since then, overfishing, other extractive industries and climate change have continued to degrade our oceans. Governments here at the CBD have to not just honour their previous commitments to create networks of MPAs but also take them further toward more ambitious goals of an MPA network covering at least 20% of our oceans by 2020, as the minimum step along the way to setting aside 40% of the world's oceans as marine reserves. If we want to invest in future generations, we need strong MPA commitments here in Nagoya, and the science is telling us that "size really does matter".

In this, the International Year of Biodiversity, the CBD can set a new course for life on Earth and begin the recovery needed to ensure that our planet can accommodate future generations. We need a global plan agreed that will set the world on a truly sustainable path for the next decade through ending overfishing and destructive fishing practices, achieving zero deforestation, mobilizing much more funds towards conservation. By charting a new course here in Nagoya, we can create a better future for life on Earth.

For more information see Emergency Oceans Rescue Plan and CBD Strategic Plan: [www.greenpeace.org/international/cbd](http://www.greenpeace.org/international/cbd)

# Synthetic Biology – A Threat to Global Biodiversity

Eric Hoffman – Friends of the Earth U.S and Jaydee Hanson – Centre for Food Safety

Synthetic biology is the design and construction of new biological parts, devices and systems that do not exist in the natural world and also the redesigning of existing biological systems to perform specific tasks. Instead of inserting genes from one species into another, what is considered more “traditional” genetic engineering, synthetic biology aims to create life from scratch with computer-synthesized DNA or without the use of DNA entirely. This form of extreme genetic engineering was addressed by the CBD for the first time in draft text proposed by SBSTTA 14. COP10 must implement a moratorium on the release and commercial use of organisms created through synthetic biology or using synthetic DNA for genetic engineering purposes until there has been adequate time to study the environmental, socio-economic, and public health threats posed by this new, dangerous, and unregulated technology.

Synthetic biology threatens the world’s biodiversity through the contamination of genomes that have evolved over billions of years with synthetic DNA. Once it has contaminated a species, this synthetic DNA cannot be recalled and will pass on indefinitely through generations. Some applications involve growing synthetic organisms (mostly algae and bacteria) in open ponds or intentionally releasing them into the environment. While other types of pollution can be cleaned up and do not breed, synthetic biological creations are designed to self-replicate and once released into the environment they would be impossible to stop.

The ways in which these organisms will interact with the natural environment is unpredictable, potentially devastating, and permanent. A synthetic organism designed for a specific task, such as eating up oil from oil spills in the ocean, could interact with naturally occurring organisms and adversely harm the environment. The synthetic organism could displace existing organisms or interfere with the existing ecosystem. Once it found an ecological niche in which to survive, it would be difficult if not impossible to eradicate. Some synthetic organisms like algae, which produces half the planet’s oxygen could threaten all life.

Synthetic biology also threatens biodiversity by creating a new “bioeconomy” in which any and all types of biomass can become a feedstock to produce industrial products such as fuel, chemicals, medicines, and plastics. Theoretically any product made from petrochemicals can one day be made by synthetic microbes in a vat eating plant sugars. But who will decide what plant matter is turned into an industrial feed stock, who decides what land is used to grow food or bio-mass, and whose land

will be used to grow these feedstocks for synthetic organisms?

Synthetic biology enthusiasts falsely assume there will be an endless supply of biomass and “marginal” land to fuel their biological revolution. These “marginal” lands are often the source of livelihood for small-scale farmers, pastoralists, women, and indigenous peoples. These “marginal” lands should be used to grow food for local communities, not fuel or industrial chemicals for wealthy nations. Synthetic organisms require an incredible amount of land, water, and fertilizer either directly in the case of algae or indirectly for biomass feedstocks for many other microbes– all of which are already in short supply for food production. Increasing pressure on already strained land will only worsen issues of land grabbing, land ownership, biodiversity, and the health of the land and surrounding communities.

SBSTTA 14 urged parties and other governments, in accordance with the precautionary approach, to ensure that living organisms produced by synthetic biology are not released into the environment until there is an adequate scientific basis on which to justify such activities and due consideration of the associated risks for the environment and biodiversity, and the associated socio-economic risks, are considered.

SBSTTA 14 also recommended that an ad-hoc technical expert group be convened on synthetic biotechnologies and other new technologies that are used or projected to be used in the next generation of biofuels to assess their impact on biodiversity and the livelihood of communities around the world.

We demand that a moratorium on the release and commercial use of synthetic organisms be implemented by COP10. The draft language must be strengthened to include commercial use since any applications of this sort, such as open-pond algae farms, equates to environmental release in the real world. All research must be conducted in bio-secure facilities. If we wait until COP11 to act, it will be too late. That is why a strict application of the precautionary principle must be applied by this COP to put a halt to this dangerous, unproven, and unregulated technology.

To learn more, read Friends of the Earth U.S.'s new report, Synthetic Solutions to the Climate Crisis: The Dangers of Synthetic Biology for Biofuels Production at [http://www.foe.org/sites/default/files/SynBio-Biofuels%20Report\\_Web.pdf](http://www.foe.org/sites/default/files/SynBio-Biofuels%20Report_Web.pdf)

## Did you know? Financial resources flowing North to South may be LESS than OECD estimates!

New research out of University of Michigan in the US finds that Parties have **not** met obligations for new and additional financial resources. At the Earth Summit in 1992, donor nations were encouraged to spend \$1.75 billion a year on biodiversity protection. But they have never met that target, say the researchers. Using a new, independent foreign aid database, AidData.org, the researchers found that their figures about biodiversity financing are about 30% lower than those obtained from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) database, which relies upon donor's categorization of the development projects they fund.

Research reported about at the following sites:

Nature: [http://blogs.nature.com/news/thegreatbeyond/2010/07/biodiversity\\_aid\\_lags\\_in\\_corru.html](http://blogs.nature.com/news/thegreatbeyond/2010/07/biodiversity_aid_lags_in_corru.html)

New Scientist: <http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn19128-rio-hopes-of-conservation-cash-w>

# Getting it Right: Incorporating social aspects into MPA planning and implementation

*International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (icsf@icsf.net)*

Marine protected areas (MPAs) are increasingly being used by governments as instruments for conservation and management of coastal and marine biodiversity. The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) has set a target of bringing at least 10 per cent of oceans under protection by 2012. The present decision to increase area under MPAs undoubtedly has significant implications for small-scale fishing coastal communities, the primary traditional users of coastal and marine areas, although across the world they have been setting aside 'no-take' or 'limited-use' areas as part of their own generations-old management systems.

Small-scale fishing communities, threatened as they are by biodiversity loss and degradation of coastal ecosystems, have been demanding effective action to protect and manage coastal and marine habitats and resources, given the close links between their livelihoods and the health of the resource base. In several parts of the world, they have been known to take their own initiatives, as part of traditional and more recent systems, to protect and manage their resources.

However, the current target-driven approach to expanding areas under MPAs, with a primary focus on meeting quantitative goals and the expansion of 'no-take areas', rather than on ensuring that processes undertaken are inclusive, recognize and build on existing local and traditional knowledge and governance systems, and respect principles of sustainable use, is inherently problematic.

The International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF) commissioned a series of case studies in eight countries—Brazil, India, Indonesia, Mexico, South Africa, Senegal, Tanzania and Thailand—in the context of Programme Element 2 on governance, participation, equity and benefit sharing in CBD's Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA). The studies reveal a mixed picture. They throw up stories of conflict and the growing socioeconomic vulnerability of communities traditionally fishing in areas declared as MPAs, faced with displacement from fishing grounds, arrests and other forms of harassment. They also throw up positive examples of community-led management, where communities are using MPAs as one among several available tools, with evident benefits for biodiversity conservation and social well-being.

These case studies demonstrate that communities can be powerful allies in efforts for conservation and management of coastal and marine resource. They equally demonstrate that processes that are not inclusive serve only to alienate and 'criminalize' local communities. The ability of such processes to meet conservation goals, in a context where local communities are excluded and alienated, is equally suspect.

The case studies underline the need for systematic attention, capacity building, funding and other resources for effective implementation of Programme Element 2 on governance, participation, equity, and benefit sharing. This is the challenge for States, environmental groups and others committed to management and conservation of coastal and marine resources.

The case studies underline the need for Member States to develop appropriate legislative and policy frameworks that

recognizes the rights of indigenous and local fishing communities, including mechanisms that recognize and enable community-based conservation and management. A range of types of MPAs and governance approaches need to be recognized, in tune with the existing diversity of such community-led approaches, and tailored to meet the needs and capacities of local fishing communities. The principles of preferential access to, and sustainable use of, marine resources by indigenous and local fishing communities living in, and adjacent to, MPAs needs to be promoted. Further, MPA management frameworks need to be nested within an ecosystem approach that encompasses broader land- and sea-scapes, for effective conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

Most critically, all the case studies highlight the key role that indigenous and local communities can play as allies in the protection of biodiversity. The biggest challenge for States is to find ways of recognizing, respecting and promoting this role, reversing the top-down legacy of the past towards genuine partnerships with communities. There is the real danger, otherwise, that the current target-driven approach to the extension of protected area networks, at the expense of principles that are integral to the lives and livelihoods of these communities, will compromise the long-term sustainability of these interventions themselves. MPAs should be seen as only one in a range of conservation and fisheries management tools available for the protection of marine and coastal biodiversity, and they should be located within a broader, socially-just ecosystem approach for effective conservation of biodiversity.

For more information:

<http://icsf.net/icsf2006/jspFiles/mpa/cbdCop10.jsp>

Contact: Chandrika Sharma (icsf@icsf.net)

**Join us for further discussion at the side-event on 21 October, 2010 (16:30-18:00), at Room 234A-Building 2-3rd Floor.**



