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Foreword

Dick Roche T.D.,

Minister for the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, Ireland.

In 2001, EU Heads of State and Government made a commitment at the Spring Summit in Gothenburg to “halt the decline of biodiversity by 2010.” Biodiversity is the term given to the variety of life on earth and the natural patterns which it forms, and it can be considered as the very raw material which sustains life on earth. It follows that the conservation of biodiversity, together with sustained efforts to halt its decline, represent one of the greatest challenges currently facing humankind.

The EU Stakeholders Conference, "Biodiversity and the EU - Sustaining Life, Sustaining Livelihoods", which took place under Ireland’s Presidency of the EU in May, 2004, was particularly significant for the broad degree of consensus which emerged on the internal measures which the EU itself needs to take to achieve the Union’s objectives.

The Conference reviewed and audited the EC Biodiversity Strategy and the four Strategic Action Plans. It was, I believe, very successful in further moving the emphasis from strategy towards implementation. In particular, the adoption of the "Message from Malahide", setting out the next steps, is to be warmly welcomed. I now look forward to the Communication from the European Commission on revised and re-focussed EU priorities on biodiversity up to 2010.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to everyone who participated in Malahide - the chairpersons, speakers, presenters and to the some 230 delegates from Member States, the Commission, the European region and civil society. The sense of commitment at the Conference was clear to see. This spirit of co-operation and, indeed, the sense of urgency which pervaded all the discussions in the working group sessions, contributed greatly to the success of the Conference.
Delegates at the Conference
Foreword

STAVROS DIMAS
EUROPEAN COMMISSIONER
FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

It is sobering to realise that we are still far from meeting the EU commitment to halt the loss of biodiversity by 2010, and from the global commitment to significantly reduce the worldwide rate of biodiversity loss by 2010. As papers submitted to Malahide conference made clear, the growth of Europe’s economy, the security of our society and the quality of our lives are all dependent on the maintenance of biological diversity. The title of the Malahide conference reflects the fact that, if we do not sustain the variety of life, we will find it all the more difficult to sustain our livelihoods.

This report, and in particular the “Message from Malahide”, provide a guide to how we must now move forward. Biodiversity is one of my top priorities and later this year I will propose a Commission Communication on Biodiversity to the Council and the European Parliament. This Communication will respond to Malahide by providing a clear road-map towards meeting the 2010 commitments. I urge Member States and civil society to work together with the Commission to deliver on these commitments. The vitality of our environment, society and economy is at stake.
View of Malahide Harbour
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1. **SUMMARY**

Biodiversity loss continues at alarming rates, in the EU and globally, with serious potential consequences for sustainable livelihoods and sustainable economic growth. Heads of State and Government have made commitments (EU Spring Council 2001, World Summit for Sustainable Development 2002) to halt this decline in the EU and significantly reduce the current rate of loss globally by 2010. Less than five years remain to meet these targets. This Conference was the key event in a critical policy review process which was widely endorsed by the Commission, Member States and civil society organisations. The Conference presented the opportunity to focus EU action in time to meet the 2010 biodiversity targets. The Conference, which brought together experts from the key sectors affecting biodiversity, from the European Commission, Member States and civil society, prepared a Message from Malahide (see Part 3 of this report) detailing priority objectives, targets, indicators of success and implementation arrangements. The importance of this message was acknowledged by the EU Environment Council of 28 June 2004 (see Annex 1 to this report) which, inter alia, called upon the Commission “to submit, as early as possible in 2005, a report…on the implementation, effectiveness and appropriateness of…the EC Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans…taking into account the consultative process…and, notably, the Message from Malahide,” and urged Member States to take various relevant follow-up measures. The Commission is now preparing a Communication on Biodiversity which will provide a road map to 2010. A rapid response to the Message will be necessary from all key stakeholders if the 2010 targets are to be met.

2. **BACKGROUND**

2.1. **The problem - biodiversity loss**

Biodiversity loss has accelerated to an unprecedented level, both in Europe\(^1\) and worldwide. Species are becoming extinct at a rate that is 1,000 to 10,000 times higher than the natural rate would be. Worldwide, over 15,500 species of plants and animals face a high risk of extinction in the near future, in almost all cases as a result of human activity\(^2\). For example, recent studies predict that environmental degradation could wipe out 1,211 bird species, an eighth of the world’s

---

\(^1\) See MALAHIDE/INF/2

total. The threat is augmented by that of climate change: a recent report predicted that climate change will threaten the extinction of a quarter of all land animals and plants by 2050.

Within Europe, 335 vertebrate species are at risk of extinction - including the Iberian lynx, brown bear, and all our sea mammals. 38% of our bird species, 45% of our butterfly species and 5% of mollusc species are threatened. 80% of our fish stocks face collapse or are of unknown status. 64 endemic plant species have become extinct in the wild, and a further 800 plant species occurring in Europe are threatened with global extinction. Worldwide, 37% of domestic animals are endangered and in Western Europe, 97 breeds of domestic animals have become extinct in recent times. Almost 30% of surviving breeds are currently under risk.

Our ecosystems are equally at risk. The EU has lost more than half of its wetlands. Only a very small proportion of the natural forest which once covered Europe remains untouched and the loss of old and semi-natural woodlands continues. Species-rich agricultural habitats in Europe have declined considerably during recent decades. And many European marine ecosystems are disrupted.

2.2. Why biodiversity loss matters

Biodiversity loss matters\(^3\). It matters for ethical, emotional, environmental and economic reasons. Ethically, we have a responsibility to future generations to maintain the diversity of life on earth. Emotionally, we derive from nature pleasure, fulfilment, inspiration and solace; nature is fundamental to our culture, language, psychological and spiritual wellbeing. Environmentally, biodiversity provides a wide range of essential services - including carbon-cycling and storage, clean water, climate mitigation, mitigation of natural hazards and pollination. Economically, the financial value of the goods and services provided by ecosystems and species - by life on earth - has been estimated at Euro 26 trillion per year - nearly twice the value of what humans produce each year. The conservation and sustainable use

\(^3\) See MALAHIDE/INF/1
of biodiversity is essential to poverty eradication in developing countries, and to sustainable livelihoods and sustained economic growth in Europe and worldwide. Biodiversity is part of the daily lives of every one of us and, indeed, we are part of biodiversity. It is for these reasons that this Conference is subtitled ‘Sustaining Life, Sustaining Livelihoods’.

2.3. The 2010 targets and existing EU biodiversity policy

In 2001, EU Heads of State and Government made a commitment at the EU’s Spring Summit in Gothenburg to ‘halt the decline of biodiversity by 2010’

4 The European Council agrees that biodiversity decline should be halted with the aim of reaching this objective by 2010 as set out in the Sixth Environmental Action Programme.’ Presidency Conclusions, Goteborg Council, 15 and 16 June 2001. SN/200/1/01 REV1, page 8.
http://ue.eu.int/newsroom/newmain.asp?lang=1

5 WSSD Plan of Implementation, Article 44.

In 2002, world leaders agreed at the World Summit for Sustainable Development to ‘the achievement by 2010 of a significant reduction in the current rate of loss of biological diversity.’

The same Gothenburg Council also adopted the EU Sustainable Development Strategy (which contains the headline objective “to protect and restore habitats and natural systems and halt the loss of biodiversity by 2010”) and the Sixth Environmental Action Programme (6th EAP) which indicates priorities for the environmental dimension of the SDS. The 6th EAP aims, inter alia, at “protecting, conserving, restoring and developing the functioning of natural ecosystems, natural habitats, wild flora and fauna with the aim of halting…the loss of biodiversity, including diversity of genetic resources, both in the European Union and at the global scale” and in particular sets the objective of ‘halting biodiversity decline with the aim to reach this objective by 2010’. The 6th EAP objectives relating to biodiversity shall be achieved in particular by ensuring the implementation…of the Community’s biodiversity strategy and…action plans.
The EC Biodiversity Conservation Strategy (ECBS), adopted in 1998, was developed to meet the EC’s obligations as a Party to the Convention on Biological Diversity. The ECBS provides a comprehensive response to the many requirements of the CBD. The four Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs), adopted in 2001, lay out in detail what actions should be taken to implement the strategy.


2.4. The need for reinforced action

The 2003 Spring Council Conclusions6 (§ 54) note that “despite some progress, the worrying trends [in natural resources degradation] observed when the [Sustainable Development] Strategy was launched have not been reversed, and a new impetus must therefore be given” and “urges the Council to accelerate work towards a more responsible management of natural resources, including action to meet the 2010 targets for biodiversity.”

The review of progress in implementation of the ECBS and BAPs carried out in the year leading up to the Malahide Conference found that while there have been some successes in implementation, there have also been shortfalls. Further, the review highlighted the need to address next steps with respect to most actions laid down in the BAPs. But perhaps most importantly, the review found that current EU biodiversity policy is missing a key element if we are to meet the 2010 targets, namely, a clear sense of priority which has broad-based agreement among key stakeholders. In a world of competing demands, resources – in terms of political will, public support, human resources and funding – are limited. *A clear set of priority objectives and targets can help ensure that these limited resources are used to greatest effect in reducing the loss of biodiversity. It can clarify to decision-makers and the public what needs to be done, and support the pulling together and coordination of human and financial resources to address agreed priorities.*

---

3. **PROCESS LEADING UP TO THE CONFERENCE**

The Commission initiated in July 2003 a *broad stakeholder process* for assessment of the *implementation, effectiveness and appropriateness* of the ECBS and BAPs. The process was agreed in consultation with the various Commission services concerned (in particular DGs Environment, Agriculture, Fisheries and Development), Member States, Accessing Countries and civil society. It was designed to meet the dual purposes of:

1. *preparing a report to Council and Parliament*, based on the above assessment; and
2. *building the necessary political momentum towards meeting the 2010 targets*.

The Malahide Conference served both purposes, and was the highest profile event in the policy review process.

Under the review process, *four sectoral working groups* involving a broad range of stakeholders were established, co-chaired by each of the responsible DGs (Environment, Agriculture, Fisheries, Development) and by Member States or civil society organisations. These four sectoral working groups carried out an ‘audit’ of implementation and effectiveness, and an assessment of the appropriateness of the existing Strategy and Action Plans, in order to recommend priority measures towards meeting the EU 2010 target. A *fifth working group* addressed the horizontal issues of indicators, monitoring and reporting. *Outputs from the working groups provided the main substantive input to the Malahide Conference*. A full list of conference papers is given at Annex 3 and papers are available online.\(^7\)

4. **CONFERENCE OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES**

The Conference aimed to outline *priority objectives* and detail the *targets* required in order to deliver the overall EU 2010 target and to optimise the EU’s contribution to the overall global 2010 target. In addition, the conference aimed to consider the *indicators* which will inform us on progress, and

---

\(^7\) On DG Environment website at: http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/nature/home.htm
implementation arrangements including key actors, coordination mechanisms and resource needs. The conference also aimed to consider research priorities to 2010 and beyond emerging from the Irish Presidency meeting of the European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy taking place in Killarney 21-24 May 2004. The conference met these various aims.

The main outcomes of the Conference were: 1) broad stakeholder endorsement of an ‘audit’ of progress to date, and 2) a Message from Malahide (see section 3 of this report) containing the priority objectives, targets, indicators, and research priorities.

5. CONFERENCE FOLLOW-UP

The Irish Presidency proposed Council Conclusions relating to the Malahide Conference to the EU Environment Council of 28 June 2004. These conclusions were agreed by the Council and appear in Annex 1 of this report. The need for accelerated action to meet the 2010 target was also reiterated by EU Heads of State and Government at the European Council of 17-18 June 2004 which linked this target to the Lisbon Reform Agenda (see extract of Presidency Conclusions, Annex 2 of this report).

The Commission now intends to respond to Malahide and to the Council Conclusions through a Communication on Halting the Loss of Biodiversity by 2010. This is expected to provide a road map towards meeting the 2010 commitment, involving the reinforcement of existing measures and, where necessary, proposing new measures. The Commission will work with future Presidencies to seek commitment from Member States to take forward necessary measures at EU and MS levels.

Civil society follow-up is expected to include coordination with the ‘Countdown 2010’ initiative. This IUCN-inspired initiative, supported by a large number of environmental organisations, aims to raise awareness, build political pressure and pull together actors to achieve the 2010 targets. The Countdown 2010 was launched at the Malahide Conference.
6. **CONFERENCE FORMAT**

The Conference opened with a plenary session on 25 May (Day 1 pm), then broke out into working groups on 26 May (Day 2) and finally reconvened in plenary on 27 May (Day 3 am).

**Day 1 (pm): Plenary** - involving keynote speakers including: Mr Martin Cullen, Minister for the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, Ireland; Margot Wallstrom, Commissioner for Environment; Yolanda Kakabadse, President IUCN. A second session involved representatives from the agricultural and fisheries sectors and from industry, to address the livelihoods side of the debate. The opening session was followed by a State Reception at the National Gallery of Ireland.

**Day 2 (full day):** An opening plenary session followed by four parallel working groups. The *opening plenary* involved a presentation of a synthesis of the ‘audits’ of implementation, effectiveness and appropriateness of the EC Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans, and a presentation of the draft Message from Malahide. Presentations were also made on a proposed first set of EU biodiversity headline indicators and on research priorities to 2010 (and beyond) based on the work of the European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy. The *working groups* then deliberated on the draft Message from Malahide including priority objectives and targets for 2010.

**Day 3 (am): Plenary** - working groups reported back to plenary, final plenary adoption of Message from Malahide, immediate responses to the Message from representatives of current and future EU Presidencies, the Commission and civil society.

7. **CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS**

A total of c.230 participants included senior officials from Member States (including the new Member States) and neighbouring countries,
environmental and developmental NGOs, industry (e.g. farming and fishing industries) and academia, as well as the media. A list of participants is provided at Annex 4.
DAY 1: TUESDAY 25th MAY 2004

KEYNOTE SESSION 1: 14:00-15:45 HRS

CHAIR: Niall Callan, Secretary General of the Department of the Environment, Heritage & Local Government, Ireland.

Minister Cullen addressing the conference
Opening Address by Martin Cullen TD, former Minister for the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, Ireland

Biodiversity and the EU: Sustaining Life, Sustaining Livelihoods

Commissioner Wallström; Madame President of the IUCN, Yolanda Kakabadse; Minister of State at my Department, Pat the Cope Gallagher; Secretary-General of my Department and Chair of this Session, Niall Callan; distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen.

Allow me to extend a warm welcome to you all here today attending this important EU Stakeholders’ Conference on Biodiversity. I very much hope that, over the next few days, you will have an opportunity to see and experience the fact that Malahide - although only some 16 km from the very centre of our capital city - retains the attractions and the Old World charm of a small maritime village and boasts a rich vein of biodiversity.

From the outset, allow me to extend a particularly warm welcome here today to the representatives from the 10 new Member States of the European Union. We are fortunate that the accession of these States greatly enriches the biodiversity of the new Union. We look forward to hearing the voices of the new Member States - as full members of the Union - during our discussions here.

I should also mention that, in honour of the recent enlargement of the Union and, in particular, in honour of the 10 new Member States, you will witness later today the unveiling of a specially-commissioned sculpture piece at Malahide Castle, which will serve as a permanent record of the rich vein of biodiversity existing in May, 2004, when the Union of the 15 became the Union of the 25.

I would like to warmly thank Commissioner Wallström for the Commission’s co-funding of this event with the Irish Government and for the assistance which her officials have extended to us in its organization.

The Conference follows immediately after the Conference of the European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy (EPBRS) which has just concluded in Killarney, also here in Ireland, yesterday. We look forward to learning here about the outputs of
the Killarney Conference, which agreed a research objective, 2010 targets for biodiversity research, as well as research priorities to 2010.

Ladies and gentlemen, the depletion of biodiversity in Europe sadly continues apace. The reduction and loss of biodiversity in Europe and worldwide has accelerated dramatically, and has affected species, habitats, ecosystems, genes and biotopes, both on land and at sea. To take just one cluster of statistics available to us, the position is that 45% of butterflies, 38% of bird species, 24% of the species and sub-species of certain groups of plants, and some 5% of mollusc species are considered threatened in Europe.

Here in Ireland, species such as the corn bunting and the corncrake are in danger of extinction, while the recent Report on Ireland’s Environment from our own Environmental Protection Agency referred to the concern that as many as 25 of the 56 commercially targeted marine fish stocks in Irish waters are over-exploited and in decline. Moreover, a number of native inland fish stocks - for example, salmon, trout and arctic char - are affected by habitat degradation caused by eutrophication.

We are taking measures to address these challenges, notably through our National Biodiversity Plan. In this international forum, I do not propose to dwell upon the contents of our Plan, except to say that I particularly welcome the fact that a number of issues addressed in the Plan have been approached on an all-island basis, with the valued co-operation of the Environment and Heritage Service of Northern Ireland. This includes an All-Ireland review of Invasive Alien Species and the preparation of Species Action Plans for key species.

A further initiative which has emerged from the Plan has been the establishment of Ireland’s National Platform for Biodiversity Research in 2003. This Platform aims to facilitate biodiversity research in Ireland, taking into account the needs of the research community, other interested stakeholders, policy makers and the public.

I also believe that it is appropriate here to refer to one new initiative which I propose to take under Ireland’s National Biodiversity Plan. The Plan includes a commitment to put in place a national biological data management system to be coordinated by a National Biological Recording Centre. Our Heritage Council has made a submission to me setting out how such a Centre could be established. I think it is most appropriate that I take the opportunity to announce in the context of this Conference
that I am committed to the establishment of such a Centre and that I am now conveying approval in principle for its establishment. I will be asking the Heritage Council, together with my Department, to further develop the practical details of the proposal, looking in particular at how it might best be funded. I'm aware that several academic institutions are very interested in hosting the Centre and I expect to be able to announce its location in the near future.

Moving specifically to the agenda for this Conference, the title of which is "Biodiversity and the EU - Sustaining Life, Sustaining Livelihoods", I should explain to delegates that it is not by accident that the concept of "sustaining life, sustaining livelihoods" was included both in the title of the Conference which was held in Killarney and also here in Malahide. It is for this reason that I believe that the EU should, more and more, press home the fact that biodiversity loss has significant adverse impacts on sustaining life itself, on sustaining livelihoods, on poverty eradication, on the protection of human health and on sustainable development. We need to explain, to the widest audience possible, the essential connectivity which exists between combating biodiversity loss and sustaining livelihoods.

And this underlines the importance of the Countdown 2010 initiative which we will be launching very soon. Countdown 2010 offers an important opportunity to sensitize all sectors of society to the significance of biodiversity; to the critical importance of achieving the 2010 targets; to the strategies which are being elaborated at both EU and the global level to facilitate this process; and, critically, to the need for all sectors to come together - and work together - if the target is to be achieved.

We, all of us - whether politicians, policy advisors, farmers, fishermen, employers, trade unionists or full-time homemakers - share responsibilities to preserve the resources of the world for our children and future generations. It is critically important, therefore, that this Conference comes forward with a set of recommendations and prescriptions which will empower and promote ownership among all EU stakeholders in meeting the considerable challenges which lie ahead of us in this area.

In undertaking this task, we should recall that, at the Gothenburg Summit in 2001, EU Heads of State and Government made a commitment to halt the loss of biodiversity by 2010. Moreover, world leaders at the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development made a commitment to significantly reduce the current rate of loss of
biodiversity by 2010, and this commitment is also contained in the Strategic Plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

There is some danger that, with less than six years to go before 2010, a tendency might emerge to down-play, and thus undermine, the 2010 target as merely an important milestone in the process of halting biodiversity loss, rather than a defining and achievable objective in its own right.

The 1998 EC Biodiversity Strategy and its 2001 Action Plans - with their welcome and innovative emphasis on sectoral integration of biodiversity concerns into key sectors - remain valid instruments for the achievement of the 2010 target. However, given the continuing loss of biodiversity and the fact that we have only five years left to reach the 2010 target, we need now to focus on priorities.

I believe, therefore, that we must elaborate priority objectives which are deserving of particular and expeditious response and attention by all players - the Commission, the Member States, and all stakeholder and civil society interests - so that the final, political, phase of the review can be swiftly addressed. This will require you, the participants, to come forward with these priority objectives and related targets which can be incorporated in a ‘Message from Malahide’ and which should form a key input to assist the Commission in completing a Communication to the Council and Parliament, hopefully by the end of 2004 or in early 2005. For our part, the Irish Presidency will be happy to report to the Environment Council on 28 June in order to drive this agenda forward. By this means, I believe that the resources available to us all can be mobilised and maximized in order to drive this renewed implementation phase, thus making the achievement of the 2010 target more likely.

The Irish Presidency undertook to organize this Conference jointly with the Commission as a means of facilitating the completion of the audit and review phase of the EC Biodiversity Strategy and its four Action Plans and the submission of new priority actions to the Council and the Parliament. We would, however, appeal to all delegates to take the opportunity presented by the Conference to identify new priority objectives and related goals and to come forward with a ‘Message from Malahide’ which, while reiterating the importance and relevance of the EC Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans, nevertheless elaborates new and ambitious ways forward in order to meet the EU’s target of halting the loss of biodiversity by 2010.

Thank you all for your attention.
Chairman: Madam Kakabadse will now address you. She discharges two roles here today. As former Minister for the Environment for the Republic of Ecuador she can speak with a developing country perspective. She’s also here to do business later on as the President of IUCN.
Address by Yolanda Kakabadse, President IUCN

The Stuff of Life: Biodiversity and the Millennium Development Goals

Thank you, Mr Chairman, Commissioner Wallström, Minister Cullen, friends old and new, and my fellow Councillor of IUCN, Alistair Gammell. Good Afternoon.

Dear friends, it is a great pleasure to be with you here in Ireland, and it is wonderful to participate in an event that brings together decision makers from the now 25 Members of the European Union. I am speaking to you today from the perspective of the President of IUCN, an organization that has 16 State Members, 25 government agency members, and 238 non-governmental member organizations from within the European Union, and over 1,000 members worldwide. Working in over 150 countries, our mission is to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable. We strongly support the efforts of the EU to halt the loss of biodiversity by the year 2010.

But I am also speaking to you from the perspective of a former Environment Minister of Ecuador, a small country blessed with biodiversity that is comparable to all of the EU countries combined. Those of us from developing countries are especially interested in how the efforts of the EU to achieve its 2010 biodiversity target will relate to the Millennium Development Goals. You will recall that these Goals were agreed at the UN General Assembly when it adopted the Millennium Declaration in September 2000. The eight goals included:

- eradicate extreme poverty and hunger;
- achieve universal primary education;
- promote gender equality and empower women;
- reduce child mortality;
- improve maternal health;
- combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases;
- ensure environmental sustainability, and
- develop a global partnership for development.

Many of us were together at the World Summit on Sustainable Development that was convened in Johannesburg in 2002 partly to agree a plan of action to achieve the
MDGs. In identifying the five key foundations for achieving the Goals, United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan asked the meeting to focus on water, energy, health, agriculture, and biodiversity. The first four topics of what came to be known as the “WEHAB” approach are easily understood by the general public, but biodiversity remains a more elusive concept. I therefore am very pleased that you are giving biodiversity such a high profile.

For the developing world, our biological wealth is the foundation of our welfare, and we care deeply about conserving this biological wealth, using it sustainably, and ensuring that the benefits of conservation and sustainable use are distributed equitably. At the same time, economic and social development and poverty eradication are the first and over-riding priorities for us, as recognized in the preamble to the Convention on Biological Diversity. The close link between biodiversity and human well-being is well illustrated by some examples of how biodiversity relates to the other four elements of Kofi Annan’s WEHAB approach.

• In the field of water, the hydrological cycle is intimately tied to vegetation cover and productive wetlands. Protected areas are demonstrating that they are able to deliver clean water far more cheaply than water treatment plants, and on a sustainable basis. The city of Quito, where I live, receives its water from a protected area in the surrounding mountains, and we are developing a compensation scheme to benefit the people who are maintaining this watershed rather than converting it to agriculture.

• In the field of energy, biodiversity is an important part of the strategy for sequestering carbon, produced as the inevitable by-product of the petroleum-driven economic development that has enabled globalisation. Recent research has demonstrated that the best way to sequester carbon is to maintain old-growth forests. And for the rural poor, biodiversity provides energy directly, in the form of firewood and charcoal - the main source of energy for 2 billion people.

• In the field of health, over 70% of the people in developing countries depend on some 20,000 species of medicinal plants, often harvested directly from the wild. These medicinal plants have also provided substantial benefits to people here in Europe, as you can see for yourselves when you visit a pharmacy and
find that over half of the drugs that keep Europeans healthy are derived from wild plants, many of them from developing countries.

- In the field of agriculture, farmers depend on numerous wild species to pollinate their crops, on wild relatives of domestic species to provide new genes for crop improvement, and the direct harvest of wild plants and animals for their nutrition.

I could provide numerous other examples of how important biodiversity is to poverty alleviation, and the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals. But for this audience, it is perhaps more important to mention some concerns that the developing countries have about the impact of European consumers on our biodiversity.

The first, and perhaps most important, is the issue of trade. Global trade is a wonderful thing for Europe, giving consumers in the EU more access to more biodiversity than ever before. A shopper in a supermarket in Dublin, Paris, Rome, or Warsaw can purchase mangoes from India, avocados from Mexico, bananas from Ecuador, and on and on. But this rich cornucopia of biodiversity flowing to Europe from the rest of the world hides the environmental degradation and biodiversity loss that is driving poverty in the developing world. The high standard of living in the EU is to a great extent dependent upon the commodities imported from other regions, including oil, timber, and agricultural products.

Biodiversity-rich tropical forests are being converted to plantations of coffee, rubber and oil palm, again often to feed the growing appetite of the European Union. While we in the tropical countries are very glad to export these crops, we still suffer greatly from poverty, and the distribution of the benefits from this conversion is far from equitable. The prices we receive are not an accurate representation of the true environmental costs, as consumers play the developing countries off against each other in a drive for the cheapest possible prices. Under such economic conditions, environmental factors are externalised and our fight against poverty is made more difficult.

We are also concerned about the trade in endangered species of plants and animals. As part of your programme to achieve the biodiversity goal, I hope very much that we will see universal ratification of the CITES Convention, for example in all new EU member states.
Second, and closely related to trade, is the impact of agricultural subsidies in the EU on agriculture in developing countries. When your excess agricultural production is sold in developing countries at prices that undercut our own farmers, we suffer economic losses, environmental degradation, and the undermining of our own sustainable development. World Bank President James Wolfensohn has pointed out that we cannot deal with the question of development without dealing with the question of trade. Similarly, we cannot deal with either development or trade without also dealing with the issue of biodiversity, which underpins both.

Third, we are concerned about the slow progress on giving the Convention on Biological Diversity enough strength to enable us to protect our genetic resources. While the CBD is binding international law, it is too weak to actually control what happens to biological resources that may be harvested in Kenya, Indonesia, or Ecuador, and then patented by a pharmaceutical or agricultural multi-national. This practice has led to the coining of a new term, “bio-piracy”, which well captures the concerns that many people in developing countries have. Our countries would like to see a strengthened international regime, as called for by the WSSD, based on the voluntary Bonn Guidelines. Measures taken in other fora, such as WIPO and WTO, need to support the goal of using genetic resources to contribute to biodiversity conservation and poverty reduction.

The Millennium Development Goals provide a dramatic opportunity to direct resources toward the reduction of global poverty. But the EU needs to seize the moment and support programmes that work to both reduce poverty and conserve biodiversity. The programmes you are developing to achieve the 2010 biodiversity target within Europe are admirable, and IUCN’s members and other organizations are strongly supporting these through the Countdown 2010 initiative at pan-European level. But conserving biodiversity in Europe is far too modest a goal.

I would like to encourage you today to fully embrace the challenge of conserving biodiversity for the cause of poverty reduction throughout the world. The vast resources available in the EU need to be mobilised in support of this biodiversity goal at the global level.

Through the Millennium Project being run out of the office of Kofi Annan, we are designing programmes that will work, provided they receive support from wealthy countries, and from the EU as an economic union. We seek to demonstrate solid
progress in ensuring a better life for the rural people in developing countries who are living hard lives among unimaginable biological wealth.

So what can the European Union do to address both the Millennium Development Goals and the 2010 biodiversity target? I have five suggestions that you might wish to consider:

First, encourage your private sector to contribute more actively to conserving biodiversity, recognising that many parts of the private sector have a significant ecological footprint and associated impacts on biodiversity. Many companies are taking voluntary measures in this direction but much more could be done to recognise the dependence between biodiversity and the private sector. Shareholders need to be made aware of how their corporations are relating to biodiversity and poverty issues, especially in developing countries.

Second, provide more support to research on biodiversity. While the EU has a thriving research community, we still do not have an authoritative baseline against which to assess progress toward the 2010 biodiversity target. We need to mobilise our full scientific capacity to map the world’s biodiversity, build stronger relationships between European scientists and those in the developing countries, apply the results of research to the needs of the rural poor, and involve local expertise and knowledge in the enterprise. This research also needs to include more effective monitoring of biodiversity, as a means of informing decision-makers about the changing state of biodiversity so that appropriate corrective actions can be taken. We need something like a “Biodiversity Knowledge Commons” to provide this information freely to the public.

Third, work much more intensively at implementing the multi-lateral environmental agreements. Most of the negotiations to date under the CBD, for example, have been about agreeing various plans of action. But we now need to implement these action plans, and to mobilise the resources necessary for doing so. We also need the World Trade Organization to be more supportive of biodiversity, for example addressing agricultural subsidies and the expanding threat posed by the spread of invasive alien species.

Fourth, integrate biodiversity into other sectors, demonstrating how biodiversity is linked to poverty alleviation, climate change, water management, human health, and
sustainable development in its broadest sense. We need to mobilise our best thinking to transform commodity production systems of agriculture, forestry, and fisheries to biodiversity-enhancing approaches.

And finally, mobilise civil society in the process of achieving the 2010 biodiversity goal and the MDGs. While governments have deep responsibilities in this field, civil society has much to contribute. For example, the Marine Stewardship Council and the Forest Stewardship Council both indicate consumer concern rather than government action. We need to form coalitions among conservation groups, indigenous peoples, human rights advocates, and religious bodies to build a stronger constituency for biodiversity. For the conservation of biodiversity is a profoundly political process, reflecting social choice. We need to turn away from a world where our options are constrained by unsustainable forms of development, and instead choose a world that is rich in diversity of cultures, biological systems, and opportunities. I hope that the Countdown 2010, spreading from Malahide today throughout Europe, will encourage and enable the citizens and decision makers of your societies to halt the loss of biodiversity in Europe – and beyond.

Thank you.

_Chairman:_ Thank you Mme Kakabadse for those very wide perspectives on biodiversity issues. I now invite Commissioner Wallström to address us.
Address by Margot Wallström, former European Commissioner for the Environment

Biodiversity and the EU: Sustaining Life, Sustaining Livelihoods

Thank you Mr President, Mr Minister, Mrs Kakabadse

In your introduction you rightly set the challenge of protecting biodiversity in the wider context of sustainable development. These two issues are linked. One of the biggest mistakes that our society still makes is to maintain the illusion that our technological skills isolate us from the need to live in harmony with nature.

So why does biodiversity actually matter?

I like to say that biodiversity matters for Ethical, Emotional, Environmental and Economic reasons – four Es that describe why we need biodiversity.

Ethically, mankind should not be responsible for wiping out other species. I do not want the shame of belonging to one of the last generations that had a chance to see the Iberian lynx. My grandchildren and great-grandchildren should not see the wonders of the underwater world only in old film footage.

And then biodiversity loss matters emotionally. From nature we derive pleasure, fulfilment, inspiration and solace.

Environmentally, of course, the value of biodiversity is unquestionable.

But what is often overlooked is its economic value, as I have just mentioned. To put it simply, we cannot afford to lose biodiversity. We are reliant on the environmental goods deriving from plants and animals and healthy functioning ecosystems. As one of the conference papers makes clear, biodiversity provides essential goods and services for our society. In purely monetary terms, according to a major review paper in Nature, global ecosystem services have an average annual value of €26 trillion, approximately equal to global GNP. According to a more recent study in Science, if we convert these natural habitats – to agriculture or forestry – the result is that on average we halve the total economic value to society of these areas.
The conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity must be recognised as a precondition for achieving the EU’s goals of sustainable growth, social cohesion and quality of life.

In my address today, I will tell you what we have done so far for biodiversity and why we urgently need to do more. Malahide must result in strong and concise recommendations. I will not go into great details as to what these recommendations should be because I want to leave room for you all here to define them - but I will briefly mention the areas where I see the need for reinforced action.

What commitments have we already made?

Our heads of state and government rightly recognised the importance of biodiversity in their declaration on sustainable development at the Gothenburg Summit in 2001. They set a challenging objective – to halt the decline of biodiversity by 2010.

But if we look closely, simply halting the decline is not enough. Much of Europe’s biodiversity is already greatly impoverished. As specified in our 6th Environmental Action Programme, we need to do more than just halt the decline: we also need to aid the recovery of the populations and ecosystems of our impoverished species.

It is important that our actions are not limited to the European scene. This challenge also has a global dimension. World leaders made a commitment at the World Summit for Sustainable Development in 2001 to significantly reduce the current rate of loss of global biodiversity by 2010.

In an increasingly global economy, it is clear that Europe leaves a significant footprint on biodiversity across the world. When visiting protected natural areas we are often encouraged to “take only photos and leave only footprints”. I fear however that Europe’s footprint on global biodiversity is far from harmless. Developing countries, often much more biodiverse than our own, also need our support through economic and development cooperation if they are to tackle loss of their biodiversity.

Mrs Kakabadse, as President of IUCN and as previous Environment Minister of Ecuador, is well placed to explain to us how we can marry this need with the urgency of meeting the UN’s Millennium Development Goals which define the global development agenda.
From the early days of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the EU has been one of the strongest voices calling for firm international commitments. In Kuala Lumpur earlier this year, we successfully argued for an enhanced programme of action. But when taking this moral high ground we must ensure that our foundations are sound. Are we practising what we preach? I fear that the answer to this question is not always positive, as the frank and detailed ‘audit’ papers before us show.

**What have we achieved so far?**

These audits do show that we have nevertheless made some progress. In the last few years, the EU has made significant reforms to both its agricultural and its fisheries policies. When fully implemented they will without question be of major benefit to biodiversity.

Considerable progress has been made with the establishment of our Natura 2000 network of protected areas. Designated sites now cover 18% of the territory of the old EU 15. I also take this opportunity to congratulate Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Poland on their proposals for the network, and encourage the remaining new countries to quickly conclude their own submissions.

This network has clearly inspired the international community, which in Kuala Lumpur called for a global network of protected areas. But these initiatives must not be paper exercises. They will ultimately only benefit biodiversity if they truly receive the protection and management they require.

There are some species success stories too. The action plans set up for our most threatened bird species do seem to be making a change for the better. There is the cheering tale of the bittern in the UK. It is a singular species: the male’s foghorn-like cry can be heard by the female up to three miles away. A Victorian taste for the species made it extinct in Britain in 1868. It reappeared in Norfolk 44 years later but, just a few years ago, was again on the verge of extinction. Now, thanks partly to funds provided by our LIFE-Nature programme for protection of its reed-bed habitat, the Norfolk population numbers some 90 birds.

**What are the remaining challenges?**

But there is no room for complacency. Despite all our efforts we continue to lose biodiversity, both in the EU and globally, at an alarming rate. As the EEA’s paper
shows, our habitats and ecosystems are increasingly fragmented by intensive agriculture and forestry, infrastructure and construction. In arable areas, our freshwaters are increasingly harmed by nitrates. Climate change pressures are on the increase.

The picture for species is equally worrying. Farmland birds have substantially declined over the last 20 years. Wetland butterfly populations have declined by some 90% over the last 30 years, grassland butterflies by 50%.

According to IUCN’s new Red List, 69 species have been added to the list of threatened species in the EU since 2000. These include the cod, which is hardly a surprise as no less than 60% of European fish catches exceed safe biological limits. The wild horse has become extinct in its natural habitat. And the status of several species already on the Red List – including the spectacular Iberian lynx – has worsened. It is now the most endangered large cat species in the world, reduced from thousands to fewer than 150 individuals in 40 years, a shocking symbol of our failure to assume our responsibilities.

**Why must we reinforce action?**

Earlier this year in Madrid, at the Pan European meeting of the parties to the Biodiversity Convention, I rang the alarm bell – calling for a renewal and reinforcement of commitment.

This is without question a critical time. A critical time because we are at the dawn of a new enlarged Europe. The new Member States have brought significant new riches of biodiversity to the EU. But also new responsibilities, to ensure that their membership does not come at the cost of that richness.

It is also a critical time because, in a few months, we will have both a new Parliament and a new Commission. Their mandate will cover the remaining five years left to us to meet the Gothenburg target.

Malahide is perhaps our ‘make or break’ moment, and I urge you to seize it. This is our golden opportunity to assess our progress and agree on the targets and priorities for the remaining five years to 2010. We must take it!
How well are we prepared?

The EU’s Biodiversity Strategy originally adopted in 1998 rightly identifies the need for action in a wide range of sectors which influence biodiversity.

But with just five years to go, and the limited resources at our disposal, we have to have a shared vision of what the 2010 target really means in terms of what we hope to achieve, sector by sector.

Over the last few months, we have been preparing for this, reviewing progress and considering the way forward, with the help and support of many of you here today. Our shared findings – on how much progress we have made, why we have not made more progress, how much of a difference it is making, what we need to do next, what we need to focus on in terms of priorities and targets, how we should organise amongst ourselves, and how we will know if we have reached the 2010 target - are all before us in the conference papers.

What must we achieve in Malahide?

Your deliberation over the next two days will, I hope, lead to recommendations on which the new Commission and Parliament must take action. I know already that the Irish Presidency is committed to presenting them to the Council of Environment Ministers at the end of June. I note that the following Presidencies – the Netherlands, Luxembourg and the UK - are represented on our panel on Thursday, and urge them to continue the good work of the Irish Presidency. For my part I will certainly recommend the Message from Malahide to the new Commission.

With many of the action areas lying in the competence of Member States and regions it is clear that the Message should also be addressed to them, and to business and civil society too. Our biodiversity target cannot be reached unless a concerted effort is made at all levels.

As I said at the beginning, I don't want to prejudge the outcome of our discussions, but I do want to just mention nine areas where I see the need for action:

(1) we need to do more to ensure that our regional policy supports biodiversity and to ensure that it has no negative impacts;
(2) we need to do more to prevent and minimise the increasing fragmentation of European habitats by urban sprawl, infrastructure and ‘desert-like’ tracts of arable and forest monocultures;

(3) we need to implement the biodiversity-friendly provisions of the Common Agricultural and Fisheries Policies and exploit these to best effect;

(4) we need to complete our Natura 2000 network, provide financial and technical support to maintain sites and species in favourable conservation status, and improve its ecological connectivity;

(5) we need to be far more effective in integrating biodiversity into our economic and development cooperation, and we need to consider how our trade affects global biodiversity;

(6) we need to ensure that our measures to adapt to climate change do not end up damaging biodiversity;

(7) we need to adopt and apply robust indicators to measure progress or to warn us if we are failing;

(8) we need substantial investment in research to fill the great knowledge gap; and

(9) we need to reinforce our efforts to build awareness, popular demand and the political will to achieve all of this.

Indeed, the process of review started by the European Commission last year leading up to this conference recognised that to succeed we need to have broad ownership of the assessment and of the proposed solutions. We still have a way to go to build the necessary level of ownership and commitment, and in this regard I welcome the Countdown 2010 initiative which we are to launch this afternoon. This effort to inform European citizens about our political commitments, to maintain public pressure for delivery, and to help pull together actors from all sectors of society is much needed.

The issues you are addressing are as complex and varied as biodiversity itself. The interest and viewpoints you bring represent a broad cross section of our society but I hope a shared goal.
The stakes are high – the variety of life on Earth, our very livelihoods and those of our children and our children’s children.

You, the participants of this conference will I hope come up with a strong Message from Malahide which will help to orientate EU action over the next five years and beyond.

Thank you for your attention.

Yolanda Kakabadse, president IUCN, Martin Cullen, former Minister for the Environment, Heritage & Local Government and Margot Wallstrom, former European commissioner for the Environment
INTERLUDE – LAUNCH OF COUNTDOWN 2010

COUNTDOWN 2010
Halt the loss of biodiversity
Supporting organisations and IUCN are very pleased to have successfully launched “Countdown 2010” during the ‘Biodiversity and the EU’ Conference in partnership with DG Environment and the Irish Presidency. In Malahide, representatives of the future EU Presidencies from The Netherlands, Luxembourg, Great Britain and Austria declared their interest in working with Countdown 2010 and we are looking forward to the collaboration. Additionally special words of thanks are also due to the local school children who assisted in the launch of the Countdown initiative and who participated in the Green School Programme, which is administered in Ireland by An Taisce, the National Trust.

The EU Council of Environment Ministers, in the conclusions of its June 04 meeting, welcomed the Countdown 2010 and encouraged the Commission, civil society and EU Member States to lend their support.

Countdown 2010 has certainly had a good start! Now what will the next steps be?

We believe that Countdown 2010 is essential to achieving the 2010 biodiversity target, as this ambitious goal will only be reached, if Europe’s society is convinced of the importance of halting biodiversity loss and understands what can be done to achieve it. Considerable work is required to increase public knowledge and understanding of the status of biodiversity and the threats it is facing, both within Europe and globally. IUCN, along with its many members and partners, envisages that the Countdown 2010 is providing the necessary framework by which to ensure public awareness and participation.

The goal of Countdown 2010 is to join key decision-makers and civil society in halting the loss of biodiversity by 2010, through:

1. Focusing public and stakeholder attention on the 2010 biodiversity commitments to keep biodiversity on the political agenda
2. Mobilising all stakeholders to contribute to achieving the 2010 biodiversity commitments
3. Catalysing and facilitating collective action for implementation
4. Amplifying the activities of IUCN members and other organisations by relating working programmes to the 2010 biodiversity commitments
Organisations wishing to join the Countdown are asked to visit www.countdown2010.net and download the logo and place it on their website, together with a link to the site. Additionally they are asked to inform the secretariat of their ongoing activities that are “halting the loss of biodiversity”.

We very much enjoyed participating in such a productive conference and welcome the forward-looking ‘Message from Malahide’ document and stand ready to work with all partners in its implementation.

_Tentative list of Countdown 2010 themes, based on the Kiev Resolution on Biodiversity and the Message from Malahide (not exhaustive):_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Biodiversity in Europe</th>
<th>Monitoring and Indicators: understanding the state of biodiversity in Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate Change: Facing the extinction crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Rural Development and Ecological Landscapes</td>
<td>Rural Development: Agriculture and Landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Development: Forestry and Landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Banking and Biodiversity</td>
<td>Sustainable investment: Banking for Biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable investment: Businesses for Biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries and Marine Protected Areas</td>
<td>The status of marine protected areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fisheries Policy and Practice – Endless Resource Oceans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe’s Ecological Footprint</td>
<td>Development Aid: Europe and the World Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade: Europe and the World Ecology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Countdown Structure:

Steering Group Role
- Overall decision making body
- Will meet once/twice a year
- Decide annual themes
- Forum for all Countdown partners
- Bring together different stakeholders

Secretariat Role
- Daily operations of the initiative
- Preparation of events
- Co-ordination of activities
- Suggesting new partners
- Fundraising

Executive Group Role
- Strategic guidance to the Countdown secretariat
- Identification of priority topics for the Countdown
- Advice and assistance on communications
- Advice on financial aspects
- Evaluation of Countdown activities
- Ambassadors for the Countdown

Left: Former European Commissioner Margot Wallström and IUCN President Yolanda Kakabadse during the launch of Countdown 2010 on May 25th, 2004, in Malahide, Ireland.

Right: Representatives of the Countdown 2010 partner organisations and of the present and future EU Presidencies are launching Countdown 2010.
Box 1: Environment Council Conclusion on Countdown 2010:

The Council of the European Union (Environment), in its 2593rd session in June 2004, concluded that it:

“WELCOMES the Countdown 2010 initiative, launched by a partnership of civil organisations, including the Irish Presidency, the Commissioner for the Environment and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and other key actors at the Malahide Conference, as an important sensitising initiative to the significance of biodiversity loss across the globe and as a means to act as an independent monitor of progress towards the 2010 targets and ENCOURAGES Member States, Commission and civil society to support the Countdown 2010 initiative”

(Source: Council of the European Union, 2004: Press release 10746/04 (Presse 203) of 28th June, 2004; http://ue.eu.int/Newsroom)

Below: The launch of the Countdown 2010 in Ireland was supported by schoolchildren from the An Taisce Green Schools Programme
KEYNOTE SESSION 2: 16:00-17:00 HRS

CHAIR: Tom O’Mahony, Assistant Secretary General, Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, Ireland.

Chairman: In this session, we will have four speakers. First, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity will seek to place this conference in a wider global context. We will then have 3 contributions from 3 very important stakeholders on the biodiversity debate, from the farming, fisheries and private sector interests of the EU. I now invite David Cooper of the CBD Secretariat to share his views with us.
I. INTRODUCTION

Biodiversity is the variability among living organisms and the ecological complexes of which they are part, including diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems. This combination of life forms and their interaction with each other and with the environment has made Earth a uniquely habitable place and provides a large number of goods and services that sustain our lives. Biodiversity is essential to our planet, human well-being and to the livelihood and cultural integrity of people.

Sustaining that biodiversity, in the face of considerable threats from human activities, constitutes one of the greatest challenges of the modern era. The importance of this challenge was universally acknowledged at the Earth Summit held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. The Convention on Biological Diversity arose from this summit and entered into force in the next year. There are now 188 Parties to this international legally binding treaty, reflecting a virtually universal participation.

The objectives of the Convention are the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components, and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources. The Convention sets out broad commitments by Governments to take action at the national level for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. Since its entry into force, the Parties have developed a series of programmes of work and elaborated a series of guidelines and other tools to aid implementation of the Convention as described in section II below.

In 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted a Strategic Plan to provide a coherent focus for the various programmes of work and cross-cutting issues addressed under the Convention. The Strategic Plan includes the target, subsequently endorsed by the World Summit on Sustainable Development, of achieving by 2010 a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss. In section III of this paper we discuss the role of targets in the Convention,
including the sub-targets for various focal areas of action adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its recent meeting in February 2004. In section IV we look at the use of the indicators adopted in this framework.

II. THE PROGRAMMES OF WORK OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Action at national level is essential to addressing the challenges of biodiversity loss and in achieving the objectives of the Convention. Under the Convention on Biological Diversity, most countries have now developed national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs). A key challenge is for these to be fully integrated into national sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, plans and strategies as required under the Convention, and for adequate resources to be mobilized for their implementation.

At the international level, the Conference of the Parties has developed a series of thematic programmes of work (see table 1). Each programme of work establishes a vision for, and basic principles to guide future work, identifies goals, objectives and activities, determines potential outputs and suggests a timetable and means for achieving these outputs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic programmes of work of the Convention:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural biological diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland waters biological diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine and coastal biological diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest biological diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain biological diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island biological diversity (under development)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, the programme of work on protected areas, adopted recently by the Conference of the Parties has the objective of the establishment and maintenance by 2010 for terrestrial and by 2012 for marine areas of comprehensive, effectively managed, and ecologically representative national and regional systems of protected areas that collectively contribute to achieving the three objectives of the Convention and the 2010 target, through, inter alia, a global network.

The Conference of the Parties has also adopted a number of principles, guidelines and other tools to facilitate implementation of the Convention (see table 2). These have been developed on the basis of expert scientific and legal advice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals, guidelines and other tools developed under the Convention:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description, Principles and Operational Guidance for the Ecosystem Approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of their Utilization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guiding Principles on Invasive Alien Species</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Akwé: Kon Voluntary Guidelines for the conduct of cultural, environmental and social impact assessment regarding developments proposed to take place on, or which are likely to impact on, sacred sites and on lands and waters traditionally occupied or used by indigenous and local communities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guidelines for incorporating biodiversity-related issues into environmental impact assessment legislation and/or process and in strategic environmental assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guidelines on Biodiversity and Tourism Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposals for the application of ways and means to remove or mitigate perverse incentives</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, the Conference of the Parties, responding to an invitation contained in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, initiated a process to elaborate and negotiate the nature, scope and elements of an international regime on access and benefit sharing.

In January 2000, the Conference of the Parties adopted the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to address potential risks posed by living modified organisms (LMOs) and to ensure an adequate level of protection in the transfer, handling and use of LMOs resulting from modern biotechnology, taking into account risks to human health. The Protocol breaks new ground through its practical application of the precautionary approach—the idea that lack of absolute scientific certainly is no reason to delay action to prevent potential risks. It also promises to make a real contribution to promoting technology transfer and to enabling developing countries to gain access to information and technology from the biotechnology industry.

The Convention aims to mobilize financial resources for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity especially for developing countries. The financial mechanism of the Convention, operated by the Global Environment Facility has mobilized some US$1.8 billion since the entry into force of the Convention, and several times more than that in co-financing.

An important dimension of work under Cooperation at the international level is cooperation with other multilateral environmental agreements and other treaties. For example, the Convention on Biological Diversity is working closely with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to ensure that climate-change mitigation and adaptation activities, including carbon sequestration projects, also contribute to biodiversity conservation wherever possible. Cooperation with other organizations, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the International Maritime Organization is intended to address some of the threats to biodiversity from invasive alien species. More generally, close cooperation with the other biodiversity related conventions such as the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands minimizes duplication of efforts and optimizes use of limited resources.
III. THE 2010 TARGET

In 2002, the Conference of the Parties adopted a Strategic Plan including the target of achieving by 2010 a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss at the global, regional and national level as a contribution to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on Earth. This target was subsequently endorsed by the World Summit on Sustainable Development and the United Nations General Assembly. The Summit also highlighted the essential role of biodiversity in meeting the Millennium Development Goals, especially the targets to half the incidence of poverty and hunger by 2015. It recognized that the Convention is the key international instrument on biodiversity.

The European Union has also established a 2010 biodiversity target at the Gothenburg Council in 2001: “to protect and restore habitats and natural systems and halt the loss of biodiversity, by 2010”.

Increasingly, targets are being used in various areas of public policy. Clear, stable, long-term outcome-oriented targets that are adopted by the international community can help shape expectations and create the conditions in which all actors, whether Governments, the private sector, or civil society, have the confidence to develop solutions to common problems. For example, several countries set economic and social targets, for employment, education etc. Targets also form the core of the Millennium Development Goals, providing a commonly agreed focus for activities by all countries and stakeholder groups. The Kyoto protocol is centred on targets for CO2 emissions targets. Even though the entry into force of that protocol is still in doubt the approach has been widely applied in Europe, by many US states, and by the private sector.

A whole series of outcome-oriented targets were set by the Conference of the Parties at its sixth meeting in the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (Table 3) and these have proved to be an important catalyst in stimulating action by countries, international organizations, voluntary organizations and donors, including the private sector. Recently, a global partnership for plant conservation has been established, bringing together a wide range of national and international organizations working to promote implementation of the Strategy and achievement of its 16 targets.
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding and documenting plant diversity:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A widely accessible working list of known plant species, as a step towards a complete world flora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A preliminary assessment of the conservation status of all known plant species, at national, regional and international levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Development of models with protocols for plant conservation and sustainable use, based on research and practical experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conserving plant diversity:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. At least 10 per cent of each of the world’s ecological regions effectively conserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Protection of 50 per cent of the most important areas for plant diversity assured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. At least 30 per cent of production lands managed consistent with the conservation of plant diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 60 per cent of the world’s threatened species conserved in situ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 60 per cent of threatened plant species in accessible ex situ collections, preferably in the country of origin, and 10 per cent of them included in recovery and restoration programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 70 per cent of the genetic diversity of crops and other major socio-economically valuable plant species conserved, and associated indigenous and local knowledge maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Management plans in place for at least 100 major alien species that threaten plants, plant communities and associated habitats and ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Using plant diversity sustainably:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. No species of wild flora endangered by international trade;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 30 per cent of plant-based products derived from sources that are sustainably managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The decline of plant resources, and associated indigenous and local knowledge, innovations and practices that support sustainable livelihoods, local food security and health care, halted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoting education and awareness about plant diversity:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The importance of plant diversity and the need for its conservation incorporated into communication, educational and public-awareness programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building capacity for the conservation of plant diversity:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The number of trained people working with appropriate facilities in plant conservation increased, according to national needs, to achieve the targets of this Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Networks for plant conservation activities established or strengthened at national, regional and international levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building upon the approach taken in the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, the Conference of the Parties, at its most recent meeting, in 2004 adopted a framework to evaluate progress towards the 2010 target, including a set of goals and sub-targets under seven focal areas for action, including measures to address the threats to biodiversity (see table 4). This provides a flexible framework within which national targets can be set.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Framework For Goals And Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focal area: Protect the components of biodiversity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1. Promote the conservation of the biological diversity of ecosystems, habitats and biomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 1.1: At least 10% of each of the world’s ecological regions effectively conserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 1.2: Areas of particular importance to biodiversity protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 2. Promote the conservation of species diversity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 2.1: Restore, maintain, or reduce the decline of populations of species of selected taxonomic groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 2.2: Status of threatened species improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 3. Promote the conservation of genetic diversity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 3.1: Genetic diversity of crops, livestock, and of harvested species of trees, fish and wildlife and other valuable species conserved, and associated indigenous and local knowledge maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focal area: Promote sustainable use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 4. Promote sustainable use and consumption.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 4.1: Biodiversity-based products derived from sources that are sustainably managed, and Production areas managed consistent with the conservation of biodiversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 4.2: Unsustainable consumption, of biological resources, or that impacts upon biodiversity, reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 4.3: No species of wild flora or fauna endangered by international trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal area: Address threats to biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 5. Pressures from habitat loss, land use change and degradation, and unsustainable water use, reduced.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 5.1: Rate of loss and degradation of natural habitats decreased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 6. Control threats from invasive alien species</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 6.1: Pathways for major potential alien invasive species controlled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 6.2: Management plans in place for major alien species that threaten ecosystems, habitats or species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 7. Address challenges to biodiversity from climate change, and pollution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 7.1: Maintain and enhance resilience of the components of biodiversity to adapt to climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 7.2: Reduce pollution and its impacts on biodiversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal area: Maintain goods and services from biodiversity to support human well-being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 8. Maintain capacity of ecosystems to deliver goods and services and support livelihoods</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 8.1: Capacity of ecosystems to deliver goods and services maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 8.2: biological resources that support sustainable livelihoods, local food security and health care, especially of poor people maintained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal area: Protect traditional knowledge, innovations and practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 9. Maintain socio-cultural diversity of indigenous and local communities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 9.1: Protect traditional knowledge, innovations and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 9.2: Protect the rights of indigenous and local communities over their traditional knowledge, innovations and practices, including their rights to benefit sharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal area: Ensure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the use of genetic resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 10. Ensure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the use of genetic resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 10.1: All transfers of genetic resources are in line with the Convention on Biological Diversity, the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and other applicable agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 10.2: Benefits arising from the commercial and other utilization of genetic resources shared with the countries providing such resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. INDICATORS FOR ASSESSING PROGRESS TOWARDS THE 2010 TARGET

The framework to evaluate progress towards the 2010 target adopted by the Conference of the Parties in 2004 includes a set of indicators for assessing progress at the global level towards the 2010 target and for communicating effectively trends in biodiversity related to the three objectives of the convention (see table 5). The remainder of this section IV provides a provisional review of current biodiversity trends according to the eight indicators adopted for immediate testing. The use of these indicators, and the development of others, will be reviewed by the Convention’s Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, and by its Working Groups on Access and Benefit Sharing, and on Article 8(j) and related provisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal area: Ensure provision of adequate resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 11: Parties have improved financial, human, scientific, technical and technological capacity to implement the Convention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 11.1: New and additional financial resources are transferred to developing country Parties, to allow for the effective implementation of their commitments under the Convention, in accordance with Article 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 11.2: Technology is transferred to developing country Parties, to allow for the effective implementation of their commitments under the Convention, in accordance with its Article 20, paragraph 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5

**Provisional indicators for assessing progress towards the 2010 Biodiversity Target**

(Indicators for immediate testing are numbered. Possible indicators for development are shown in italics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status and trends of the components of biological diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trends in extent of selected biomes, ecosystems and habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Trends in abundance and distribution of selected species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coverage of protected areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in status of threatened species (Red List indicator under development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in genetic diversity of domesticated animals, cultivated plants, and fish species of major socioeconomic importance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of forest, agricultural and aquaculture ecosystems under sustainable management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of products derived from sustainable sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threats to biodiversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Nitrogen deposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers and cost of alien invasions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecosystem integrity and ecosystem goods and services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Marine trophic index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Water quality in aquatic ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of trophic index to freshwater and possibly other ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity/fragmentation of ecosystems Incidence of human-induced ecosystem failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and well-being of people living in biodiversity-based-resource dependent communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity used in food and medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV.1 Status and trends of the components of biological diversity

In accordance with Article 2 of the Convention, components of biological diversity include living organisms from all sources and the ecological complexes of which they are part. This includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems.

*Indicator 1: Trends in extent of selected biomes, ecosystems and habitats*

Currently, the most complete data on trends in a major ecosystem type are available for forests. In 2000, natural forests covered about 40% of the land surface: more than 60% of tropical land and approximately 30% of non-tropical land was classified as forests. For the period 1990–2000, the Food and Agriculture Organization, in its Forest Resources Assessment estimates that the net loss in natural forest area was 14.2 million hectares annually in tropical forests, and 0.4 million hectares annually in non-tropical areas (Figure 1). This is equivalent to an annual loss in natural forest area of over 0.7% in tropical and 0.02% in non-tropical areas. The rapid loss of tropical forests remains a main feature and concern, contributing to losses of biological diversity, increases of atmospheric carbon and spreading of desertification.
Species population trend indices such as the Living Planet Index are valuable ways of monitoring and communicating biodiversity change at global, regional and (sub-) national scales or within biogeographic units. These indices can be built using existing biological data to show clearly understandable trends in species abundance and, by implication, the condition of the ecosystems in which they occur. Since the 1970s the Living Planet Index, which reflects a change in population size of more than 700 species of vertebrates has dropped by over 30 percent (Figure 2). Similar trends have been observed for abundant and widespread bird species breeding on farmland throughout Europe.


**Indicator 3: Coverage of protected areas**

The establishment of protected areas reflects measures taken to safeguard biodiversity. Globally, the number of protected areas has been increasing significantly over the past few decades and is now more than 100,000 sites. The total area has also increased continuously from less than 3 million km² in 1970 to more than 20 million km² in 2004 (Figure 3). However, ecoregional and habitat representation remains uneven, and coastal and marine ecosystems are particularly under-represented.

**Figure 3. Development of the protected areas network since 1873.**

The statistical measurement of protected area numbers and extent does not tell us how effective those protected areas are in actually conserving biodiversity and reducing its rate of loss. This requires two additional pieces of information: an understanding of how well biodiversity is covered by these sites, and an understanding of the effectiveness of their management.

**IV.2 Threats to biodiversity**

Article 14 of the Convention requires Parties, inter alia, to avoid or minimize adverse effects on biodiversity. Land use change is reflected in indicator 1.
Among the other direct drivers of biodiversity loss, the Conference of the Parties proposed that indicators be used for invasive alien species and the anthropogenic production of reactive nitrogen. Other direct drivers of biodiversity loss, for example climate change, ozone and persistent organic pollutants, are addressed in other intergovernmental processes.

**Indicator 4: Nitrogen deposition**

While nitrogen in reactive forms is essential for life, excessive levels in the biosphere and atmosphere constitute a major threat to biodiversity in terrestrial, aquatic and coastal ecosystems. Reactive nitrogen from anthropogenic sources (mainly fertilizer production, fossil fuel use, and widespread cultivation of legume crops, and crops such as rice which stimulate biological N fixation) has increased markedly following the discovery of the Haber-Bosch process for fertilizer manufacture (Figure 4). Anthropogenic sources now exceed natural sources and hence more than half of all reactive N in ecosystems globally is from human sources. Higher than natural levels of reactive nitrogen in natural terrestrial ecosystems, especially temperate grasslands, shrublands and forests leads directly to lower plant diversity, as slow-growing species are out-competed by a small number of faster-growing species. The major source is aerial deposition. Excessive levels of reactive nitrogen in water bodies, including rivers, coastal zones and other wetlands frequently leads to algal blooms and eutrophication, including low-oxygen conditions which causes major damage to biodiversity including fisheries. The main source is run-off of nitrates and other nitrogenous compounds from agricultural lands. In addition to the above effects nitrous oxide is a potent greenhouse gas, and in the upper atmosphere can damage the ozone layer.
IV.3 Ecosystem integrity and ecosystem goods and services

Indicators under the focal area on ecosystem integrity and ecosystem goods and services provide information on the quality and health of ecosystems and their productive capacity. This information complements the information on the area coverage of ecosystems addressed through the indicator on trends in extent of selected biomes, ecosystems and habitats. While two indicators on the integrity of inland water and marine ecosystems are considered ready for testing and use, a range of additional indicators related to terrestrial ecosystems require further development.

Indicator 5: Marine trophic index

The marine trophic index measures the change in mean trophic level of fisheries landings by region and globally. Trophic level is defined as the position of an organism in the food chain, and ranges from a value of 1 for primary producers up to a level of 5 for marine mammals. Trophic level also changes through the life history of fish, with juveniles having lower trophic levels than adults. The preferred fisheries catches consist of large, high value, high trophic level predatory fish, such as tuna, cod, and swordfishes. Overfishing leads to depletion of these large predatory fish so that the relative
numbers of low trophic level small fish and invertebrates increase. The intensification of fishing has already led to effective removal of species from marine food webs. The biomass of top predators in the North Atlantic has decreased by two-thirds in approximately 50 years and the mean trophic level of fisheries landings globally has declined at a rate of approximately 0.1 per decade. Figure 5 demonstrates the strong declining trend in mean trophic levels of fisheries landings between the years 1950 and 2000. The decline in mean trophic levels results in shortened food chains, leaving ecosystems less able to cope with natural or human-induced change.

Figure 5. Decline of mean trophic level of fisheries landings reported by FAO. (Graph by R. Watson, Sea Around Us Project, Fisheries Centre, UBC, Vancouver)

Indicator 6: Water quality in aquatic ecosystems

Water quality data represent one of the most comprehensive sources of indicator data for aquatic systems. They are multi-functional and indicate both major threats to the sustainability of freshwaters and unsustainable activities outside that ecosystem. Biological oxygen demand (BOD) is an indicator of the organic pollution of freshwater. In comparing the past two
decades, rivers in Europe and Australasia show a statistically significant reduction in BOD concentrations. Although the reduction is not particularly large, it is indicative of positive trends (Figure 6). Other indicators of water quality include sediment loads in rivers, concentration of pollutants in water, quantity of water abstracted from inland waters.

**Figure 6. Changes in biological oxygen demand (BOD) of major water bodies on a regional basis**

![Graph showing changes in BOD](image)

**IV.4 Status of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices**

In accordance with article 8 (j) of the Convention, Parties should inter alia respect, preserve and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities, embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. This provision and related guidance provided by the COP recognize the role of indigenous and local communities in managing and maintaining biodiversity.

**Indicator 7: Status and trends of linguistic diversity and numbers of speakers of indigenous languages**

The close association between language and cultural knowledge and practices, including traditional ecological knowledge and associated
biodiversity management practices, is widely recognized. While additional indicators need to be developed the COP decided to use trends in indigenous languages and speakers as a proxy for trends in traditional knowledge, innovations and practices. There are an estimated 5,000 to 7,000 languages spoken today on the five inhabited continents. Of these, about 250 are spoken by 97% of the world’s people. Conversely, about 96% of the world’s languages are spoken by about 3% of the world’s people. Indigenous and local communities speak the vast majority of these languages. More than half of the world’s languages are spoken by less than 10,000 people. Analyses have demonstrated that there is a comparable magnitude and pace of the current extinction rates effecting biodiversity and human languages. The extinction of each language results in the irrecoverable loss of unique cultural, historical, and ecological knowledge. Every time a language dies, we have less evidence for understanding patterns in the structure and function of human language, human prehistory, and the maintenance of the world’s diverse ecosystems. According to the most pessimistic predictions, the world may lose 90% of languages in the next century. While no accurate data about trends in language loss are available as yet, current information on numbers of languages and numbers of speakers can serve as baseline information (Figure 7).

Figure 7: distribution of world languages
IV.5 Status of resource transfers

The need for financial, technical and technological resources for the implementation of the Convention is reflected in Articles 20 and 21 of the Convention. The COP adopted an indicator on official development assistance, which can draw on official statistics provided by relevant bodies, and an indicator on technology transfer, which needs to be developed.

**Indicator 8: Official development assistance provided in support of the Convention**

Bilateral assistance provided to developing countries, as measured by Official Development Assistance (ODA), is an important component of the financial resources available for the implementation of the Convention. ODA commitments are reported by OECD member States to the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC). Using a “biodiversity marker” jointly developed by the OECD/DAC Secretariat and the CBD Secretariat, ODA activities targeting the objectives of the CBD have been reported for the period 1998 to 2000. The figures reported were 1.09, 1.03 and 0.87 billion US$ respectively. The data assembled to date is insufficient to identify clear trends over time (Figure 8). However it has recently been decided to continue use of the biodiversity marker for at least another three years and it is envisaged that this will give rise to useful information on both status and trends of resource transfers. Among the providers of multilateral assistance the Global Environment Facility (GEF) is a key source of financial assistance for the implementation of the Convention. The commitments to GEF in the three replenishment cycles 1994, 1998 and 2002 amounted to 959, 1,451 and 1,773 million US dollars.
V. NATIONAL ACTION

Implementation of the Convention must take place primarily at the national level. It is largely action at the national level that will lead to progress towards the 2010 target. At its seventh meeting, the Conference of the Parties of the Convention invited Parties and Governments to develop national and/or regional goals and targets, within the framework established by the Conference of the Parties at its seventh meeting (Table 4) and, as appropriate, to incorporate them into relevant plans, programmes and initiatives, including national biodiversity strategies and action plans. The Conference of the Parties also invited Parties and Governments to use existing national indicators or to establish national indicators to assess progress towards their national and/or regional targets. Implementation of activities to achieve and monitor progress towards the goals and targets will require capacity-building, especially in developing countries and countries with economies in transition. In this respect, the Conference of the Parties invited Parties, Governments, international and funding organizations to provide adequate and timely support. Concerted action will be needed to achieve the target by 2010 which is now only a few years away.
Chairman: That puts in very good context for us the task that each of us has in our own individual countries. We now move to three key sectors and we’re very pleased to have three prominent and influential speakers from each of the sectors this afternoon. First of all, the farming sector. Quite obviously, agriculture is key to the conservation of biodiversity and we have to look at how our policies help support that. We’re very pleased to have this afternoon John Dillon who is not only the President of the Irish Farmers Association but is also the Vice President of COPA, the European Farmers’ Union which now with the enlargement of the EU has 25 member associations.
Address by John Dillon, Vice President COPA-COGECA and President Irish Farmers Association

The View from Agriculture

Mr Chairman, Madam Commissioner, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a great pleasure for me to be here today at this stakeholders’ conference on EU biodiversity policy. It gives me an opportunity to present a farmer’s perspective on the challenges to agriculture in contributing to biodiversity in the European Union.

Farmers, as the custodian of 70% of the EU landmass, have protected and shaped the environment for the citizens of Europe over many centuries. They have made a significant contribution to biodiversity across the Union.

In doing so, farmers have always responded to the demands of the non-farming society. However, conflicting policy messages are now being conveyed to farmers.

On the one hand, European farmers are asked to produce higher quality and cheaper food. On the other hand, we are asked to compete with ranchers and factory farmers operating in the lowest cost regions of the world. Producers in these regions do not have to meet the EU standards of production and high costs. However, they have full access to our markets.

An example of this is GMOs, where the Union has allowed, rightly in my view, consumers choice at the point of purchase. It is quite obvious that the vast majority of EU consumers will opt for cheaper GM produced products than those that are produced at high standards in the European Union.

Relentless consumer and retail downward farm gate price pressure has resulted in increased productivity being necessary in order to maintain farm profitability.

Going forward, the consumers of Europe must realise that there will be two markets in the future. One will relate to the normal marketplace for food. The other one will be the recognition of the public good that biodiversity brings to the wider society. Society must also be prepared to pay for goods provided by farmers in this second market.
One of the main supports to the environment is the Agri-Environmental programme, which farmers have embraced throughout the European Union. In Member States, the participation level of farmers in the programme is as high as 90%. In the recent CAP Reform, the Agri-Environmental programme has been enhanced. It is important to recognise that the incentives for farmers to participate must be strengthened so that biodiversity results are achieved.

The Less Favoured Areas Scheme has helped sustain extensive farming and prevented abandonment of land and depopulation of 50% of the EU territory. Agricultural support in Less Favoured Areas is essential for the conservation of landscapes and the preservation of biodiversity. I have no doubt that this measure has played a major role in ensuring that the European Union has protected biodiversity.

The SAC - Natura 2000 network covers 18,000 sites across the European Union, which is equivalent to 63.5m hectares or 17.5% of the EU-15 territory. It is important to point out that the restrictions applying in these areas impose a cost burden on farmers. Society should pay for these areas to be protected because of their national and international habitat importance.

During the 2002 Brussels Summit, the European Council decided to freeze the funds allocated to agriculture until 2013. This is at a time when the EU is enlarging from 15 to 25 Member States.

The message conveyed to farmers was that in return, the European Council would keep the current level of spending, and not decrease it.

COPA / COGECA maintain that this commitment must be lived up to. The financing of the EU’s environmental objectives must not be done at the expense of the CAP.

I wish to highlight to you that halting the decline in biodiversity does not only involve agriculture but all sectors of the economy. Asking farmers to do more to curb the decline in biodiversity is not compatible with other EU policies, particularly trade and budgetary policy.

Farmers need stability in the policies affecting them. That is why I ask you to remain realistic in your demands to the farming world.
In conclusion, let me reiterate again, that farmers support the protection of our environmental heritage, including its biodiversity. However, it is important to recognise that farmers earn their living from farming. Therefore, measures which seek to protect biodiversity must be consistent with, and not undermine, the ability of farmers to generate their incomes from farming.

Thank you!

Chairman: Thank you very much John. The second sector is the fisheries sector and we’re very pleased to have Michel Dion, who is the General Manager of the Union of Boat Owners of France, who is going to give us the perspective from the fisheries sector.
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The View from Fisheries

(Translated from the original address in French)

Thank you Mr Chairman!

What a nice topic for a conference: Sustaining Life, Sustaining Livelihoods. I am grateful to the organizers of this conference, the Irish Presidency, to have chosen this title and to have chosen somebody from my part of the economy to talk about it. And I am grateful to my own organisation for having put my name forward for this rather delicate task.

It is a delicate task because many – perhaps even more in this room than is usual – believe that conservation and fisheries simply contradict each other. As you can see I have come unarmed into the lions den. I agreed to come to this conference not so that I could make an academic presentation that would be well balanced and carefully crafted. Rather I came here trying to show that unlike what many may think, fishing and ecology can work together – they are not foes but friends. And to do that I would like to make a few very simple points.

First of all: Man is part of biodiversity.

That is a very simple, even simplistic idea as I see it, but not everybody seems to see it that way. A long time ago, I heard a famous French actress, who did a lot for baby seals, saying in an interview on the radio that if she had to get rid of man to save an animal species then she was quite happy to get rid of man. I hope that these words, which probably went a bit further in the fire of the moment than she intended, are not echoed by many today because man is part of the global ecosystem and of biodiversity.

And when I say man, I mean humans and what allows them to live, which includes extraction of natural resources, their processing and their use. Amongst these, right from the beginning of time, fisheries have been one of the main primary harvesting functions. Man may have taken a few tens of millions of years to be aware of the need for biodiversity and the need to sustain his ecosystem. Nevertheless, fishermen have evolved in the same direction and have reached the same conclusion over the same
period of time, perhaps even fishermen got there well ahead of the average land-based man because the fisherman is far closer to nature than land-based man. He is almost part of the aquatic environment of the planet, he lives there, he lives from it and he is therefore one of the first persons concerned about, and aware of, the quality of that part of the environment. Fishermen are the first to see how water is being degraded and water quality suffers. Fishermen are the first to suffer after environmental disasters, which are usually named after various oil tankers like the Amoco Cadiz, Exxon Valdez, Erika, Prestige, etc. Fishermen are also the first to suffer from the more dangerous types of permanent pollution that we cannot see such as sewage and by-products of industries that we sometimes see washing down our rivers.

The fisherman is a natural defender of nature and the environment. You say that is fair enough but he is still fishing! Well that is true, fishermen do take fish. But the issue is whether they are fishing in a responsible way. Can they do it in a way that sustains stocks and maintains biodiversity and preserves ecosystems? And I would like to try and show you, in my own simple way, that this is what is happening.

The second simple point I would like to make: fisheries actually do not damage biodiversity.

Well I heard that biodiversity can be understood in a very broad sense, however, basically biodiversity in a strict sense encompasses the protection of all the different types of species. Now I think fishing has never lead to a single marine species becoming extinct.

I heard earlier somebody saying that dozens or hundreds of species are becoming extinct every year. That’s very distressing. Nevertheless, I do not think that you can actually take those disastrous statistics to apply them to the field of fish stocks. Some stocks are over-fished; some stocks were very heavily over-used. That I think is quite clear now. But no stock has been wiped out. No species has disappeared.

Having said that, given the fact that we are talking about biodiversity in the EU, we have also to think about the second half of the conference title - sustainability for species but also for people to make a livelihood. So it is not good enough to just say we are not harming biodiversity by fishing, we need to go beyond that. We need to look at what we are doing, at what has been done and at what can be done in the future.
**My third simple point: the Common Fisheries Policy should sustain life in the maritime environment and for fishermen.**

I am not going to go over the whole of the Common Fisheries Policy going back to the 60s and 70s and all the way up to the latest in-depth reform of 2002. The main thrust of this last reform, when it came to stock management and ecosystem management, had some clear objectives using the TACs, the Total Allowable Catches, and the technical measures. But on top of that there was a Commission proposal which aimed at a long-term management approach based on some critical thresholds and biological targets that were built into the system. Non-compliance with any of this would automatically trigger long-term management plans and recovery plans as well as the fixing of new TACs. Recovery plans can limit how many days a ship can spend at sea. Controls will be stepped up and there will be a harmonized control, overseen by a centralized co-ordinating agency. This new Common Fisheries Policy had its first result with the North Sea cod recovery plan and progressively other species recovery plans are being implemented.

Now, the trade I represent shares the aim of preserving the environment and the resources in it. And that is basically where the fisheries policy’s priority is. But we are critical about a number of its aspects and we continue to be so: the scientific data is unreliable; the precautionary principle is being overused, both at scientific level and within the Commission; there are too many overlapping management tools; there is a legal overload - a sort of forest of red tape; there is a risk that the relative stability might be undermined; there is complete lack of ex-ante impact studies on social/economic issues and there is no sort of help for the economic damage this entails; and there is a sort of overkill at every end of the scale.

Basically the Council and Commission have given more importance to resource sustainability than to sustainability of fishing. Now, the Commission says that this is not true you cannot have fishing without a sustainable resource. Yes, fair enough but you kill the fishermen to protect fish. Keeping the fish will not help anyone if it is being carried out in such a violent and overhasty way.

If you only use a fishing vessel ten days a month how can you ever make a return on your investment? But that is what the cod plan for the North Sea requires the cod fishing vessels to do. There is this overkill which has made fishermen even more suspicious of the Common Fisheries Policy and of politicians and the EU more
generally. So from where I stand now I would like to call for a Common Fisheries Policy that takes into account fishermen as well as fish and that seeks to preserve both parts of the marine ecosystem. Only thus can dialogue be possible between fishermen and people who run fisheries, and only thus will the Common Fisheries Policy be understood and accepted by fishermen so that it will be something that can be introduced in a peaceful way.

The Regional Advisory Committees (RACs) may help. I hope they will! These Advisory Committees could be a way forward if people do take them seriously. Perhaps I have been talking too much about fishermen and not enough about the environment.

*I will now come to a fourth simple idea: do not shoot the pianist!*

It is always very well to protect corals, sharks, birds and seahorses. You want to avoid by-catch and you want to have fisheries that respect the environment.

But what about Chernobyl? What about all those atomic rust-buckets the Russians still have? What about the Americans refusing to ratify Kyoto? What about the non-application of various conventions that many industrializing countries are not joining? They do not care about environmental or social aspects in their rapid rush to industrialization. What about the equatorial rainforest which is a rampart against desertification and a major carbon sink? What are we doing in Europe about our waste management? What do we throw into our rivers and sea? What are we doing with our running water? When are we going to have a European maritime control and monitoring process like air traffic control, so that ships stick to routes, we know what they are carrying, and we check in our ports that they comply with navigability, security and other international and European safety standards. What do we do to combat massive extraction of marine granulate? Marine mining completely destroys whole areas of the sea floor as a marine habitat. What do we do about off-shore rigs, marine cables, marine wind farms, pipelines?

It is easier to pick on the weakest link, particularly when this weakest link is cheeky enough to go out into nature to try to get some food for humanity. It is easier to crack down on fishing as an adjustable variable than on states or super-powerful multinational companies. Some of them of course are able to create a fig-leaf by financing green initiatives. I think that things have to be put into perspective. We have to look at sustainability for life and livelihoods in a real and proportional way.
I think we should tackle first the main engines and risk of pollution that are
degrading the marine environment, leading to global warming, changing biotopes,
increasing natural mortality of organisms and changing their behaviour. Let us start
with that. Fishermen and the Common Fisheries Policy can deal with the technical
aspects of fishing.

*My last and fifth simple idea: fishermen are managing the environment and their resource.*

This may make some of you feel a bit cynical but based on what I have seen in my
country I would like to give you a few examples. The National Fisheries and
Aquaculture Committee and the regional committees regulate access to resources in
the 12 miles limit through fishing licences or special fishing permits. The Brittany
Council delivers 2000 licences for different coastal fisheries, particularly for shellfish
harvesting. Only if you have a licence can your vessel harvest those species and there
is mutual oversight by people checking each other. This is perhaps the most effective
way of checking on any possible cheat. The actual penalizing is carried out by the
justice system or the administration, but these local committees can also limit the
fishing efforts or impose quotas where appropriate.

I’d like to give you another example. Fishermen, together with manufacturers, try to
develop more selective gear so that you select in the sea rather than on deck, and so
that you are actually catching what you want in the first place without having to
throw part of the catch back into the sea. More selective fishing gear is being
developed and in particular the new shrimp trawl and dolphin panels on pelagic
trawls and the use of various escape panels for marine mammals in some of the more
modern trawling systems are all trends in the right direction. More effort and money
should be put into selectivity rather than cracking down on by-catch which is just a
bit of a buzzword at the moment.

A third example is the management of quotas by the producer organisations. There is
some experience among producer organisations that have shown how it can and
should be done. But this approach to management is not binding. You do not have to
join a producer organisation and that is a bit of a handicap for the whole system.
There is no cohesive power for the producer organisations and I think that we
should think about remediying those aspects to find a better way of making fishermen
responsible for what they are doing and making the people in charge of imposing the
quotas more aware of what they need to do so that there is some sort of mutual checking going on.

With that I have finished my list of simple ideas.

Through what I have tried to say I hope that I got my message across. Basically I am trying to say on behalf of the trade: please stop shooting at us! Give us a break! Give us time to digest the new Common Fisheries Policy, the new long-term management plan, the cuts in TACs, the new technical measures, the closing off of zones for protection of coral, the codes for responsible fisheries, the observers we have to have on board, the satellite surveillance, we are also losing construction aid, and I could go on and on. Give us time to deal with all that red-tape and all those layers of control. Fishing is perhaps the economic sector in the world that is the most scrutinized. So please let us leave it at that! No more straws on the fishermen’s backs because they will otherwise soon be extinct!

Thank you for your attention.

*Chairman:* Thank you very much Michel for a very clear exposition of the case of the fishing industry. Our final presentation comes from the perspective of the private sector, business and industry, and we are very glad to have Teresa Presas who is the Managing Director of the Confederation of European Paper Industries.
Address by Teresa Presas, Managing Director, Confederation of European Paper Industries

The View from the Boardroom

Thank you Chair.

I am very glad to be here today and to give the so-called boardroom perspective on biodiversity - and that from an industry that relies on one key conservation sector, the forests. I would also like to say that I am sure that all responsible companies will take up the challenge, launched by the President of IUCN to encourage the private sector to do more to protect biodiversity and to recognize the footprint of companies on biodiversity. In turn, we would like to be considered as fully-fledged stakeholders and an internal part of the solution and not solely as the problem.

Forests are expected to fulfil numerous functions. Through management forests provide raw materials and energy resources. They offer opportunity for leisure and are the reservoirs of cultural and spiritual values. They protect landscape and water; they contribute to clean air, shelter flora and fauna and maintain specific habitats. In this multi-functionality biodiversity has a very important place.

Nobody can deny the importance of protecting endangered species. Forests are particularly rich in fauna and flora and as Commissioner Wallström said earlier on, enlargement has brought even more diversity into the European Union. The recognition of these different roles of forests needs the balanced approach of the three pillars of sustainability - notably as far as rural development, environmental protection and economic viability are concerned. All the functions of forests need to be equally addressed and taken into consideration.

But the problem is that each stakeholder focuses on its own interests. The existing framework approaches lead to a situation where forests and forestry are managed from various perspectives and in a fragmented way. Just to give an example, hiking and cycling associations look at it from a leisure point of view, while forest owners being interested in getting income from forests hardly address these aspects without considering the potential side-effects and trade-offs. Forests are cut in slices and they are not seen as a whole.
As recognised in the Message from Malahide, EU forestry remains exceptional at global level by maintaining one of the largest single biodiversity reservoirs and continuing to function as a sustainable source of raw material for important economic activities.

The stakeholders who have developed that document state that the long-term challenge will be the reconciliation of biodiversity preservation, the use of wood which is carbon neutral and the economic role of forests. One cannot forget that European forests are mostly man-made or man-driven ecosystems. The natural environment we want to keep and protect has been under human influence for thousands and thousands of years. The existing biodiversity is the biodiversity we have created throughout generations. So we need a balanced approach that takes this into consideration.

The relationship between the pulp and paper industry which I represent here today and biodiversity can be seen from two angles. On the one hand, pulp and paper mills consume a renewable raw material that comes from forests and of course should pay attention to the environmental impacts of wood procurement including biodiversity. The impact of logging activities has been reduced by using modern technology paying special attention to keep biotopes. The industry should of course be encouraged to continue doing so. On the other hand, many mills are located in rural areas and special assessments should be made about the potential impacts of location and operation - directly on fauna and flora and indirectly though emissions, effluences, etc.

The industry has already made tremendous efforts to reduce those impacts and they have been recognized even in Commission policy documents. Profitable companies have the possibility to invest in nature protection and there are many good examples throughout Europe. Wood as raw material has many assets and qualities. It is part of nature. European legislation requires that forests are regenerated and in fact they have annually been increasing at a rate of 340,000 hectares a year since 1990 and the absolute area of EU forests is still expanding. Wood is a renewable resource.

It is also reused thanks to recycling. We have calculated that 54% of all the paper fibre in Europe is recycled which is the highest recycling rate for any material. Forests sequester carbon and wood products store carbon. Wood can replace fossil fuel as a source of energy. It can also replace other maybe less environmentally-friendly raw
materials, for example in construction. More and more forests are managed in a sustainable way, as required by law and through increasing commitments of stakeholders - because forestry is our livelihood.

The amount of EU policy and international forest-related processes in which biodiversity is included is quite considerable and I will not go through that. I have picked one example because it is about the refinement of monitoring and definitions of variables which are relevant to different types of forests to be addressed through responsible forest management systems. The Work Programme on the Conservation and Enhancement of Biodiversity and Landscape Diversity in Forest Ecosystems, was a joint initiative of the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE) and the pan-European ministerial process Environment for Europe. The Programme was designed for the period from 1997 to 2000. Already then biodiversity programmes aimed to effectively address most urgent needs in the conservation and enhancement of biological diversity as an essential element of sustainable forest management. The four objectives of the Work Programme are not very different from what this conference wants to achieve. The initiative was a good example of how different stakeholders can collaborate on common objectives and interests such as the preservation of biological diversity. The four objectives of the programme were complemented by a set of actions to achieve the objectives. The programme ended in 2000.

However, there are many lessons to be learnt. The programme provided the response from the forest sector to the forest chapter of the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy (PEBLDS) signed by the European Ministries of the Environment under the Council of Europe. It also sets similar objectives and actions for 20 years. Again it was a good example of how differently driven groups could collaborate and build actions under common interests. These types of initiatives should be further explored instead of emphasizing the divergences among groups of stakeholders.

How is the current EU programme linking into all this? When we speak about biological diversity – and interested parties have different and subjective views about what it should be – there can be rather restricted definitions or broader ones. The definitions rely on the stakeholder’s point of view and agenda. Various concepts have

---

been used in relation to forests and its environmental values which sometimes need further clarification as they are rather confusing for forest managers, for the forest-based industries and in particular for the large amount of European small forest owners.

A few words about the policy context on forestry. It is important to know that forest ownership structure in Europe is unique as some 60% of forests are owned by some 60 million families. European policies are increasingly impacting on forests and related economic sectors. Last year CEPI released a study that measured the potential impact of several policy scenarios on the future mobilization of wood as a raw material for industry. The conclusion was that a number of policies and a number of regulations were seen as potentially impacting on the willingness to harvest, hence on the mobilization of raw material.

We support the policies and we work hard to achieve their objectives in terms of climate change, in terms of biodiversity, etc. But one of the consequences of the shortfall that our industry could be faced with in terms of raw material could well be the replacement of wood by other less environmentally-friendly raw materials for a number of purposes. Looking at the global and European policy context for forests and forestry we have estimated that some 350 pieces of legislation impact on forest and related industries. At the same time the European institutions have no mandate, no legal basis in the treaty, to regulate forestry. Concretely it means that forests are mainly subjected to non-forest policy, impacting on forests. And the fragmentation of forests handled by numerous Directorates General and other services within the EU institutions leads to a lack of recognition and sometimes contradictory, insufficient and overlapping measures, lack of law enforcement and of visibility of the sector. European forests have been managed under laws and regulations for centuries. These laws and regulations have reflected the main concerns of society through time and it is expected it will continue to be so.

Currently there are opportunities to address forests in a more comprehensive manner, both at global level and at regional level. The first is a global legally-binding instrument, a global forest convention in the context of the United Nations Forest Forum. The second is a European visible framework for forests and forestry as a result of the EU Forest Strategy. These opportunities would lead to better, more coherent and more efficient policies and to the proper recognition of the multiple functions of forests.
Besides the development of a favourable policy context, the forest sector has taken the initiative to improve management methods and act towards sustainability. The private sector has already responded very positively to the call for action. New codes of practice were developed incorporating sustainable forest management, biodiversity, climate change and related issues in existing corporate policies. Moreover good manufacture practices manuals were elaborated. Methodologies for the assessment of practical indicators for management purposes will be put in place. We regularly report on sustainable forest management practices.

Within this context some companies have gone even further in demonstrating excellence through environment management systems adapted to their own forest operations. Forest certification has been developed on a voluntary market-driven basis aiming at assuring that wood is coming from responsibly managed forests. Certification systems operating in Europe include provisions related to forest protection and biodiversity enhancement. In CEPI most members are actively involved in certification. Currently 1 tonne out of 2 of virgin fibre used by the industry is certified. We just saw earlier on that the amount of forest under sustainable management is a candidate for a biodiversity indicator; we are well ahead on it. As far as products coming from the industry are concerned more than a quarter of the production volume is covered by certificates of chain of custody.

Ladies and gentleman the role of forests is reflected in the three pillars of sustainable development and that includes sound environmental performance, a responsible social attitude and last but not least profitable economics.

Thank you very much.

Chairman: Thank you very much Teresa and thank you again also to David Cooper to John Dillon and to Michel Dion. I think the papers that we’ve heard this afternoon have provided you all with a very good set of perspectives and the context for the workshop discussions you’re going to have for the next two days.
DAY 2: WEDNESDAY 26th MAY 2004

PLENARY SESSION: 09:00-10:30

CHAIR: Martin Capstick, Head of European Wildlife Division, Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK
Chairman: Yesterday we had some extremely important contributions which we hope will inform your considerations and debate. Obviously from the programme the key focus today will be on the content of the Message from Malahide and the efforts that we hope people will put in to seriously address the issues and the objectives. I am delighted to chair this session and to show that this is an important issue for the UK, who will have the Presidency in the second half of next year. Events such as this one will help us to establish how best we take forward this crucial biodiversity agenda during our Presidency. With me on the panel this morning are 4 colleagues who will be giving presentations which move from the general discussions of yesterday to provide a specific context for the working session deliberations later today. We have a slight change in the order. First we’ll have Guy Duke from DG Environment who will have the challenge of giving an overview of the recent audit of the EC Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans. Second will be Gordon McInnes, Deputy Director-General of the European Environment Agency, who will be talking about the first set of EU biodiversity headline indicators. Third will be Sybil van den Hove who will be speaking on behalf of the European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy, reporting on research priorities to 2010 and in particular on the recent meeting in Killarney. Finally, this morning, Nicholas Hanley of DG Environment will be speaking on the Message from Malahide.
Presentation by Guy Duke, Principal Administrator Biodiversity Policy, DG Environment, European Commission

Overview of Working Group Audits of the EC Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans

Copies of the presentation overheads are provided in Annex 5A.

Introduction and scope of presentation

I stand here today as a representative of DG Environment and in particular Unit B2 Nature and Biodiversity which has been architect and facilitator of the current EU biodiversity policy review process.

I will go over very briefly:

- EU biodiversity policy leading up to the 2010 commitments;
- the mandate for this review process and for reinforcement of action;
- the Commission’s response in terms of this process;
- the various outputs that have emerged from the work over the last year or so and which provide the basis for the deliberations at this conference;
- the substantive findings of the working group audits of the EU Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans; and finally
- I will introduce briefly the Draft Message from Malahide, about which Nicholas Hanley will give further information at the end of this afternoon’s session, and give an indication of planned follow-up.

The historical development of EU biodiversity policy

You’re all very familiar I’m sure with the historical development of EU biodiversity policy. Key early developments were the Birds and Habitats Directives of 1979 and 1992 respectively.\(^{13, 14}\) In 1992 the Rio Earth Summit produced the Convention on

\(^{13}\) Council Directive of 2 April 1979 on the conservation of wild birds (79/409/EC)

Biological Diversity. This was ratified in 1993 by the Community which became a Party in its own right. All 25 EU Member States are also parties to the CBD. In meeting its obligations under the CBD, the Community drew up a Biodiversity Strategy\(^{15}\) which was adopted in 1998. Subsequent to that, four Biodiversity Action Plans\(^ {16}\) focusing on four key areas - the conservation of natural resources, agriculture, fisheries, and economic and development cooperation - were adopted in 2001.

The same year, at the Gothenburg Spring Council, Heads of State and Government adopted the EU Sustainable Development Strategy\(^{17}\) and the environmental dimension as expressed in the 6th Environment Action Programme\(^{18}\). And they also made the commitment to halt the decline of biodiversity (in the EU) by 2010\(^{19}\). Subsequent to Gothenburg, the global commitment to significantly reduce the current rate of (global) biodiversity loss by 2010’ was made, first at the 6th Conference of the Parties to the CBD in The Hague\(^ {20}\), and subsequently by world leaders at the World Summit for Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002\(^ {21}\).

**The mandate for the policy review**

Let’s turn now to the mandate for the review. The background paper on state and trends\(^ {22}\) makes clear that the picture is grim. The background paper on values\(^ {23}\) makes clear that this loss matters, for various reasons. So we have, if you like, a


\(^ {21}\) World Summit for Sustainable Development. Plan of Implementation, para 44.


moral mandate to reinforce action towards the 2010 targets. We have an administrative mandate also – within the EC Biodiversity Strategy itself there is a requirement to report every 3rd year on implementation, effectiveness and appropriateness of the ECBS and BAPs. And then there is an express political mandate from last year’s Spring Council where Heads of State and Government urged accelerated action towards meeting the 2010 target.

The Commission’s response – the review process

The Commission’s response has been to establish this policy review and reinforcement process. This process was agreed through discussions in the Biodiversity Expert Group (BEG) which is the advisory group to DG Environment. It consists of MS and civil society representatives. Discussion were held in early-mid 2003 – about process, structure, participation – and agreed and initiated in July 2003.

Two purposes were agreed. First, that there should be an objective assessment of implementation, effectiveness and appropriateness of the European Community Biodiversity Strategy (ECBS) and Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) with as broad a stakeholder engagement as possible. Second, that the process should be building momentum and ownership towards meeting the 2010 commitments.

The structure of the review was that the BEG with its broad stakeholder membership would provide the advisory oversight of the process, that the assessments would be carried out by Working Groups under the BEG, chaired and facilitated by the lead Directorates General for each of the BAPs (i.e. DGs Environment, Agriculture, Fisheries, and Development). Provision was made for consultation of other services within the Commission through an Inter-Departmental Coordination Group. There was provision, beyond the four sectoral working groups, for a fifth cross-cutting working group on monitoring, indicators and reporting, and for engagement of the research community through the European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy (EPBRS).

Outputs from the Working Groups – the papers submitted to Malahide

Regarding the outputs from the working groups submitted to this conference, there are first and foremost the so-called ‘audit’ papers which contain the assessment of each group of implementation, effectiveness and appropriateness of the ECBS and BAPs. Supplementing these, we have the audit of the EC Biodiversity Strategy Theme 3 on research, provided by the EPBRS. There is also, from each working group, a Towards 2010 paper which attempts to extract from the audits indicative priorities to 2010.

Finally, there is the Draft Message from Malahide which attempts to draw together these priorities to 2010. This is the main paper in front of this conference. The intention is that the conference debate and refine this paper and that it becomes the principle output of the conference. The main elements of this Message are priority objectives, and related to each objective a set of targets. Effectively, the Message from Malahide is a deconstruction – for EU purposes - of what is implied by the EU and global 2010 targets.

Other outputs of importance include a first set of EU biodiversity headline indicators. This is the main output from the cross-cutting working group. We feel this is a major step forward. There has been a very lengthy debate in recent years on biodiversity indicators and this group has built strong consensus among Commission, Member States and civil society on what a first set should contain.

Also, we have, coming out of Killarney last week, a revised proposal for the Draft Message from Malahide Objective 19, the Killarney Declaration and Recommendations providing clarity on research priorities to 2010 and beyond. Sybil van den Hove will be elaborating on this a little later this morning.

---

25 see Annex 3, papers (10)-(13)
26 see Annex 3, paper (27)
27 see Annex 3, papers (6), (7), (9) (note: Towards 2010 paper no. 3 [conference paper no. (8)] was not issued.)
28 see Annex 3, paper (4)
29 see Annex 3, paper (5)
30 see Annex 3, papers (25) and (26)
Finally, we have prepared for this conference five background information papers\(^{31}\) – some of which I’ve already referred to:

(1) a paper on the \textit{values} we attach to biodiversity which helps to explain why it is important to conserve biodiversity;

(2) a paper prepared by the European Environment Agency on current \textit{state and trends} of biodiversity in Europe; for this, the EEA has tried to apply the first set of biodiversity headline indicators to give a first impression of how they might work in practice;

(3) a paper on \textit{complementarity between EC and MS strategies and action plans} which provides an important basis for future work in this regard; there is a clear need for stronger complementarity;

(4) a paper on \textit{effectiveness of selected key measures} for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity – this reviews what the published literature tells us in this regard; and

(5) a paper highlighting major \textit{recent CBD decisions} (post-dating the biodiversity strategy and action plans) to which the EC and Member States are expected to respond.

To recap, the Draft Message from Malahide is the main paper, and is largely derived from the ‘Towards 2010’ papers which in turn are derived from the ‘Audit’ papers. The set of biodiversity headline indicators and the Killarney Declaration and recommendations on research priorities are proposed as annexes to the ‘Message’.

\textbf{Findings of the Working Group ‘audits’ on the implementation, effectiveness and appropriateness of the EC Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans}

I’ll now provide a little flavour of the content of the working group audits.

\textit{WG1 – EC Biodiversity Strategy and BAP-Natural Resources}

\(^{31}\) see Annex 3, papers (14)-(18)
This WG examined implementation and effectiveness of the BAP for the Conservation of Natural Resources, and for those sectors and themes addressed by the ECBS but not picked up in any of the BAPs (such as regional policy, transport and energy). Overall, the audit reports a fairly mediocre performance. There have been frequent delays, and there is still much to be achieved. But this is not to say there are no successes. For example, there has been significant progress in the establishment of the Nature 2000 network of protected areas. Species Action Plans have resulted in recovery of some of the most threatened bird species. As mentioned, we’ve made progress on biodiversity indicators. And there are useful new pieces of legislation, such as the Water Framework Directive which when fully implemented will provide for better ecological status of freshwaters, and the Environmental Liability Directive which holds actors liable for damages to priority nature sites.

But there are as I said major areas of concern and these tend to relate to the need for the integration of biodiversity concerns into other sectors and horizontal instruments. For example, in regional policy, where there is a need for much stronger integration of biodiversity into the structural funds. Also, there is evidence that the treatment of biodiversity in environmental impact assessment is often poor. Strategic environmental assessment, which has yet to kick in, will provide a significant reinforcement in preventing, minimising and mitigating damages to biodiversity from developmental activities. In forestry, there is a clear feeling that the manner in which biodiversity is currently addressed within the Forestry Strategy is inadequate and there needs to be a comprehensive Community response in particular to the CBD Expanded Programme of Work on Forests adopted at COP6 in The Hague. Invasive Alien Species is an area where MS have continued to remind us that there is a need for the Community to respond to the COP6 decision. Progress is now being made towards a Thematic Strategy on Soils but there is a fear this may not adequately address biodiversity concerns. Regarding business and industry, it appears that eco-labelling, EMAS and other measures are not being exploited to their full potential for the benefit of biodiversity.

**WG 2 – BAP-Agriculture**

In agriculture, generally the consensus is that the recent mid-term review of the Common Agricultural Policy has moved in the right direction. It provides for **decoupling** – the separation of subsidies from production, reducing incentives for intensification – and this will begin to kick in from 2005-2007. **Modulation** provides
for the movement of more funds to the second rural development pillar from 2005. *Cross-compliance* provides that all beneficiaries of direct payments must retain land in good environmental condition. And there will be a higher rate of EC funding for agri-environment measures. The audit shows that *agri-environment measures* and *less favoured areas* payments are spreading, but that for most Member States the majority of these measures and payments are not targeted directly at biodiversity, though many – such as reduced nitrogen applications - may have indirect benefits to biodiversity. *Good farming practice* has been applied since the 2000 reform but priority to biodiversity under GFP is only found in few MS. The continuing *expansion of organic farming* may be bringing biodiversity benefits in some if not all cases.

**WG 3 – BAP-Fisheries**

Regarding fisheries, the recent reform of the CFP is moving in the right direction, but not fast enough given the current state of many stocks and problems with non-target species. The reform provides for reduction of fishing pressures, for the introduction of long-term management plans, the introduction of precautionary reference limits for most stocks, and has withdrawn financial aid for new build, so limiting the fishing capacity of fleets. A number of new regulations – such as the Mediterranean Regulation, Shark-Finning Regulation, Communication on Discards - have introduced new technical measures relating to exploited stocks. There are also new technical measures relating to non-target species, for example the Cetaceans Regulation, the Darwin Mounds Regulation, the sand eel closure of the Firth of Forth, the proposed amendment to the Fisheries Structural Funds to enable, inter alia, recovery of salmon migratory routes, and a proposal to protect vulnerable habitats around the Macaronesian Islands from deep sea trawling. So, the reform has gone in the right direction but it is too soon to see how effective these reforms will prove. As M. Dion said yesterday, there is a clear need for better dialogue between fish vessel owners, fishermen, environmentalists and scientists and there is some hope that the Regional Advisory Councils that have been provided for under the reform will foster this.

**WG4 – BAP Economic and Development Cooperation**

Finally, regarding the BAP for Economic and Development Cooperation, there is a feeling that this has been the weakest of the BAPs in terms of implementation. There
have been biodiversity projects but impact appears to have been largely very localised. However, one of the findings was that the current databases within the Relex family of DGs at the Commission do not allow for much useful interrogation relating to how much is actually being spent on biodiversity. Mainstreaming has been very disappointing. Key measures, such as establishment of a helpdesk have not been implemented, and there has been very little progress in terms of integrating biodiversity into recipient countries’ Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs - which guide development assistance) and indeed into the Country and Regional Strategy Papers (which guide the EC’s development assistance). There was also a clear gap observed in the provisions of the ECBS and BAPs in terms of addressing the EU’s trade footprint on biodiversity in Third Countries. Causes of the failures of the BAP were identified as: the shift to recipient-driven aid; the absence of an ‘engine room’ for mainstreaming of biodiversity within the Relex family of DGs; cross-cutting fatigue among development professionals; and the absence of any significant earmarked fund. It is recognised that earmarking is not much favoured among development professionals. However, given the urgency of biodiversity loss, and the fact that the effects of mainstreaming will take many years to be felt, many working group members saw a need for enhanced earmarked funds for biodiversity. Some felt that the Global Environment Facility was the instrument for this and pointed to the last replenishment. However, others felt there was a case for a significantly increased EC earmarked fund for biodiversity.

**Generic findings**

There are some generic conclusions emerging from the four audits in relation to the *enabling environment*. First, to what extent do we wish to prioritise biodiversity against the other economic, social and environmental goals of the EU? How much can we build the *political will*? Political will responds to the level of demand, and influences the allocation of resources and the readiness to comply and to enforce. Many of the shortfalls in implementation and effectiveness are due to inadequate implementation at Member State level. Another key issue is *institutional coordination*. Weaknesses were identified in the arrangements in place to secure implementation of the ECBS and BAPs, both at EU level and between the Commission and Member States. Thirdly, there are issues relating to the knowledge base and its application. We still know very little about state and trends, about the drivers and pressures leading to biodiversity loss, and about the effectiveness of
policy responses. For too many of the actions, it was impossible to obtain adequate information to assess effectiveness in reducing biodiversity loss.

**The Message from Malahide and beyond**

Nicholas Hanley will talk more about the Draft Message from Malahide which we shall address within the working sessions this afternoon. The key task will be to refine the objectives and targets within the Message and to make those targets as SMART as possible. As we heard yesterday from David Cooper, SMART targets within strategies such as the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation have really helped mobilise action and pulled together stakeholders towards an agreed vision.

Beyond Malahide, assuming we come out with a powerful Message, the Presidency will be taking this to the Council. We hope there will be Council Conclusions on the Message which encourage both Commission and Member States and indeed civil society to respond concretely and rapidly. The Commission will most probably respond through a Communication to Council and Parliament. We would anticipate a continued stakeholder engagement in the follow-up, through the Biodiversity Expert Group and as necessary through continuing Working Groups.

Thank you.
A First Set of EU Headline Biodiversity Indicators

The following provides a brief summary of this presentation. Copies of the presentation overheads are provided in Annex 5B.

The presentation was based on two papers made available for the Stakeholders’ Conference namely ‘The First Set of EU Headline Biodiversity Indicators’ and ‘The State of Biological Diversity in the European Union.’

The presentation included background information on a proposed set of headline biodiversity indicators, illustrative example indicators already available and used in recent or upcoming European Environment Agency reports, and proposals on how to coordinate the testing, development and delivery of the proposed set.

The first set of EU headline biodiversity indicators is based on the list of indicators adopted by the seventh conference of the parties to the UN Convention on Biological Diversity held in Kuala Lumpur in February 2004. The EU set was proposed by the Working Group on Monitoring, Indicators and Reporting (formed as part of the review of the EU biodiversity strategy and action plans) to address the EU target to halt biodiversity loss by 2010 as well as other EU biodiversity-related policy and legislation. The EU Biodiversity Expert Group at its meeting on 28 April 2004 agreed to put the EU set to the Malahide Stakeholders’ Conference for endorsement.

The EU set includes the seven focal areas adopted by the CBD and adds an eighth area – Public Opinion – in order to include an indicator on public awareness and participation.

Example illustrative indicators include trends in the extent of wetland ecosystems in Ireland between 1990 and 2000, trends in the abundance of butterflies in various ecosystems across EU, changes in the status of threatened species as presented in the IUCN 2003 red list of globally threatened species, the area of forest under sustainable management.

See Annex 2 List of Conference Documents, papers no. (5) and (15) respectively.
management, as well as selected examples of the impact of climate change on biodiversity and of water quality in aquatic ecosystems.

Finally proposals are presented for a coordination team and expert groups, to be led by EEA in cooperation with the European Topic Centre for Nature Protection and Biodiversity and the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre. The team and its expert groups will improve coordination, information exchange and collaboration across pan-European countries; build on current activities and good practice within both governmental and non-governmental organisations; consolidate, test, refine and document agreed biodiversity indicators and help ensure funding for monitoring, indicators and assessments to support achievement of the 2010 target. The team will prepare a detailed work plan by August 2004 and work over the period 2004-2010 to provide support on monitoring, indicators and reporting relevant to the UN Convention, the EU Habitats and Birds Directives and other EU/European biodiversity-related policy.
Presentation by Sybil van den Hove, Board Member, European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy

Research Priorities to 2010 and Beyond – the Killarney Declaration

The following provides a brief summary of this presentation. Copies of the presentation overheads are provided in Annex 5C.

The European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy (EPBRS) is a forum for scientists and policy makers to ensure effective dialogue between researchers and policy makers. It meets twice a year under successive EU Presidencies. Meeting outputs consist in recommendations on key scientific priorities for biodiversity research in Europe. Recommendations are for research to fill identified gaps on specified topics of policy concern. They include methodological comments if needed. The focus is on science policy and science for policy.

In May 2004, the Irish Presidency hosted the Killarney meeting of EPBRS on “Sustaining Livelihoods and Biodiversity: Attaining the 2010 Target in the European Biodiversity Strategy”. The main objectives of the meeting were to review Theme 3 of the European Biodiversity Strategy (on Research, identification, monitoring and exchange of information) and to prepare recommendations for research priorities to achieve the objectives of the Biodiversity Strategy and the 2010 target.

The review of theme 3 built on a preliminary synthesis based on input from National platforms for biodiversity research, on an extensive electronic discussion of the synthesis, and on two electronic conferences (on marine and terrestrial biodiversity) prior to the meeting. In Killarney, a revised synthesis was adopted which presents research progress on issues raised in theme 3 as well as barriers, difficulties and outstanding issues. The report concludes that research has made significant but far from sufficient progress towards the understanding and measurement of biodiversity. Nevertheless, there are still large gaps in key research areas to reach the 2010 target. The main barriers and difficulties include: the inherent complexity of biodiversity issues, the lack of interdisciplinarity between natural and

---

33 see Annex 3, paper (27)
34 Available at: www.epbrs.org.
social sciences, the difficulty of linking different scales in biodiversity knowledge, the validation of monitoring schemes and indicators, the implementation of effective real time science-policy interfaces, and the finance-bounded lifespan of research networks.

The Killarney EPBRS meeting proposed a revised research objective\textsuperscript{35} for inclusion in the Message from Malahide - To improve and apply the knowledge base for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and a related set of targets for 2010. (Note: this was adopted as Objective 16 of the Message from Malahide - see Part 3 of this report).

Concerned by the alarming rate of biodiversity loss and the importance of research gaps that need to be filled to attain the 2010 target, the plenary of EPBRS also adopted the Killarney Declaration\textsuperscript{36} which stresses: that knowledge is essential for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity; the crucial role the European Research Area/7th Framework Programme; the critical importance of research in delivering the EC Biodiversity Strategy; and the need for immediate research actions to fill gaps in current knowledge. (Note: The Killarney Declaration was adopted as Annex 2 to the Message from Malahide - see part 3 of this report.)

The EPBRS meeting also developed the Killarney Recommendations for research priorities to attain the 2010 target in the European Biodiversity Strategy.\textsuperscript{37} These were based on research priorities identified during the review process and electronic conferences, as well as EPBRS plenary and working group discussions. They contain eight overarching research priorities, specific research priorities for each BAP; and a series of methodological priorities (Note: these Recommendations were adopted in Annex 2 of the Message from Malahide – see Part 3 of this report).

\textsuperscript{35} see Annex 3, paper (25)
\textsuperscript{36} see Annex 3, paper (26)
\textsuperscript{37} see Annex 3, paper (26)
Address by Nicholas Hanley, Head of Unit Nature & Biodiversity, DG Environment, European Commission

The Draft Message from Malahide

As my colleague Guy earlier on this morning reminded you, this Conference comes at the end of a year-long process of stakeholder involvement in the review of the Biodiversity Strategy. And as the Commissioner and the Minister both said to you yesterday, there is a market for the Message. As we move to the new Commission and the new Parliament in the next 6 months, it is very important that the Message is a strong one and focuses these institutions on the critical job they have to do.

The document you have before you, the Draft Message from Malahide\textsuperscript{38} is, I stress, a draft. My colleagues and I put this together based on the contributions from the Working Groups. We’ve tried to make it a slim and focused document, but it is open to you in the working sessions today to do what you want with it. If you want to change the objectives or the targets, that is your right.

The status of the document is that it is the report from this Conference; it is not a Commission document. We hope you will ensure SMART\textsuperscript{39} objectives. There is always a tendency in large forums like this to resolve differences by adding more objectives and targets. Clearly, the impact and the influence of your document will be diluted if you swamp it with too many objectives and targets. So I would encourage you, the chairmen and rapporteurs to show some discipline and keep an eye on the main purpose of the Message.

As I say the status of the document is that it is your document. It will go to the Commission, and the latter half of tomorrow’s programme provides for a first response from senior Commission representatives and the Presidencies to this document. The Message itself will be the compilation of the four working sessions. We considered having a session tomorrow morning where we try to get the plenary to sign off on the whole document. We decided there were too many different interests to allow this. Therefore, the differences of opinion should be addressed in

\textsuperscript{38} see Annex 3, paper (4)

\textsuperscript{39} SMART: S = specific; M = measureable; A = agreed; R = realistic; T = timebound
the groups today. The Chairmen of the groups have clear instructions that they are not to force any unreal compromise. If there is difference of opinion in any one session, that has to be reflected in the reports that come from the sessions. That will reflect true divisions in society and is something the Council and Parliament should know about when they come to reflect on it. So, don’t miss your opportunity to get your views across today, because we are not going to re-open the box tomorrow morning.

Each Working Group will address the objectives of the draft Message from Malahide according to the allocation given in box 1 (below).

To focus the groups, we want you to do 3 main things:

(1) A quick scan of the audit – if you feel there are any fundamental flaws, these should be signalled. Any detailed comment may be provided in writing to the end of June 2004.

(2) Examine and refine the objectives and targets allocated to your Working Group.

(3) Consider cross-cutting issues including the proposed objectives on indicators and research, and the issue of EU-MS complementarity.

I wish you all an interesting time, I hope you’ll all participate fully, and nobody will go away from this conference feeling they’ve not had an opportunity to make their views heard and understood.

Thank you.
### Box 1: Allocation of Draft Message from Malahide objectives to Working Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective no.</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>WG1 ECBS &amp; BAP-NR</th>
<th>WG2 BAP-AGRI</th>
<th>WG3 BAP-FISH</th>
<th>WG4 BAP-EDC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sites and species</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Environmental legislation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Invasive alien species</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Climate change and biodiversity</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>Ex situ</em> conservation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GMOs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fisheries and aquaculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Regional policy</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Urban and industrial construction</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Energy and transport</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ecotourism</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Economic and development cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Global governance</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>International trade</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Access and benefit sharing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Indicators and monitoring</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Communication and awareness</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORKING SESSION: REMAINDER OF DAY 2

Participants dispersed to 4 Working Groups to assigned Suites:

- **EC Biodiversity Strategy & Biodiversity Action Plan for Natural Resources:** Chairs: Gunther Liebel, Austria; Nicholas Hanley, DG Environment, European Commission. Rapporteur: Guy Duke, DG Environment, European Commission (This group divided into 2 sub-groups with additional co-chairs and rapporteur provided by the Irish Presidency).

- **Biodiversity Action Plan for Agriculture:** Chairs: Viki Swaile, Institute of European Environmental Policy; Adelmo Moreale, DG Agriculture, European Commission. Rapporteur: Mike Hammell, DG Environment, European Commission.


DAY 3: THURSDAY 27th MAY 2004

PLENARY SESSION - FEEDBACK FROM WORKING SESSION AND ADOPTION OF MESSAGE FROM MALAHAIDE: 09:00-10:45

CHAIR: Peter Bos, Ministry for the Environment, The Netherlands

Gorse and Larch, Killarney National Park, Co. Kerry
Chairman: Welcome to this final day of the Conference. I am standing in for my colleague Giuseppe Raaphorst who will be arriving later this morning. The Conference Secretariat will provide us a final printed version of the Message from Malahide later this morning, which consolidates the outputs from yesterday’s working sessions. May I remind you, the contents of the Message will now be presented, but it is not the intention to open and discuss the contents of the Message this morning.
Feedback from Working Groups 1-4

Working Group co-chairs

The non-Commission co-chairs of each of the four Working Groups (Gunter Liebel, Vicki Swale, David Tripp, Glyn Davies) presented the objectives and targets as refined by their respective groups on the basis of the draft Message from Malahide, for the final Message from Malahide. These refined objectives and targets are provided in Section 3 of this report in the final Message from Malahide.

All chairs reported a high level of stakeholder participation in their groups, broad representation of stakeholder interests in each group (though WG4 noted the absence of developing country stakeholders), lengthy and energetic debate, and a high level of consensus achieved on the final objectives and targets (only one group, that on fisheries, having had to record an issue – that of fishing capacity - where a difference of opinion could not be fully resolved).

In addition:

• Gordon McInnes (EEA) reported on Objective 15 (indicators, monitoring and reporting) for which comments had been obtained from each Working Group. He proposed in line with the first target under this objective (target 15.1) that the Conference endorse the proposed first set of headline biodiversity indicators. This set appears at Annex 1 to the Message from Malahide (see section 3 of this report).

• Guy Duke (DG Environment) reported on objective 16 (research/knowledge). He reminded the participants that the objective and targets had been drafted at the Killarney meeting of the European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy immediately prior to Malahide. Suggestions from the Working Groups had resulted in one amendment (at target 16.4) to make specific reference to the need for sufficient funding under the Community’s forthcoming Seventh Framework Programme for Research. The Killarney Declaration and recommendations on research priorities would be annexed to the Message from Malahide in order that they could be brought to the attention of the Environment Council.
Chairman: It is clear that a lot of work took place yesterday and it is good to see so many improvements have been made to the objectives and targets – and that we have ended up with fewer objectives than we started with. It is now time to reflect on what we have achieved. I give the floor now to Nicholas Hanley for some words on the final Message from Malahide.
Some words on the final Message from Malahide

Nicholas Hanley, Head of Unit Nature and Biodiversity, DG Environment, European Commission

The range and quality of the presentations you’ve just heard pays tribute to the hard work that you’ve all put in over the last day and the positive spirit in which you’ve entered into these discussions in addressing the challenge of coming up with a strong and coherent Message. When we started the working sessions yesterday, we were worried the price of consensus would be a multiplication of objectives and targets. You’ve not fallen into that trap, but have managed to refine and further focus the recommendations. The final Message from Malahide\textsuperscript{40} is the compilation of the messages of the separate groups. I think the range of representations in those groups and the quality of the debates ensures that the result is a genuine reflection of the broad representation at this Conference.

We propose that the final Message from Malahide will also include a preface. This will be drafted by the Presidency and the Commission and will be sent to you for comment. It will draw on a number of points submitted to us by different groups. It will pay particular attention to the process we have followed in arriving at the objectives and targets.

Certainly the strength of the document is that we have achieved a large degree of consensus. This will reinforce the potential impact of the Message. As the different policy debates go forward, many of you representing various organisations will express your particular viewpoints in other fora. But I think the achievement of this Conference in providing a coherent overall Message is very important.

In the preface, we will also make reference to a number of cross-cutting issues which have been raised and yet not found expression in any particular objective. Critical among these is the need to recognise the vital role of working with stakeholders. Much of Europe’s biodiversity is the product of traditional land-management and other practices and working with people in rural communities is a very important part of future success. This is implicit in the very title of our conference. Equally

\textsuperscript{40} See section 3 of this report
importantly, although we have an objective on awareness raising, this will be stressed in the preface. Finally, the preface will pick up on implementation arrangements. The audits have shown that much of the weaknesses in past implementation have resulted from the absence of coherent and comprehensive institutional arrangements for implementation, both at Community and at MS levels. It will be important to stress the important part Member States have to play both in exercising their individual national responsibilities, and in implementing a lot of the detail of Community policy.

With those few words, we come to an end of the Conference sensu stricto, and enter the ‘post-Malahide era’. We now hand over the Message to a first set of representatives of the main target audiences – the Commission and the future Presidencies, representing the Member States.

I’d like to take the opportunity to thank Chris O’Grady and his team from the Irish Presidency for the excellent organisation of the Conference and the continuation of a long tradition of excellent Irish hospitality. Their work in preparing the Conference and facilitating the discussions over the last two days is in no small part responsible for the success we’ve achieved, and I’d therefore on your behalf like to propose a vote of thanks to Chris and his team. Thank you very much.

Comments from the Floor

Dirk Schwenzfeier (Germany – Federal Ministry of the Environment): First of all, I’d like to thank the Chair and the working groups. It’s been a constructive and encouraging atmosphere and a great deal has been achieved. But I’d also like to suggest that in the preamble we should say that the results are not in all cases to be seen as reflecting the views of all the participants of the Conference – there are differences of opinion on individual points. I don’t wish to re-open the discussion on the objectives and targets – but would make one point having just seen the full Message. Many of the objectives and targets – such as those relating to protected areas - concern not only the EU and Member States but also have a global dimension. The Message from Malahide should give appropriate mention to this point.

Response (Nicholas Hanley): The preamble will speak about broad consensus and not unanimity.
Carlos Martin-Novella (Spain): I’d also like to thank those responsible for organising this conference. I thought a week ago to pull this off would be an impossible task. I would like other levels of decision-making to have the same commitment to environment and sustainability – particularly Council. More specifically, based on what we’ve just heard, I’ve noticed you’ve referred to our endorsing the Message from Malahide Annex 1 text on indicators. If this is simply a list of indicator titles as already seen, we have no problems with this – but we would have difficulty in endorsing further details at this stage.

Response (Nicholas Hanley): Annex 1 will simply provide the headline list without further detail. Objective 15 provides for the further development of the headline set of indicators.
PLENARY SESSION – INITIAL REACTIONS AND NEXT STEPS
CHAIR: Catherine Day, Director General, DG Environment, European Commission

PANEL

European Commission

• Nikiforos Sivenas, Director (Directorate F Horizontal Aspects of Rural Development; SAPARD), Directorate-General for Agriculture.
• Armando Astudillo, Head of Unit (Unit A3 Environment and Health, Directorate A Conservation Policy), Directorate-General for Fisheries.
• Marc Debois, Coordinator Environment (Unit B4 Environment and Rural Development, Directorate B Development Policy and Sectoral Issues), Directorate-General for Development.
• Pierre Valette, Director (Directorate I Environment), Directorate-General for Research.

Civil society

• Achim Steiner, Director General IUCN.
• Sylvi Ofstad Samstag, Chair, Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy.

Current and future EU Presidencies

• Chris O’Grady, Director, National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, Ireland.
• Giuseppe Raaphorst, Director, Ministry of the Environment, The Netherlands.
• Esther Bollendorff, Ministry of Environment, Luxembourg.
• Martin Capstick, Head of European Wildlife Division, Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK.
Catherine Day, Director General, DG Environment

Good morning everybody.

I am very pleased to be here with you and have the opportunity of chairing this final plenary session of what has been, I think, a very stimulating and very important conference.

It has been a particular pleasure for us to see the degree of consensus which has emerged in the course of discussions here. As we have heard in the presentations from the working groups there has been a high degree of consensus, with only one or two areas where it was not possible to reach complete agreement. But I think the fact that you have managed to come together and come up with a very strong Message will certainly reinforce the impact and hopefully the take up that it will now have in the different institutions at European level and across national and regional governments right across Europe.

The clarity of the message and the quality of the work that has been done is evident and you are all to be congratulated on that. I think it also shows really the power of bringing different levels and kinds of stakeholders together and showing that it is possible, despite the fact that people come from very different backgrounds and defend very different interests; that it is nonetheless possible to agree on a way forward to achieve the objectives that we all think that very important, in particular meeting the 2010 target. So I think that it has been an excellent conference.

As Nick Hanley said in closing the last session, we’re now already into the ‘post-Malahide era’ and the very important question is, ‘What do we do with the output of the Malahide Conference?’ And that is what this last session is designed to address. It is a very big task in which we all have a role to play. I think the composition of our panel already shows that meeting the 2010 target has to be a combined and cooperative effort. It is not just for the European institutions at EU level, it is not just for the Member States in their national roles, it is not just for civil society. It is only by harnessing everybody’s efforts in working together that we are going to be able to meet the objectives we are setting ourselves.

I’d like to highlight and pick up a number of the cross-cutting themes which came across in the presentation of the final reports from the working groups. Obviously
time and time again the message of integration comes out from the different groups. Biodiversity has to be integrated as a common message right across different sectors and different levels of policy. We certainly got the message about the importance of finance and everybody is right to make that message and it is a very timely reminder as the European Union begins to prepare setting the framework for its Financial Perspectives from 2007 onwards. And as certainly you are all aware there is a lot of work going on right now in the Commission to try to turn the political vision which the Commission put forward in February into more specific proposals for different policies and instruments. So now is exactly the right time for this Message to come forward at European level.

I think also what came out very strongly from the discussions this morning and yesterday is that the internal and external dimensions are two sites of the same coin. We live on one planet so we have got to take global factors into account. Europe has the responsibility in terms of the policy decisions it makes to think about the impact outside of the European Union. I think that message is very well woven into the conclusions here.

Similarly I think it is important that we all continue to put the emphasis on implementing existing commitments as well as adding new ones. We have a lot of work to do just to deliver on past promises and past undertakings. The recommendations - the fruit of your very hard work - map out very well how we can on the one hand implement what we are already committed to, and on the other hand find a way of moving forward.

So as I said the task of the panel now is to ‘take delivery’ of the Message and then to give a very preliminary reaction from different perspectives to the recommendations that have been made.

Just before I give the floor to others I wanted just to say a few words about how we in DG Environment and the Commission will be responding to this message. Obviously a major part of our ongoing work is to emphasise integration, the integration of the environmental dimension into all other European Union policies. And as I said the biodiversity message is a message of integration we will continue to work on. We will certainly work on trying to shape the future finances of the European Union in an environmentally friendly way and in a way which supports biodiversity. We are about to publish a communication on Financing Natura 2000 and
we are also working with our colleagues in the other lead services in the commission to make sure that adequate and appropriate funding for Natura and other environmental objectives is woven into rural development, the structural funds, and the 7th Framework Programme for Research.

It is very important that the Commission makes the right proposal, but it is also very important that all of you here also embrace the Message and argue for it in your own capitals. Member State environment, agriculture and other ministries need to make sure that they take this integrated Message to heart in their internal negotiations, as each Member State develops its position in what will undoubtedly be difficult financial negotiations. And similarly stakeholders need to keep us all under pressure to make sure that we deliver on these objectives.

The work that now is being done on biodiversity indicators is also very important from the environmental perspective, because as you know we would like to see them woven into wider European Union policy, e.g. in the next stages of the Lisbon Strategy. It is very important to have indicators which can clearly explain to Heads of State and Government what is happening and what is not happening in terms of biodiversity so that it can be taken up in wider policy discussions.

It is our intention, since the Commission will be changing at the end of the year, to come forward next year with a Communication on Biodiversity early in the life of the new Commission. We hope this will put a particular emphasis on biodiversity.

This is just a very summary way of telling you how we as DG Environment will take on board a lot of the Message from Malahide and continue to weave it into our ongoing and future environment policy.

The way we have decided to organize this plenary session this morning is, first of all, to have a number of representatives of different DGs in the Commission give you their first reactions to the Message. We will then give the floor to IUCN and to PEBLDS to comment from their particular perspectives. And we will then finish up by asking the current and the following three Presidencies of the European Union to say a few words about how they will take forward the Malahide Message in their respective presidencies. I think that will give a very strong start to taking on board the Message at European level – both from the Commission perspective and from the Council perspective – and at the wider international level. I think this is a very good
way to close this conference by taking delivery of the Malahide Message at both
European and international level.

And so without any further ado, I’d like now to give the floor to my colleague
Nikiforos Sivenas from DG Agriculture in the Commission to make some remarks as
he sees fit on how DG Agriculture is likely to respond to the Message from Malahide.

Thank you very much.
Thanks Catherine.

I come from DG Agriculture and am responsible for rural development. I will cover of course the Message from Malahide Objectives 5 and 6 which deal with agriculture in a broad sense. I mean markets, rural development, natural resources including forests.

Agriculture and forestry represent almost 90% of the land use in the EU. So farmers and foresters are the biggest land users in the EU. That is why agricultural policy is very important for this issue.

I will start with the market part of the objective. Following the reform 2003 we have some key words to bear in mind. The first is ‘decoupling’. This is very important - the decoupling of payments from production. The second is ‘modulation’ which means shifting money from the market pillar to the rural development pillar. And the third is ‘cross-compliance’ which means that farmers in order to get their direct payment need to respect specific statutory standards.

I’d like to stress that we came here after a long period of discussions and reforms and 2003 was the last step in this reforming process which started in 1992. And I must say that during this time, agricultural issues were no longer the subject of agricultural specialists. Farming became a subject, an issue for the whole of society. So I must say that the main elements relating to this objective for the period 2007-2013 are in place. Of course, at the Member States level, we have to put more emphasis especially on implementation of these new concepts.

I will come now to rural development. Rural development will start in 2007-2013 on a new basis. As Catherine has pointed out we are in the process of preparing and finalizing our legislative proposal for rural development for the period 2007-2013. In preparing this, we took into account of course our own experience, the experience of Member States, the reports of the Court of Auditors – sometimes very critical – the opinions of the European Parliament, the opinions of the academics, with a lot of studies and also the results of many conferences.
I must say that the biggest event was a conference which took place in Salzburg in November 2003, where more than 1000 stakeholders of rural development discussed the main elements or guidelines for the new rural development policy. They came up with three specific objectives. The first objective or major orientation is to have a competitive agricultural sector. Competitivity means we need to invest in knowledge, value added products, and quality. The second objective is land management - the way of cultivating land and managing forests; environmentally sustainable agriculture falls within this objective. This objective encompasses areas with natural handicaps, agri-environment measures and forests. The third objective is a living countryside. The objective is to create the necessary conditions in order to attract and maintain population in rural areas. This is a major issue - we cannot continue to have agriculture in rural areas if we do not have a human population, men, women and children, in rural areas. These are the three main objectives and these were the three main conclusions of Salzburg.

There were two other particular points. First, the need to apply rural development policy throughout the enlarged EU, to all European areas. Second, we should privilege a territorial approach contributing to cohesion. Of course rural development contributes to cohesion because in the EU rural areas have a lower GDP per inhabitant than urban areas.

Recently we have had further stakeholder discussions. Last Tuesday in Brussels we had very extensive discussions with representatives of stakeholders in rural development on the basis of a document we are preparing - an ‘extended impact assessment’ on the future rural development policy. I must say that the reactions are positive and I can affirm that future rural development policy will be based on the three Salzburg objectives because we have rather good acceptance of these principles.

Some perhaps more minor points. I made a reference to the report of the Court of Auditors and I have to add also that we had critical comments from the European Parliament, especially from the budget control committee, on Less Favoured Areas. At present Less Favoured Areas represent 56% of agricultural land. They consider that this is too large a part of agricultural land to be considered less favoured. So they invited the Commission to reflect on this and to come with a proposal to restrict in particular that part of LFAs which is defined on the basis socio-economic criteria (we have two major parts: mountains, and areas defined by socio-economic criteria). The second point I would like to make is that for the budget 2007-2013, the suggestion is
very welcome to strengthen the budget. We hope that this will be taken into account by the Members States in the Council although we think that it will be very difficult.

So for the next period we will try to make the best out of what we have and in order to do that we have to focus especially on the second objective which is the land management, on the outcome and input of the measures we finance. It is very important to focus and to target the measures to resolve specific environmental problems of the regions. This is the best way of course to justify that we spend big amounts of money – by producing positive effects on the environment. Monitoring and evaluation is important in this respect. We plan to finance a study on how to integrate indicators produced in various sectors into rural development policy.

Natura 2000 is recognized as a very important issue for rural development. We think that Natura 2000 can become a motor of development for some regions. It is not a handicap or it should not be considered as a handicap. It can be considered a starting point for rural development. We need to be in a position to measure the effort we are going to make on Natura 2000.

Forests are eligible for the rural development programmes and we are going to apply - we are reflecting on this – a kind of parallelism between agriculture and forestry. We want to integrate Natura 2000 into the forest support. Moreover, we want to reflect on ways for applying a kind of environmental scheme for forests – especially when there are specific requirements for the forest owners regarding management of forests. We want sustainable management of forests

Thank you.

Chairwoman: Thank you very much Nikiforos for that very encouraging preliminary indication. Next I give the floor to Mr Armando Astudillo who comes from the Commission’s Directorate-General for Fisheries.
Armando Astudillo, Head of Unit (Unit A3 Environment and Health, Directorate A Conservation Policy), DG Fisheries

Thank you very much.

To begin with, I chaired the fisheries working group and I realized that we had a lot of stakeholders represented there and they took a very full part in the debate. I would like to thank all involved and in particular the fisheries sector for having ensured a full representation, more representation than we often had in the past. And I think that shows how important this is and the concern they have in this area. They co-operated with us in a very constructive way and I think they not only showed their interest in this subject but also their responsible engagement in it.

We all agreed these targets and objectives. I think from DG Fisheries point of view we can be satisfied with the outcome, how these targets and objectives have been defined. I think this confirms that what we started with the last reform process; that what we’ve done since then has been in line with the needs of biodiversity and sustainability and that we have basically been on the right track. The Objective 7 targets pretty much reflect what DG Fisheries had in the pipeline anyway, though with a different emphasis and priority for biodiversity preservation – so it is a way of focusing out minds even further.

In my view, the first and last of the targets are the biggest ones. First of all we are talking about structural funds being financed in a way to better sustain biodiversity and better protect the environment. That seems to be a very important message to me and I will pass on that emphasis. Starting tomorrow there will be another conference in Donegal also bringing together many stakeholders here in Ireland to discuss the future of fisheries funding from 2007 onwards. I will pass a message directly from here onwards to those stakeholders.

The last target relates to those Regional Advisory Councils. On Monday the Fisheries Council agreed to a Regulation which sets out the rules under which these Councils will be set up. So things may speed up pretty soon and the idea of having all this up and running by 2005 is something we can be quite optimistic about. It is very important to have a bottom-up approach and this is an example of it. The stakeholders are basically the people who are going to drive this forward.
Now the other targets. These are mostly things that are in the pipeline anyway and some of them are actually proceeding apace. I would like to highlight target 7.3 regarding technical measures. Following up on Dundalk, DG Fisheries have prepared a Communication which will be sent to Council, I hope before the end of this presidency, so that the Irish Presidency can begin discussing this in June. That Communication will explain what further steps need to be taken to beef up the technical measures regulation and to give environmentally friendly fishing techniques a boost.

There are number of other targets that are a little bit outside our direct remit or outside our direct control in DG Fisheries but we will do everything we can do on our behalf. For instance, target 7.5 regarding Natura 2000. Obviously the Member States drive Natura 2000 and so of course our input will depend on what they allow us to do. We, however, will do everything we can to make fisheries-related proposals that are best adapted to the Natura 2000 areas. Recently the Commission proposed banning trawling off North-West Scotland to protect deep-sea coral-beds. That is an example of what we can do. But basically this target will have to be driven by Member States requests.

Then target 7.6 regarding restoration programmes for diadromous species - salmon and related species, eels, etc. This is a process that has begun but a great deal still needs to be done because there are many other authorities that have to play a role. This is not something which the Commission has exclusive powers over. This could be quite complicated. I cannot guarantee how successful we are going to be but again I can promise that we will do all we can.

Another target a little out of our control is 7.7 regarding application of impact assessment to new fishing activities. Again, all we can do is to require, facilitate and promote this uptake but it will really depend on the fishing sector, in their initiatives when they decide to move into a new area of activity or new type of fish-farming, or when a new type of plant is opened. They and their Member States have to do the actual impact assessment.

There are a couple of new targets that are worth mentioning. One is very ambitious: target 7.9. We are talking here about designing a whole strategic plan and an ecosystem based approach to fisheries management. That is very ambitious. We will put a lot of effort into this and I think there is some work already being carried out
which we start from – I refer to what’s been going on under the aegis of the FAO with a lot of conferences and other programmes, all of which provide input for us. The Marine Strategy which is being developed by DG Environment with co-operation from many other departments is also something that will help us in this process.

So, I would like to promise you our full commitment to this. We will be dealing with this very seriously and I hope that we will be able to move these things forward in the way indicated.

Thank you.

Chairwoman: Thank you very much Mr Astudillo. Next we move to Mr Marc Debois from the Commission’s Development DG.
Marc Debois, Coordinator Environment (Unit B4 Environment and Rural Development, Directorate B Development Policy and Sectoral Issues), DG Development

Thank you very much.

First of all I would like to say that DG Development welcomes the Malahide Message. It will give the necessary push to increase awareness of biodiversity and perhaps this additional push is a little bit more needed in the development cooperation context, as biodiversity, as with other environmental issues, faces difficulties to be integrated in the development co-operation programmes. There are various reasons for this. I believe that the objectives and targets of this Malahide Message address them and should help in making significant progress in the coming years.

From a development perspective and the discussions in the group have confirmed this, the key way to address biodiversity issues in development co-operation remains mainstreaming. That is the integration of biodiversity issues into the global co-operation context. To achieve this mainstreaming, we need two things: we need political commitment (and this conference is part of this political commitment) and also capacities. These are human capacities and technical capacities – training, guidelines, analysis of biodiversity issues on the ground, impact assessments. Perhaps we do not need so much additional cash from what has been agreed already in the Monetrey agreement.

On capacity, progress is being made in DG Development and other Commission Services. Training for desk officers, for delegations and also for partner countries are indeed very important. An environmental helpdesk will be in place later this year. Also currently the country strategy papers for the ACP countries are under review. This is called the mid-term review, and we note already some progress in the integration of environmental issues in these mid-term review. This should be the basis for further progress in the next round of programming which will start in 2006.

Another initiative which is in preparation are the new guidelines for the environment and tropical forest budget line which are prepared and which in the current draft give ample space for biodiversity issues to be funded. So we are confident that the new identified targets of today in relation to mainstreaming are achievable as long as an appropriate level of political commitment remains or is even increased, not only in the EU but also in developing countries.
May be this is one of the additional difficulties we face in integrating biodiversity in development policy – that we have external partners who have a key role to play. Political commitment in developing countries can be at best achieved through political dialogue and perhaps by demonstrating linkages between sustainable use of biological resources, livelihoods, poverty reduction and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. DG Development has probably a particular role in enhancing this dialogue with ACP countries.

I’d like to mention another recent initiative which has been prepared by DG Development. It is the FLEGT initiative which will lead to concrete progress in dealing with illegal logging.

Now I would like to come to issues outside mainstreaming. We agreed in the Malahide Message that besides mainstreaming and besides funding to development co-operation programmes, there is a need for dedicated funding to biodiversity. So we agree with the target and we will have to work with colleagues in other DGs to try to achieve this in negotiating with the Parliament and the Member States in the coming months.

Finally, I would like to underline two issues. The first is related to governance and in particular the need for synergy between multilateral environmental agreements – on biodiversity, desertification, climate change, etc. This is a problem we face when we talk to colleagues or to partner countries. We cannot ask first that they mainstream climate change, and then that they mainstream biodiversity, etc. We have to try to really make a common programme on these issues. The second issue is the importance of an appropriate regime for sharing benefits generated from genetic resources. This is important if we want to keep our partners in developing countries on board in the run towards achieving our 2010 objective. They have to be politically engaged but also have to get some benefit from their resources. In this context the proposed objective and targets concerning benefit sharing are welcomed.

So, we welcome the Malahide Message, we welcome the objectives and the targets. Some of them are very ambitious and challenging but DG Development is prepared to do its best to fulfil them.

Thank you.
Chairwoman: Thank you very much Mr Debois. The last speaker from the Commission is Mr. Pierre Valette from DG Research and Technological Development.
Thank you Madame Chair.

Well, Mrs Day said this is a good moment to talk about the future. Well yes, because discussions on the Financial Perspectives are a good moment for such discussions. As far as research is concerned it naturally has its role to play in the context of the Financial Perspectives, but I will single out three areas which will be important:

- Firstly, the European Research Area.

- Second, the research agenda itself, which is probably of most interest for you. The 6th Framework Programme (FP6) is not completed – we are in midstream at present. And then there are the preparations for the 7th Framework Programme (FP7) which is of course one of the issues being discussed in connection with the Financial Perspectives.

- Third, the links between research and environmental policy in general and biodiversity in particular.

**European Research Area**

First then, what kind of progress is being made in the European Research Area? It has been said that biodiversity research is something which is not very well established in Members States. In the research community at university level it is not very well structured in terms of objectives - it is all a bit confused. One of the roles of the European Research Area, if not its main role, is to structure and to co-ordinate national and Community research to make it more consistent and coherent. With the help of Member States - and I stress that the Commission has not done this by itself - an instrument has been created for this purpose, and we have heard about it at this Conference; the European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy. The EPBRS identifies research needs and priorities, taking into account national priorities and taking into account the Community Biodiversity Strategy. You can see the advantages of such an instrument for the European Research Area. The Irish Presidency has been particularly helpful in promoting EPBRS by organizing the
conference in Killarney and the results of this have fed into this conference. This is all encouraging and certainly shows a consistent interest in this research agenda.

The Research Agenda

Reports are now coming in from those projects implemented under FP5 and we can now think about how best to apply these research findings in taking forward the EC Biodiversity Strategy. Indeed, we have been talking with our colleagues in DG Environment about how we can make the best use of these results.

Regarding FP6, we are midstream. We had two calls for tender and biodiversity was well served. About €50 million will be spent on biodiversity projects - on new instruments, networks of excellence, integrated projects, targeted projects - so funding is available. We will have two further calls for proposals – in June 2004 and in 2005. I cannot say what will actually be involved - you know probably more than I do. But there are two pillars here. One concerns the effects of biodiversity change on the functioning of ecosystems. The other concerns the interface between biodiversity and social economic sciences; we do realize that this is part of the problem, and there is a great deal to be done.

Regarding FP7 there are some encouraging signs for research in the discussions on the Financial Perspectives. We are hoping to have a first Communication soon which will describe, we hope, what might be the shape of FP7. I can perhaps reveal some of the ideas contained in this first Communication and which have already been revealed by our Commissioner, Mr Busquin.

There will be six main research areas. That is new - so far, we only had three. Those three will continue but there will be three more. First, the existing three areas. Well, we have collaborative research. Then there is the area concerning human resources for research - mobility, scholarships, grants; that will be strengthened. And then there is the co-ordination of research activities. For example, under FP6, we have financed ERA-Net, which has been quite successful in bringing together national and regional programmes and it is going to be continued and amplified. And there is Article 69 which concerns co-ordinating national research. We hope that this is going to be strengthened under FP7. Perhaps we can strengthen efforts here concerning biodiversity.
Now the three new research areas. The first is technological platforms; these will address the needs of stakeholders and the market and involve making use of new technologies. The second is infrastructure; this includes support to national and EU data infrastructures. There is quite a lot of scope there I imagine for biodiversity. The third – and completely new area – is fundamental research. And under the Irish Presidency this point has been clarified by setting up the famous European Research Council.

Thematic priorities have not been yet identified; we are still building the framework. But one could imagine that the environment will have to be among the thematic priorities. Why? Because it is one of the main public goods that must be funded by Community money. And if we talk about the environment we cannot ignore biodiversity. So, biodiversity research will be supported under FP7.

Indeed, we can now begin to consider under which of the six research areas biodiversity might be addressed. I suggest it is not just under collaborative research, but might also be under fundamental research, it might also be under research infrastructures. So there are various opportunities under the FP7 which I think offer themselves to you, and it is time to think about what might be achieved.

The link between research and other policies

Here again the Irish Presidency have organized an important event, the ‘Bridging the Gap’ conference in April in Dublin, which was a roaring success because it emphasized what was working and what was not working very well concerning the results of the research and its application in environmental policy. Success stories were emphasized and there have been quite a few of them. There is also great importance given to the European Environmental Agency which is going to be very much part of this discussion about policies and the effect of research on policies.

Another point concerning FP7 is that the Lisbon Strategy says that action to improve competitiveness and policies must be based on knowledge. So by design, FP7 must give importance to the link between research and policy. This is a duty imposed upon it.

Mrs. Day of course is at the cutting edge of all this. Environmental policy and research policy will, we hope, be a pioneer for other areas. We have to work together with our environmental colleagues to show what we can achieve in operational
terms. Biodiversity is certainly a candidate for being a success story – a very probable one. Research on biodiversity and biodiversity policy are obviously closely linked through the EPBRS and this will be a good project for us to develop in future.

Thank you Madam Chair.

Chairwoman: Thank you very much Mr Valette. I think that it is very important that we have already five Directorate Generals from the Commission here today to take delivery of the Malahide Message. I think that you can hear from what my different colleagues have said that we are very conscious both of the need to strengthen the emphasis on biodiversity in each of the sectoral policies, but also and just as importantly of the importance of working together across the different policies, both in terms of shaping future policy and in terms of shaping the future financing of the Union. So I would like to thank my colleagues for their very positive reactions to the Malahide Message and to assure everybody that when we get back to Brussels we will not only continue to work among ourselves but also rope in the other DGs who were not here today but who will certainly be receiving the Malahide Message. Now as I said we are going to go international and the next speaker is going to be Mr Achim Steiner, Director-General of the IUCN.
Achim Steiner, Director-General, IUCN

Thank you very much, and thank you for the opportunity to be able to address you here this morning to provide some observations on the Message from Malahide.

I would like to begin by saying that it is quite an extraordinary document that we have here before us. Without doubt, everybody in this room sees things that should have been in here that are not, things that should have been formulated in a different way. But I think one has to reflect for a moment: if you take the multi-stakeholder nature of this process that you have initiated; and the fact that you have produced a document in which you capture, in 18 objectives, some of the major areas that relate to biodiversity; and have actually provided them with targets and indicators and even a timeline; and have come out with, essentially, a consensus document that is not simply at the meta-level of talking about biodiversity; then this really is quite an extraordinary document. I think one should take a moment to reflect on this partly because it also demonstrates that Europe at the moment really is the one region in the world where, through multi-stakeholder processes, a consensus on biodiversity is emerging that really is amongst the most progressive that we have in international policy making. And for that reason alone I think the Message from Malahide is important, not only in terms of the domestic political agenda of the EU, but in fact in terms of adding credibility to the international debate about trying to meet the targets that were agreed at Johannesburg, that we have in the Millennium Development Goals, that we agreed in international conventions and conferences of the parties. Because one of the dilemmas we face in global environmental work is that the credibility of the North in actually following up on its commitments has suffered severely since Rio. So I, on behalf of IUCN, would very much like to give a very positive message in principle on the Message of Malahide. I do not think there is any equal document at the moment that you would find in any other part of the world involving multiple countries, multiple stakeholders and such very difficult issues.

Having said that I think it is very important to remind ourselves that, in some ways, the Message does not quite yet live up to expectations in terms of depth. When we talk about biodiversity in Europe, and sustaining life and sustaining livelihoods, we have to talk about three dimensions; we have to talk about Europe the Union, Europe beyond the Union, and Europe and the rest of the world. And I think it is one of the challenges that Europe will face as a community over the next few years - to try to
respond to these three challenges. Because talk about biodiversity and the EU has to address all three, it cannot only be a domestic political agenda. And I think from that point of view there are a number of things that, over the process of consultations and further development, we would certainly hope can be captured more effectively and in particular lead to greater commitments - in terms of actions that address, not only the mechanisms for management and promotion of biodiversity concerns within the EU, but ultimately the footprint of the EU in its many forms as it exists today, because that is part of biodiversity and the EU.

My third point is about implementation. We all know that these kinds of products are not yet in themselves results in terms of political, financial and national implementation. I think particularly from the next Presidencies it will be interesting to hear how they can see these objectives being translated into explicit, endorsed political commitments and targets. Because without that, the distance between what is happening on the ground and the kind of multi-stakeholder consensus that we create - in a community of essentially enlightened operators - will become larger and there is no question, that particularly for the biodiversity agenda over the last five years, that gap had grown. It is sad, it is frustrating, but the fact of the matter is that biodiversity today as an international agenda item has lost ground in some respects compared to other agendas and it is continuing to lose ground. This is despite some of the breakthroughs that we have made at meetings such as the CBD meeting in Kuala Lumpur. But remember, that is a gathering of those who are actually advocating change on biodiversity issues, is not yet the rest of society. I think one of the crucial indicators or litmus tests will ultimately be to what extent the Message from Malahide can really live up to making the linkages. Here I would like to pick out three in particular - and it is I think a very a good sign that we have at least two DGs here who are crucial to that:

- The first is agriculture. Unless the Message from Malahide has some kind of impact on the Common Agricultural Policy and the Common Agricultural Policy becomes an investor in the kinds of objectives that we outline here, I think we are not going to see very much progress. And there is still a great deal of scepticism in Europe about the extent to which the agricultural economy of Europe is really beginning to invest, willing to invest, in these kinds of objectives that we have outlined here.
The second is trade, and in some ways I think the Message from Malahide reflects that; trade is a remarkably under-developed set of objectives and indicators here. And yet trade is probably the most fundamental nexus along which the European Union and the rest of the world will determine the fate of biodiversity on our planet. I think it is critical that trade in the EU and trade in the international context become a more explicit part of trying to address biodiversity issues within EU policy both domestically and internationally. And we should not be fooled by the fact that as oil prices go up, everybody starts talking about countries like China being the great Hoovers of natural resources on this planet. Europe is a very significant factor in the biodiversity footprint on our planet today and trade is in fact the vehicle through which this takes place. If we cannot address this more explicitly and make that link, then the Message from Malahide will essentially remain a domestic message in the EU.

The third is development co-operation. You mentioned earlier on again the efforts to mainstream this Message. I have to tell you very honestly that, from IUCN’s point of view, the success of the European Commission in trying to mainstream biodiversity in the development co-operation work of the Union remain as yet to be fulfilled. In fact I would say we have serious concerns about the current state in which that is occurring. And I think it is crucial that if we talk about biodiversity and the EU in a global context, and a pan-European context for that matter, it is critical that we do not stop at a level of putting some resources into direct biodiversity investments, and essentially allow the entire remainder of the development co-operation portfolio to proceed as if major changes are not required in the way it deals with those issues.

My fourth point is regarding financial resources. I think unless we have a more significant commitment of financial resources - and get over this inhibition that any investment in biodiversity is essentially a tax on economic development and not an investment in the future use of that natural resource base - many of these objectives will simply not move beyond where they are today, which is, aspirational (and we have to remember that).

Finally monitoring. Here I refer to the research agenda as much as the public awareness agenda. Monitoring is a crucial part of providing political will. The
strange thing is that everybody in our society calls for political will - the politicians, the bureaucrats, the NGOs and the private sector. Where does political will come from? It essentially comes from, first, a society understanding the implications of continuing along the course of actions that is now on and, second, having a sense that something can be done about it. That is why I believe the launch of initiatives such as Countdown 2010 two days ago is a critical part of trying to throw a spotlight on these objectives. Unless we manage to make biodiversity a concern that the mainstream of European society actually takes on, we will not succeed in getting buy-in from that mainstream. I would like to thank particularly the Presidency of Ireland, but also DG Environment, for having made this Countdown idea a part of the process of bringing biodiversity and the EU more into the mainstream of development choices within the European context. Without this kind of initiative, we will continue to meet in these rooms convinced about what needs to be done, but equally aware of the fact that we are actually not going to make much progress unless we manage to capture public attention. And I hope that the following Presidencies will take advantage of this vehicle of the Countdown 2010 as a companion to trying to bring biodiversity into the mainstream of European public attention. From there derives also the political will to realize what is really an inspiring and progressive document - the Message from Malahide.

Thank you very much.

Chairwoman: Thank you very much Achim. You obviously struck a cord with the audience there. I would like now to give the floor to Sylvie Ofstad Samstag from PEBLDS, please.
Sylvie Ofstad, Chair, Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy

Thank you very much.

I first want to thank the Irish Presidency for inviting me. Through being the chair of PEBLDS I represent another thirty countries in Europe. I also want to say that we are all under the same CBD umbrella when it comes to biodiversity which PEBLDS is very much aware of. We want to develop PEBLDS as a regional forum for implementing the CBD COP decisions and we have, through three different conferences - first in RIGA, then in Budapest and now lately in Madrid - tried to follow up on that. And I think that this pan-European region with the EU as one of the main players can actually fulfil and do something about all the manifold decisions of the COP.

Allow me also to say that I am particularly pleased with this exercise that I’ve been a part of. It is wonderful to see that the EU is actually approaching the stakeholders within agriculture, fisheries, development, etc., in the way they’ve done in this Conference. It gives Europe I think a great hope for reaching the very important goals – the targets from Johannesburg, the targets from Gothenburg and not least the targets from Kiev.

PEBLDS is actually mandating its work on the Kiev resolution which has also been endorsed by the EU. The Ministerial Conference in May last year committed the entire Pan-European region to halting the loss of biodiversity by the year 2010. And the Kiev conference also adopted a groundbreaking environmental strategy for the countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia.

The Kiev resolution and the environmental strategy provide excellent opportunities for the European Union to reach out to Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia region and assist them in reaching the 2010 target and meeting their obligation to implement the CBD. So I would urge the EU through the development programme to look into that matter, how they can actually help the countries in the so called ECA-countries to fulfil their own strategies. They have their own biodiversity strategies as part of their environmental strategies. Developing countries are not only countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America - you also find them in the far eastern parts of Europe and I think that is very important for you to be aware of and to discuss in your next conferences. And that is also in line with the aims, the
objectives and terms of references within CBD. So that is my challenge to you from the PEBLDS.

You may also recall that Commissioner Wallström in the Madrid conference on biodiversity has said that she wanted to co-operate with PEBLDS. I hope that the Commission will fulfil that promise because PEBLDS is of course open to work with the EU. We have now 25 EU countries within PEBLDS and I think that will be a major EU block which will strongly colour the decisions that we are taking. We have made now, in connection with the Kiev resolution, seven action plans that we have to follow up. I must say that they can be very compatible with what we have been doing here today, except for some few issues, and we are trying to focus the action plans in a way that we can go hand-in-hand with other action plans in Europe.

I am extremely pleased with the launch of the Countdown 2010 here in Malahide and I will remind you that this programme will also be a major part of the PEBLDS incentives in order to reach the Kiev target. And I wish to challenge IUCN to go together with PEBLDS to have another launch in the Caucasus area so that we can join forces there within the Countdown 2010 and we should also then have EU participating in that launch.

Please allow me also to suggest that the preamble of the paper should give recognition to the ongoing relevant Pan-European or regional processes such as the PEBLDS and the Ministerial Conference for the Protection of Forests in Europe, and call for continued support and collaboration with them as all European Union Member States are participating and contributing to these processes.

Thank you.

Chairwoman: Thank you very much for that contribution. And now we come to four people who carry a big responsibility in terms of taking forward the Message from Malahide: the current and the next three Presidencies of the European Union. I’m going to start by giving the floor to Chris O’Grady. Chris there is one month to go! What are you going to do in the one month that is left to the Irish Presidency?
Thank you Chair. I hope to be able to clarify that very soon.

Just very briefly to put our work into context: When we in Ireland and the Irish Presidency started planning for the biodiversity element of our Presidency in discussion with the Council and the Commission, we had two broad tasks to achieve. One was to prepare for the Conference of the Party of the CBD and to do so in close co-operation with wonderful support initially from the Presidency of Italy. That part of the work has been completed. The second part of our work was to see how we might give some value-added to the process of the audit and the review of the EC Biodiversity Strategy, mindful of the fact that the EU target for 2010 is far more ambitious than the global target of the CBD. In that context we were grateful to get the approval of the Commission firstly to move the Conference from Brussels to here in Ireland, because we felt that we could bring a new political dimension to the audit and review process and we hoped that could lead to a renewed phase of implementation. We indicated to the Commission that our intention would be, subject to the outcome of Malahide, to report to the Council; and that report would be in a passive or an active way. On the one hand we had the option of just making a report for the Council of what took place here; and on the other we could bring some qualitative analysis by way of Council Conclusions.

So what have we seen here in Malahide at the moment? We had 228 people registered and let’s say at least another 30 that did not register because they came late - that, by any standards, is a very rich cross section of Europe. We had 22 of the 25 Member States represented here officially. We have had a rich vein of stakeholders right across the European landscape, the new EU25 Member States landscape. So by any standards we could be confident that we have a forum here whose deliberations would carry some considerable weight if indeed some consensus could be achieved. What we have now, as I understand it, is a broadly consensual analysis in the Malahide Message. We accept that not every line can be accepted by everybody but it is broadly conceptual by any standards. It carries considerable weight by virtue of the participation of this conference. It has identified 18 objectives with related targets which are clear and focused. Critically it addresses this not just to the European Commission but to the Member States themselves and to all the stakeholders in our
society - all of who must come together if we are to meet the challenge and pass on the baton to future generations.

We also should place some emphasis on the fact that this Malahide Message endorses these headline indicators, which I think is something quite considerably important, given the work of the working group on indicators which was able to come with some very good conclusions. I also wish to note that it endorses the scientific priorities which came from the Killarney Conference which just concluded last Monday. We have scientific priorities and indicators and it seems to me that we can now, in terms of moving forward, as Presidency consider going in an active rather than in a passive way to the Council on the 28th of June.

Our intention would be to suggest to the Council in Council Conclusions, which only can be adopted if you the Member States accept them, that: the outcome of the conference was worthwhile by any standards; that the broad stakeholder involvement suggest considerable weight to the analysis; that the Council should take note of the Malahide Message as being an important stepping stone to come to the political phase of the Community’s review of its Biodiversity Strategy; and that it should call upon the European Commission to use the Malahide Message as a useful and very important input to its next phase, which is meeting its obligation to draft a Communication to Council and Parliament which, as I understand, will essentially involve a new five-year prioritization to achieve the 2010 target in the last five years that remain for us.

Additional things I think we would like to see in the Council Conclusions: some reference to the endorsement by Malahide of the headline indicators; some reference to the scientific priorities; but also we must consider the fact that the next few months are going to be critical for the whole debate of biodiversity and the whole debate of funding of Europe as Member States decide on the new funding window for the years 2007 until 2013. Within that debate, we have the discussion under the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development. So if we are really in earnest about mainstream biodiversity concerns it seems to me that we have a very short window of opportunity to seek to do that.

From our perspective we would have two messages about Member States and stakeholders.
On the one hand we will come to the Working Group on the Environment next Tuesday week on the 8th of June with draft Council Conclusions. This Working Group is a different animal to the Working Party on International Environmental Issues (through which we have worked almost exclusively up to now) because there are Permanent Representative people at the table who have a whole plethora of responsibilities and cannot be expected to understand the extent and the depth of feeling that this forum has articulated in the Malahide Message. So we would ask you, colleagues, to use the Malahide Message to lobby your ministries, and especially to sensitize your Permanent Representations, to the importance of this Message, and to help us next Tuesday week to obtain Council Conclusions that will have some direction and some depth to enable and empower the European Commission to move to the last phase of the audit and the review, which is the elaboration of a Commission Communication.

But the Malahide Message as I said to you, colleagues, addresses all the players in this whole debate including not just the Commission and the Community institutions but also the Member States and the stakeholders. And it seems to me that if you look at the opportunity in the next 10-12 weeks as the Community decides about this next 7 years funding window, I think it really behoves us all to go home with the Malahide Message and to lobby to drive home to our policy makers in our respective countries that these considerations in this Malahide Message which are very clear, very focused should be used by them to ensure that in this funding window there is specific guaranteed funding for biodiversity-related considerations.

So Madam Chair, to conclude. I was asked in the Working Party on International Environmental Affairs last Tuesday week, ‘What are you going to do after Malahide?’ I said I hadn’t a clue, because we genuinely did not know what would emanate from this forum. We are now very heartened by the fact that we have a broadly consensual document with very heartening initial responses from some of the key players in the European Commission - I think we should record that fact here as well. So we will proceed with Council Conclusions, we ask for your help to try to brief your Permanent Representatives for the Working Group meeting on 8th June. We will then go to COREPER and to the June Council with two sets of Conclusions. First, Conclusions related to the outcome of the COP and the MOP in Kuala Lumpur. We are anxious as Presidency to ensure that the hard work that was done in Kuala Lumpur is not left behind in Kuala Lumpur. Those texts have been approved now by the Working Party on International Environment Affairs with a general scrutiny.
reservation which has probably been lifted but we can check that with the Council. Second, Conclusions on the internal EU dimension drawing from the analysis that you have very kindly helped us with in your deliberations over the last few days. So I think that is clear Madam Chair.

Thank you.

Chairwoman: Thank you very much Chris. You may not have had a clue last week but you certainly have a very clear focused view of where we should go from here. So thank you very much for that very practical advice on how we can immediately take forward the Malahide Message. Now at the end of June the baton passes to the Dutch Presidency. So I would like to give the floor to Giuseppe Raaphorst from the Department of Nature in the Dutch Agriculture Ministry.
Thank you Madam Chair.

I would like to congratulate the Irish Presidency for this conference. I am especially impressed by the homogenous views I have heard – but am also glad that there are still some open ends on which we can work further.

It is a very strong Message from Malahide - concrete and concise in its formulation - and should give teeth to the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans. As you have heard from Chris O’Grady, the Malahide Message will be brought to the Environment Council. The Netherlands considers it very important that sectors internalise the concepts contained in these objectives and targets within their policies – and within their production methods. The Netherlands Presidency intends to bring these objectives and targets to the Agriculture and Fisheries Council. These sectors should be our partners and we must assist them in bridging the gap. Action plans should belong not only to the public sector - they should also be taken up by the private sector and we hope we can find ways to further bridge the gap through discussion with these sectors.

I am very happy with the Countdown 2010 initiative which will help us in this. It is a powerful communication instrument and the challenge is to make it a constructive process. We cannot reach everything by 2010, so it is important to concentrate on themes which have potential to deliver results in the next 6 years - because 2010 is coming fast.

I come briefly to what The Netherlands considers major priorities in this Malahide Message. First, adaptation of the CAP and the Cohesion Funds to biodiversity. I think the next few years will be very important for that. Second, we consider ecological connectivity a priority. We see this as a proactive approach – not reacting after nature has been destroyed, but acting during planning and development. Third, we see integration into trade as particularly important. The Commission has already mentioned the FLEGT programme. I think this is a very important process and we will try to do all we can to support it in our Presidency.
To wrap up I want to mention two particular events which the Netherlands Presidency considers important in bridging the gap with various sectors. First, the Conference on the 25th anniversary of the Birds Directive which will be held together with the Commission on the 8th - 9th November 2004; we aim to show sectors how to work in conformity with the Directive rather than against it. Second, the 13th Conference of the Parties to CITES. We see CITES as an important tool for the control of trade and the conservation of biodiversity.

I hope we can do as well as the Irish Presidency has done.

**Chairwoman:** Thank you very much Giuseppe. At the beginning of next year we will have the Luxembourg Presidency so I am going to give the floor to Esther Bollendorf.
Future Luxembourg Presidency (Jan-Jun 2005) - Esther Bollendorf, Luxembourg

I want to thank the Irish Presidency for giving a push to this process and for delivering this Malahide Message. Luxembourg wants to support the process towards the 2010 target as well as the initiative of the Countdown.

We are considering holding a conference about indicators during our Presidency. This conference will be a sort of review about what has been launched here.

Thank you.

Chairwoman: Thank you very much. Now we come to Martin Capstick from the UK to tell us what we can look forward to in the UK-Presidency in the second half of 2005.
Thank you.

There is a certain luxury of being the last speaker and the last of the Presidencies although with each passing minute the luxury reduces. As you will expect me to say the main message is obviously that we are still developing the themes and priorities for our Presidency and it is a bit early to give some very firm steers.

I might say though that I think that this conference and the Message that has come out has been particularly helpful and has to my mind three key achievements. It has produced an outcome which is coherent, which is I think is well balanced between the various areas, and as a consequence of that appears integrated. It is therefore a very valuable document which informs our planning.

Integration is a key prize which a number of speakers have mentioned. It is one we feel particularly important domestically coming from a department which brings together environmental concerns - obviously including biodiversity - plus agriculture plus fisheries. I think that is extremely helpful and again will be something that will certainly ensure that we will carry on.

I know that Giuseppe reported that the Dutch Presidency was very keen to take messages to Agricultural and Fisheries Council and obviously we will have ministerial continuity on that. Both in terms of that agenda and in terms of working with the Netherlands and Luxembourg in taking things forward I think we will be very constructive.

I might also add that, picking up some of the other comments that have been made, that indicators and research have traditionally been areas that we have been very keen to contribute and again I think that those are important items.

I have just two final comments. The first one was to notice that was a stakeholder conference and there has not been unanimity on everything but the degree of consensus which has been achieved is extremely constructive and enables us to go back from here with some very positive messages to those with whom we deal. Finally, since I was put up here to say something about the UK-Presidency, by the
time the UK Presidency starts we will be a whole year closer to 2010. I hope we will have noted some positive progress - because not all the targets that we have been looking at over the last two days have been ones that we wait until the UK Presidency before we start making any progress. So it is in your hands and in our hands to move the agenda forward to enable the UK Presidency to reflect that progress.

Thank you.

Chairwoman: Thank you very much Martin and to all the other speakers in this last plenary session. I think we all go away from this meeting buoyed up with the sense of what is possible. In the Message from Malahide we have something which is clear and concise, which is focused, which tells decision makers and policy makers what is expected of them and helps them see how to turn an aspiration and a target into a reality.

So everybody goes away from this meeting encouraged by the fact that, although biodiversity is a very broad subject, it is possible to reach a large degree of consensus on what needs to be done to protect this very valuable and fundamental asset, not only in Europe but right around the world. So, you will go home and I hope be determined to pass this Message around in your circle, to advocate the components of the Message in your particular area of work. Certainly from the panel representing both the European institutions and international bodies, I think you have heard a very strong endorsement and a determination to implement this Message in the years to come to make sure that we do deliver on the 2010 target.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Despite substantial action, biodiversity loss continues at alarming rates. This loss threatens to undermine economic and social progress in Europe and worldwide.
- The European Council has repeatedly recognised that reinforced action is urgently required if the EU is to meet the commitments made to halt the loss of biodiversity in the EU by 2010, and to significantly reduce the rate of loss of biodiversity by 2010.
- This action needs to be carefully directed so that it has the desired effect and so that resources are used as cost-effectively as possible.
- The conference ‘Biodiversity and the EU – Sustaining Life, Sustaining Livelihoods’ was convened by the Irish Presidency 25-27 May 2004 in Malahide, Ireland, to address these concerns.
- The 230 participants were drawn from 22 Member States and represented key stakeholders from the environmental, agriculture, fisheries, business and development communities.
- The conference built on a broad, in-depth, year-long consultative review of progress in the implementation of the EC Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans coordinated by the Commission.
- This ‘Message from Malahide’ comprises an unprecedented level of consensus on priority objectives to meet the 2010 commitments. It provides key targets attached to each objective which clarify where the EU needs to get to by 2010.
- It is now imperative that all key stakeholders respond effectively to this Message.
- At the EU level, the Council should provide the leadership needed to enable the Commission to put the resources and instruments in place and to provide coordination at the EU level.
- Member States have a responsibility to ensure their actions compliment those taken at the EU level, and to ensure effective implementation on the ground within their own territories.
- Civil society also has critical roles to play in mobilising the engagement of the private sector and the general public.
PREAMBLE

1. Content, background, status and organisation of this document

1.1 Content of this document

This Message from Malahide is the output of the stakeholder conference entitled ‘Biodiversity and the EU – Sustaining Life, Sustaining Livelihoods’ held under the Irish Presidency in Malahide, Ireland from 25th to 27th May 2004.

This document presents priority objectives and detailed targets designed to meet the EU commitment to ‘halt the decline of biodiversity by 2010’\(^1\), and to optimise the EU contribution to the global commitment to ‘the achievement by 2010 of a significant reduction in the current [2002] rate of loss of biological diversity.’\(^2\) All targets are to be achieved by 2010 except where otherwise specified. Annex 1 presents a first set of headline biodiversity indicators to monitor progress towards the 2010 commitments. Annex 2 presents a declaration and recommendations on biodiversity research.

1.2 Background

The Malahide conference was organised to finalise a year long consultative process overseen by the European Commission. This process was designed to assess the implementation, effectiveness and appropriateness of the European Community Biodiversity Strategy\(^3\) (ECBS) and its four Biodiversity Action

---


Plans (BAPS) and to identify priorities towards meeting the 2010 commitments.

In the year preceding Malahide, consultation had taken place through five working groups (one for each action plan, and a fifth addressing indicators) under the supervision of the EC’s Biodiversity Expert Group and facilitated by the EC Directorate Generals for Environment, Agriculture, Fisheries and Development. Conference deliberations were informed by the substantial products from these working groups.

The research community was engaged through the European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy (EPBRS) and in particular through the Irish Presidency meeting of the EPBRS entitled ‘Sustaining Livelihoods and Biodiversity – Attaining the 2010 targets in the European Biodiversity Strategy’ held in Killarney from 21st to 24th May 2004. The Killarney meeting adopted a declaration and recommendations on biodiversity research which were subsequently endorsed at Malahide (Annex 2).

Malahide was attended by 230 participants representing a wide range of interests including delegates from 22 Member States, 1 non-Member State (Norway), conservation agencies and non-governmental organisations, and representatives of key economic sectors including agriculture, forestry, fisheries and industry. The objectives and targets were evolved in four broadly-based working groups, each drawing membership from these various interest groups.

While not all participants have given their individual agreement to each objective and target, a remarkably high degree of consensus was achieved on all 18 objectives and 97 targets. One additional target (on fishing capacity) was discussed, but there was no general agreement on its inclusion.

---


A full report of the Conference including a list of participants is in preparation\textsuperscript{47}.

1.3 \textit{Status of this document}

While the content of this document does not have the status of intergovernmental agreement, the depth and breadth of the consultative process which underlies it, the level of expertise engaged, and the remarkable degree of consensus obtained in Malahide lends it considerable weight. This has since been further enhanced by the European Environment Council’s request that the Commission report on progress towards the 2010 commitments taking into account the Message from Malahide\textsuperscript{48}.

1.4 \textit{Organisation of the objectives and targets}

For ease of cross-reference, the objectives and targets in this document are organised according to the sectors and themes of the Biodiversity Strategy, with the addition of one new sector (international trade) and one new theme (international environmental governance).

2. The 2010 targets and existing biodiversity policy

2.1 \textit{EU biodiversity policy}

In 2001, EU Heads of State and Government made a commitment at the EU’s Spring Summit in Gothenburg to ‘halt the decline of biodiversity by 2010’\textsuperscript{49}. In 2002, world leaders agreed at the Sixth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and, subsequently, at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) to ‘the achievement by 2010 of a significant reduction in the current rate of loss of biological diversity.’\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{47} Conference report will be posted when available at: http://www.ue2004.ie/templates/meeting.asp?sNavlocator=5,418,13&list_id=193

\textsuperscript{48} Halting the loss of biodiversity by 2010’ - Council Conclusions adopted 28 June 2004, Luxembourg.


\textsuperscript{50} See footnote 2
The same Gothenburg Council also adopted the EU Sustainable Development Strategy (which contains the headline objective “to protect and restore habitats and natural systems and halt the loss of biodiversity by 2010”) and the Sixth Environmental Action Programme (6th EAP) which indicates priorities for the environmental dimension of the Sustainable Development Strategy. Nature and biodiversity are one of the four priorities of the 6th EAP, and the 6th EAP specifies the full implementation of the EC Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans as a key measure towards meeting the 2010 commitment.

The EC Biodiversity Strategy, adopted in 1998, was developed to meet the EC’s obligations as a Party to the Convention on Biological Diversity. The Strategy provides a comprehensive response to the many requirements of the CBD. The four Biodiversity Action Plans (for the Conservation of Natural Resources, for Agriculture, for Fisheries, and for Economic and Development Co-operation) lay out in detail what actions should be taken to implement the Strategy in specific areas of Community activity.

2.2 Pan-European biodiversity policy

Pan-European biodiversity policy has been developed under the Environment for Europe process and in particular through the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy (PEBLDS)\textsuperscript{51}. In 2003, the 5th Environment for Europe Ministerial Conference agreed the Kyiv Resolution on Biodiversity\textsuperscript{52}, which extended the EU target of halting the loss of biodiversity by 2010 to the pan-European region. Through this Resolution, the Ministers made a commitment to achieve a number of targets in key areas for biodiversity conservation through national efforts and regional co-operation. PEBLDS has adopted action plans for activities to achieve these targets in the pan-European region, with special focus on Eastern Europe, the Balkans, the Caucasus and Central Asia\textsuperscript{53}.

\textsuperscript{51} See PEBLDS website at: http://www.strategyguide.org/

\textsuperscript{52} Available under the title ‘Kyiv Declaration’ on the following web page http://www.strategyguide.org/kyiv.html#form

\textsuperscript{53} Available at: http://www.strategyguide.org/stradocs.html
3. The need for reinforced action

The 2003 Spring Council Conclusions\(^{54}\) (§ 54) note that “despite some progress, the worrying trends [in natural resources degradation] observed when the [Sustainable Development] Strategy was launched have not been reversed, and a new impetus must therefore be given” and “urges the Council to accelerate work towards a more responsible management of natural resources, including action to meet the 2010 targets for biodiversity.”

The Malahide Conference information paper on ‘The State of Biological Diversity in the EU’\(^{55}\) prepared by the EEA indicates that there is continuing loss of biodiversity in the EU. Many reports indicate alarming rates of loss globally. This loss matters; biodiversity has important social, economic, scientific, educational, cultural, recreational, aesthetic and intrinsic values\(^{56}\).

The ECBS requires the Commission to make an assessment of implementation, effectiveness and appropriateness of the ECBS and BAPs and to report to Council and Parliament every three years. The assessment carried out through a consultative review process in the year leading up to the Malahide Conference has found that, while there have been some successes in implementation, there have also been shortfalls. Further, the review has highlighted the need to address next steps with respect to most actions laid down in the BAPs. But perhaps most importantly, the review found that current EU biodiversity policy is missing a key element if we are to meet the 2010 targets, namely, a clear sense of priority which has broad-based agreement among key stakeholders. In a world of competing demands, resources – in terms of political will, public support, human resources and funding – are limited.

\(^{54}\) Presidency Conclusions, Brussels European Council, 20 and 21 March 2003.

\(^{55}\) MALAHAIDE/INF/2 ‘The state of biological diversity in the EU’. European Environment Agency.

\(^{56}\) MALAHAIDE/INF/1 ‘The value of biodiversity: insights from ecology, ethics and economics.’
4. Some overarching considerations

4.1 Financing

A recurrent theme at the Conference, particularly in the context of the ongoing preparation of the EU’s budget for the period 2007-2013, was the need to allocate sufficient financial resources for the implementation of key measures, including in particular the Natura 2000 network, and the further integration of biodiversity into the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), Common Fisheries Policy (CFP), Cohesion Policy, the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development, and EU economic and development co-operation.

4.2 Impacts on third countries

The Conference recognized that the Community responsibilities are not restricted to action within Europe. Europe has a profound impact on biodiversity across the globe and these conclusions reflect acceptance of the need to address these issues. For this reason, provision should be made for the involvement of developing countries and other relevant stakeholders in the follow-up process.

4.3 Ecosystem approach and biodiversity stewardship

The Conference placed particular emphasis on the need to adopt an ecosystem approach. Moreover, integration of biodiversity concerns into the policies and actions in a wide variety of economic sectors represents a critical element of the conclusions. The theme of the Conference, ‘Sustaining Life, Sustaining Livelihoods’, itself recognised the integral relationship between biodiversity protection and the well-being of our society. Implementation of future policies and actions should recognise the fact that much of European biodiversity has its origin in traditional land management practices - it will be critical that future policies support the continuation of this stewardship of our biodiversity by farmers, foresters, landowners, agricultural workers and fishermen.

57 As defined by the Convention on Biological Diversity Decision V/6 available at: http://www.biodiv.org/decisions/default.aspx?m=COP-05&id=7148&lg=0
4.4 Public awareness

The Conference identified the promotion of broader public awareness, understanding and support for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity as a critical overarching issue. There is an urgent need to mobilise public opinion in support of biodiversity. Until the person in the street understands that biodiversity provides for his/her wellbeing and that decisions he/she makes and actions he/she takes impact on biodiversity’s ability to do so, the 2010 targets will simply not be achieved. There is a need for greater public understanding of the economic importance of biodiversity (for example in providing raw materials for manufacturing, medicines, etc and supporting agriculture, forestry and fisheries) as well as its many other values. We also need to change a frequently held perception of the public, businesses and other key stakeholders that halting the loss of biodiversity threatens economic development. We need to get the message across that biodiversity:

- is essential for sustaining human life and well-being;
- is critical in sustaining livelihoods; and
- has a vital role as a provider of natural capital, goods and services underpinning the Lisbon Agenda across all sectors.

In this regard, the Malahide conference welcomed the Countdown 2010 initiative which was inspired by IUCN – The World Conservation Union and launched by a partnership of civil society organisations at the conference.

5. Next steps

The Conference, building on the outputs of the consultative review, considers that the EU needs to re-commit itself to full implementation of the EC Biodiversity Strategy if the Gothenburg and WSSD commitments are to be met. The Conference however recommends that resources should be focused on the priority objectives identified in this document, where action is felt most likely to result in substantial movement towards the 2010 targets. Specific targets are attached to each objective to ensure clarity of what has to be achieved by 2010 (or before that date as appropriate). Additionally, a set of headline biodiversity indicators, consistent with the framework adopted
under the CBD\textsuperscript{58} (Annex 1) are proposed as a basis for monitoring and reporting on progress.

The weakness of implementation to date argues the case for re-enforcement of implementation arrangements. Member States are seen to have a particular responsibility in this respect. Not only do they have to implement their own direct competencies but they are also responsible for the detailed implementation of most Community policies. A concern was expressed at the lack of coherence between the Community’s Strategy and those adopted or under preparation by the Member States.

The Conference addresses its conclusions to the Community institutions, Member States and society at large. It recommends that the new Commission, which takes up its duties in November 2004, should give priority to consideration of how the priorities and targets can be incorporated across the Commission into its future priorities and work programmes.

6. Concluding remarks

The CBD COP6 and the WSSD established a new momentum by giving global political support at the highest level to biodiversity and recognised that it is essential for sustainable development. They set an ambitious target: to \textit{significantly reduce} the current [2002] rate of biodiversity loss by 2010. The EU has made a commitment to \textit{halt} the loss of biodiversity within the EU by 2010. We are at the dawn of a new, enlarged EU, bringing new biodiversity riches to the EU but presenting a yet greater challenge if we are to meet the 2010 target. We have little more than 5 years left to meet this challenge. Setting and delivering priorities is a chance for the EU to take leadership, to signal to the rest of the world that our words have substance, and are not merely pious hopes. As pointed out by Margot Wallstrom, Environment Commissioner, in her speech to Malahide, the stakes are high - the challenge ahead of us is to conserve and use in a sustainable manner the variety of life on earth; our very livelihoods as well as those of our children and our children’s children depend on it.

\textsuperscript{58} Convention on Biological Diversity, Decision VII/30 (Strategic Plan: future evaluation of progress) http://www.biodiv.org/decisions/default.aspx?m=COP-07&id=7767&lg=0
SECTOR 1: CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE USE OF NATURAL RESOURCES
OBJECTIVE 1: To ensure conservation of Europe’s most important wildlife habitats and species within a thriving wider environment.

2010 and earlier targets

1.1 Natura 2000 network completed on land by 2005, marine sites by 2008 and management objectives for all sites agreed and instigated by 2010.

1.2 Natura 2000 contributes to the establishment of effectively managed, comprehensive and ecologically representative networks of protected areas at land and at sea, integrated into a global network.

1.3 Arrangements established which ensure adequate and guaranteed community co-financing for the Natura 2000 network. This should include inter alia the enhancement of Life-Nature funding in the new Financial Instrument for the Environment alongside enhanced funding from the structural and rural development funds. These funds should be accessible to all those who manage Natura 2000 sites. Funds should also promote awareness raising and networking initiatives.

1.4 Appropriate protection status, management and adequate financial support identified and provided to areas of biodiversity importance in parts of the EU not covered by the Habitats and Birds Directives.

1.5 Action plans prepared and implemented to enhance the status of those species under particular threat, with a view to establishing their favourable conservation status.

1.6 Scientific review of the annexes of the Birds and Habitats Directives initiated in 2008 following the next periodic reports of these Directives.

1.7 Article 6 (avoidance of damages to Natura 2000 sites) of the Habitats Directive fully transposed into national legislation and planning policies, and routinely implemented; where development proposals cannot avoid damage to sites, special effort given to the adequate design and implementation of compensation measures.
1.8 Protected areas integrated into broader landscapes and seascapes by applying the ecosystem approach, and where appropriate, developing tools for ecological connectivity, such as ecological corridors.

1.9 Support strengthened for ex situ conservation programmes which are operated in line with best practice.

**OBJECTIVE 2: To ensure that biodiversity concerns are fully recognised in the conception and implementation of community legislation and instruments in both environment and other sectors.**

**2010 targets**

2.1 Integration of biodiversity concerns in the further development and implementation of horizontal environmental legislation and instruments ensured, in particular regarding water, soils, marine, liability, eco-labelling, Environmental Monitoring and Audit Schemes (EMAS), IPP, Precautionary Principle, Environmental Impact Assessment, Strategic Environmental Assessment, Århus, chemicals and GMOs.

2.2 In the conception and development of broader EU policies, assessment of the likely impacts on biodiversity carried out so as to ensure that these policies do not prejudice achievement of the Gothenburg target.

**OBJECTIVE 3: To develop and implement measures for the prevention and control of invasive alien species and alien genotypes.**

**2010 and earlier targets**

3.1 Strategy on IAS adopted by 2005, taking into account the CBD’s guiding principles on IAS, considering potential legal instruments, and identifying priorities for eradication programmes and measures capable of the prevention of further intentional or non-intentional introductions of potential IAS.

3.2 MS encouraged to develop national strategies by 2007 and implement them fully by 2010.
3.3 Adequate funding provided in the 7th Framework Programme and from national sources for research on the extent and scale of IAS and possible solutions to the problems they cause.

3.4 Ratification by MS of the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ship’s Ballast Water and Sediments under the IMO encouraged.

3.5 Early warning system established for the prompt exchange of information between neighbouring countries on the emergence of IAS and cooperation on control measures across national boundaries.

**OBJECTIVE 4: To prevent or minimise the negative impacts on biodiversity and optimise opportunities to benefit biodiversity, in relation to climate change adaptation and mitigation.**

**2010 and earlier targets:**

4.1 Commitments made under the Kyoto Protocol respected, and further ambitious measures agreed in line with the long-term Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) assessments.

4.2 All climate change adaptation and mitigation measures assessed to ensure they have no negative impacts and, wherever possible, provide positive benefits to biodiversity.

4.3 The ecological connectivity of Natura 2000 network supported in order to achieve or maintain favourable conservation status of species and habitats in the face of climate change, including the promotion of cross-border ecological corridors between the EU and neighbouring states.

4.4 Habitats and species most at risk from climate change assessed by 2007, and appropriate management plans subsequently prepared.
SECTOR 2: AGRICULTURE
OBJECTIVE 5: To further integrate biodiversity issues into the Common Agricultural Policy in order that the agricultural sector can fulfil its contribution to the 2010 biodiversity target

2010 and earlier targets

Within the Rural Development context

5.1 The Rural Development Regulation strengthened within the Financial Perspectives 2007-2013 including its funding and in particular those measures including Less Favoured Areas and areas with environmental restrictions and agri-environment that contribute to the delivery of biodiversity.

5.2 High Nature Value areas (including the Natura 2000 network) threatened with loss of biodiversity and abandonment identified, and measures to address those threats provided.

5.3 Habitats and species in other agricultural areas also at risk of biodiversity loss identified and support for their protection provided.

5.4 High-Nature Value areas and traditional farming systems included in Less Favoured Areas and their continued support provided for.

5.5 Rural Development support underpinned by identified Good Farming Practices that provide a basic level of protection for biodiversity.

5.6 Agri-environmental schemes – in addition to their other tasks – specifically targeted to provide positive incentives for biodiversity conservation in the longer-term;

5.7 Extension services and farm advisory system broadened, and biodiversity training for farmers, land owners and farm workers strengthened.

Within the market pillar

5.8 Provisions of the 2003 CAP reform (eg. decoupling, national envelope, Single Farm Payment) implemented in such a way as to benefit biodiversity.
5.9 Cross-compliance effectively implemented in ways that benefit biodiversity, including possible extension of scope following its evaluation in 2007.

**Genetic resources**

5.10 Measures in place to ensure the conservation and availability for use of genetic resources, and in-situ conservation (varieties, breeds and races)\(^9\) promoted.

**Monitoring and evaluation**

5.11 Effectiveness of rural development and key market policy reform measures (single farm payment, cross-compliance, national envelopes etc) for biodiversity monitored and evaluated.

\(^9\) This includes the Community commitment to the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.
SECTOR 3: FORESTRY
OBJECTIVE 6: To conserve and enhance biodiversity through sustainable forest management at national, regional and global levels.

2010 and earlier targets

National and EU level

6.1 Biodiversity considerations fully integrated with economic and social considerations in implementation of sustainable forest management.

6.2 Forest species and habitats listed under the Birds and Habitats Directives in favourable conservation status.

6.3 Adequate financial support secured for the conservation of forest biodiversity both inside and outside Natura 2000 sites by 2007.

6.4 Biodiversity of all ancient and semi-natural woodland of significant importance secured.

6.5 No overall long-term negative impact of afforestation and deforestation on biodiversity in EU from 2004.

Global level

6.6 Wood imported by the EU derived only through sustainable forest management.

6.7 EU imports driving deforestation identified and reduced.

6.8 Bilateral agreements made between the EU and the major timber exporting countries with the aim of supporting forest law enforcement, governance and trade (FLEGT).
SECTOR 4: FISHERIES
OBJECTIVE 7: To further promote conservation and sustainable use of commercial stocks and to continue reduction of adverse impacts of fishing and aquaculture on species and habitats making full use in particular of the CFP instruments.

2010 and earlier targets:

7.1 New Regulation on Structural Funds in the field of fisheries, with an increased allocation of funds for investments aiming at environmentally-friendly management adopted by 2006.

7.2 Recovery plans prepared and implemented as soon as needed for any stocks outside safe biological limits.

7.3 Technical measures, including marine protected areas, effectively implemented to help ensure favourable conservation status of marine habitats and species not commercially exploited, in line with the process initiated at the Dundalk Conference60 including measures aimed at the reduction of unwanted by-catch and of damage to the benthos.

7.4 Community Plans of Action on sharks and seabirds adopted by 2006 with progressive implementation thereafter.

7.5 Fishery protection measures required for Natura 2000 implementation adopted following CFP procedures.

7.6 Restoration programmes for diadromous species (eg. eel, trout, salmon, sturgeon) designed and adopted in collaboration with the appropriate authorities and in close consultation with relevant stakeholders.

7.7 Appropriate environmental impact assessment techniques applied to new aquaculture and new fisheries to identify impacts on biodiversity and these assessments acted on from 2004.

7.8 Funds made available regularly to undertake assessments of the short- and long-term effects on marine ecosystems of principal fishing and aquaculture techniques and practices.

7.9 A strategic plan for making operational the ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management developed and adequately funded as soon as possible.


7.11 Regional Advisory Councils (which will be instrumental for the delivery of biodiversity objectives) established, adequately funded and fully operational by 2005 in order to strengthen stakeholder participation in fisheries management and promote biodiversity awareness.

Footnote to targets:

There was discussion of a potential further target to be worded: ‘Reduction of fishing capacity facilitated where the exploitation rate exceeds the sustainability of the resource.’ There was, however, no agreement on inclusion of such a target.
SECTOR 5: REGIONAL POLICY & SPATIAL PLANNING
OBJECTIVE 8: To ensure that Cohesion policy and spatial planning support conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

2010 and earlier targets

8.1 Substantial proportion (10%) of structural funds guaranteed under Financial Perspectives 2007-2013 for positive measures for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, in particular to enhance ecological connectivity.

8.2 Projects co-financed by structural funds not causing significant negative impact on biodiversity and complying with Community nature and environmental legislation.

8.3 All territorial plans subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive take full account of impacts on biodiversity from July 2004.

8.4 Spatial plans have ensured the maintenance and enhancement of the ecological functioning of landscapes and of the coherence of the Natura 2000 network.

8.5 An Environment Objective established within the Structural Funds to address nature conservation issues in regions of high biodiversity value implemented through the new Regulation for 2007-2013.
SECTOR 6: ENERGY & TRANSPORT, CONSTRUCTION & EX extrative industries
**OBJECTIVE 9:** To prevent, minimise and mitigate negative impacts on biodiversity of construction, infrastructure and extractive industries, or related to the use of infrastructure.

**2010 and earlier targets**

9.1 All environmental assessments of transport, energy, urban, industrial and extractive projects under the EIA Directive and/or Art. 6 of the Habitats Directive, take full account of impacts on biodiversity in the authorisation procedure, whether or not the project receives EU financing.

9.2 All environmental assessments of transport, energy, urban and industrial and extractive programmes and plans under the SEA Directive take full account of impacts on biodiversity from July 2004.

9.3 All new Trans-European Networks (TENs) provide for environmental assessment, taking full account of biodiversity impacts.

9.4 All EU pollution and accident prevention legislation and post-Prestige measures fully implemented to schedule.
SECTOR 7: TOURISM
OBJECTIVE 10: To make all tourism sustainable.

2010 targets

10.1 All Natura 2000 management arrangements ensure that recreation and educational use of the site is sustainable.

10.2 CBD guidelines on sustainable tourism promoted, adopted and implemented as appropriate by key stakeholders.
OBJECTIVE 11: To ensure an improved and measurable contribution of EU economic and development cooperation to achieving the global target ‘to significantly reduce the current [2002] rate of biodiversity loss by 2010’ in support of the Millennium Development Goals.

2010 and earlier targets

11.1 EU Regional and Country Strategy Papers and Sectoral Strategy Papers have integrated implementation of the CBD by 2007.

11.2 Partner countries have integrated implementation of the CBD in national development strategies, including Poverty Reduction Strategies by 2007.

11.3 EC and Member States funding for supporting implementation in partner countries of the CBD, its work programmes and its Biosafety Protocol, significantly increased by 2007.

11.4 Adequate dedicated EU funding secured to support international implementation of the CBD where these actions fall outside development cooperation.

11.5 All programmes and projects funded by the EU in partner countries have ex ante strategic environmental assessments and environmental impact assessment, and actions are taken to prevent and mitigate negative impacts on biodiversity in a timely manner.

11.6 Adequate long term capacity has been established in EU delegations and development cooperation agencies to sustainably achieve the above targets by 2006.

11.7 EC and Member States cooperate and coordinate their efforts to support the above targets, with corresponding reporting mechanisms by 2006.

11.8 Effective mechanisms are in place to enable NGOs and local communities to access EU funding and to increase synergies between governments, NGOs and the private sector.

The term “Partner countries” includes Overseas Territories
SECTOR 9: INTERNATIONAL TRADE
OBJECTIVE 12: To contribute to the global 2010 target by promoting ecologically sustainable international trade.

2010 targets

12.1 Major negative impacts of trade on third countries’ and EU’s biodiversity identified, and mechanisms proposed and adopted and action taken to significantly reduce them.

12.2 All trade agreements between the EU and third countries avoid or at least mitigate negative effects on biodiversity.

12.3 All trade in CITES species effectively controlled to ensure that it is not detrimental to their conservation and sustainable use.

12.4 Biodiversity conservation and sustainable use fully integrated into EC trade-related technical assistance and capacity-building activities.

12.5 Mutual supportiveness between biodiversity-related agreements and the WTO and other trade-related agreements ensured, consistent with the precautionary principle.
THEME 1: CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

No objective – see Policy Area 1
THEME 2: SHARING OF BENEFITS, TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE
OBJECTIVE 13: To ensure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the use of genetic resources while promoting their conservation and sustainable use.

2010 and earlier targets

13.1 Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising out of their Utilisation fully applied in the EU by 2006.

13.2 Capacity built in developing countries for the implementation of the ABS provisions of the CBD.

13.3 International regime on ABS concluded according to the mandate adopted at COP7.


OBJECTIVE 14: To ensure the implementation of CBD decisions on knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying their traditional lifestyles.

2010 targets

14.1 Ensure application of the principle of prior informed consent when commercially using traditional knowledge

14.2 Apply the CBD Akwe-Kon Guidelines for projects affecting terrestrial lands of indigenous and local communities both within the EU Member States and in third countries.
THEME 3: RESEARCH, MONITORING AND INDICATORS
OBJECTIVE 15: To implement an agreed set of biodiversity indicators to monitor and evaluate progress towards the 2010 targets, with the potential to communicate biodiversity problems effectively to the general public and to decision-makers and provoke appropriate policy responses.

2010 and earlier targets

15.1 Indicators: biodiversity headline indicators adopted in 2004, tested, optimised, finalised by 2006; biodiversity indicator adopted in list of Sustainable Development Indicators for reporting on Sustainable Development Strategy by 2004; interim biodiversity structural indicator developed by 2005 and finalised by 2006.

15.2 Monitoring: use, and if necessary develop, monitoring frameworks (building on existing monitoring approaches and methods including those of civil society) in order to establish adequate harmonised data flows for the biodiversity headline and structural indicators to reveal and communicate key trends from 2006.

15.3 Reporting: adopt best approaches to streamline national reporting to European Community, pan-European and international agreements from 2006 onwards; headline indicators applied for reporting on progress in implementation of the ECBS and BAPs 2007 and 2010.

15.4 Funding: adequate financial resources allocated to biodiversity indicators, monitoring, reporting and their coordination.

Note: The Malahide Conference endorsed the first set of biodiversity headline indicators for testing, optimising and finalising in line with target 15.1 (Annex 1)
OBJECTIVE 16: To improve and apply the knowledge base for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

2010 and earlier targets

Knowledge outcomes

16.1 Status\textsuperscript{62}, trends and distribution of all habitats and species of Community Interest and of additional habitats and species of policy relevance known.

16.2 Impacts of the most significant pressures\textsuperscript{63} on biodiversity for each key sector of the European Community Biodiversity Strategy discriminated, ranked and quantified where possible, and prevention and mitigation options developed and tested.

16.3 Tools for measuring, anticipating and improving the effectiveness of the most important policy instruments for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in each of the sectors of the European Community Biodiversity Strategy developed and applied.

Enabling outcomes

16.4 Adequate financial resources (to achieve knowledge and enabling outcomes) allocated by 2006 to European and national biodiversity research and to the dissemination of its results, including sufficient funding under the Community’s FP7.

\textsuperscript{62} Here ‘status’ is used to refer to the abundance of species, extent of habitats and the favourable conservation status of habitats and species of Community Interest. Composition and function to be included here.

\textsuperscript{63} Pressures include sea- and land-use change, habitat fragmentation, connectivity and destruction, climate change, pollution, including eutrophication and nitrogen deposition, harvesting and hunting pressure, natural and anthropogenic catastrophes, non-indigenous and invasive organisms and emergent diseases, globalisation, trade, consumption patterns, business practices and social conflicts, institutional structures and property rights, loss of genetic diversity and key functional groups (e.g. pollinators and bio-turbators), policy conflicts, and new technologies including GMOs and renewable energy.
16.5 Effective and inclusive European Research Area for biodiversity established, research capacity in key disciplines (e.g. taxonomy) with interdisciplinary and participatory science strengthened by 2008.

16.6 Institutional arrangements in place to ensure essential policy-relevant research is done and research outcomes are assimilated by policy-makers.

16.7 Common data standards and quality assurance procedures established and promoted to enable interoperability of key European and national biodiversity databases and inventories by 2008.

Note: The Malahide Conference endorsed the Killarney Declaration and EPBRS recommendations on research priorities (Annex 2).
THEME 4: EDUCATION, TRAINING & AWARENESS, PARTICIPATION
OBJECTIVE 17: To reinforce measures for public communication, awareness and participation.

2010 and earlier targets

17.1 “El Teide Declaration” implemented through the development of partnerships, involving the broad range of stakeholders in the conservation and management of Natura 2000 sites, the sharing of experience and good practice in managing the Network, the sustainable use and management of Natura 2000 areas for educational and recreational purposes.

17.2 Positive dialogue with Member States and stakeholders continued through charters, guidance documents, to improve efficiency of communication channels on the implementation of the Natura 2000 Network and Birds and Habitats Directives.

17.3 Ten thematic conferences under the “Countdown 2010” initiative (launched at Malahide in 2004) to halt the loss of biodiversity supported from 2004 to 2010, and parallel processes in other regions, or by other partners encouraged.

17.4 Public participation and related access to justice requirements of the Århus Convention applied to projects, and plans and programmes, relating to or having an impact on biodiversity conservation.
THEME 5: INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE
OBJECTIVE 18: EU contributes to improved international environmental governance to increase implementation of the CBD and other biodiversity related agreements

2010 targets

18.1 Coordinated and effective compliance and dispute settlement mechanisms established for all biodiversity related international agreements.

18.2 Effectiveness and synergy of implementation of biodiversity-related agreements strengthened through the global partnership for biodiversity.

[Note: while there was preliminary agreement on the need for this objective, the Conference felt there was a need for more thorough examination of the issues and legal context]
First set of EU headline biodiversity indicators based on CBD decision and focal areas

**Status and trends of the components of biological diversity**
- Trends in extent of selected biomes, ecosystems and habitats
- Trends in abundance and distribution of selected species
- Change in status of threatened and/or protected species
- Trends in genetic diversity of domesticated animals, cultivated plants, and fish species of major socioeconomic importance
- Coverage of protected areas

**Sustainable use**
- Area of forest, agricultural, fishery and aquaculture ecosystems under sustainable management

**Threats to biodiversity**
- Nitrogen deposition
- Numbers and costs of invasive alien species
- Impact of climate change on biodiversity

**Ecosystem integrity and ecosystem goods and services**
- Marine tropic index
- Connectivity/Fragmentation of ecosystems
- Water quality in aquatic ecosystems

**Status of access and benefit sharing**
- Patents (to be developed)

**Status of resource transfers and use**
- Funding to biodiversity

**Public opinion**
- Public awareness and participation

---
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Killarney Declaration
and Recommendations on Biodiversity Research

The mission of the European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy (EPBRS) is to ensure that research contributes to halting the loss of biodiversity by 2010.

KILLARNEY DECLARATION

AND

RECOMMENDATIONS

ON

BIODIVERSITY RESEARCH

Adopted by the EPBRS Meeting
Sustaining livelihoods and biodiversity –
Attaining the 2010 targets in the European Biodiversity Strategy
under the
Irish Presidency of the EU
in Killarney, Co Kerry 21-24 May 2004
KILLARNEY DECLARATION

*Emphasises:*

- that biodiversity is essential for sustaining human life and well-being
- that biodiversity is critical in sustaining livelihoods
- the vital role of biodiversity as a provider of natural capital, goods and services underpinning the Lisbon agenda across all sectors

*Recognises:*

- the alarming rate of biodiversity loss in the EU and globally
- that urgent and effective action is needed to meet the 2010 target

*Stresses:*

- that knowledge is essential for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and that investment in an improved understanding of biodiversity will deliver new and exciting opportunities for development
- the crucial role the European Research Area/7th Framework Programme must play in supporting the achievement of the biodiversity targets
- the critical importance of research in delivering the EC Biodiversity Strategy and thereby meeting the EU and Member States’ international obligations as Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity
- the need for immediate research actions to fill gaps in current knowledge, brought about by targeted biodiversity research funding from EU sources and Member States
KILLARNEY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BIODIVERSITY RESEARCH
PRIORITIES FOR THE 2010 TARGET

To achieve the objectives of the European Community biodiversity strategy and the target of halting biodiversity loss by 2010, the participants of this meeting place high priority on research to:

**Status and trends**

1. Further develop an accessible Europe-wide geo-referenced inventory of species and habitat distribution, status and trends, underpinned by significant new taxonomic effort, and support similar research in developing countries. This should include quantification of genetic diversity for species of economic or conservation importance, and improved understanding of traditional knowledge and uses of species and habitats.

2. Develop, test and evaluate indicators, and harmonise habitat and landscape classifications, to deliver policy-relevant information on the status and trends of biodiversity, the drivers of biodiversity change and the success of policies designed to halt the loss of biodiversity by 2010, and progress towards targets of the EC Biodiversity Strategy. Develop indicators of sustainable management of renewable resources, ecosystem integrity and ecosystem goods and services, vulnerability of livelihoods, public awareness and participation, and funding to biodiversity.

**Pressures and drivers of change**

3. Improve understanding of the major anthropogenic and natural drivers of biodiversity change, and their individual and combined impacts. Important drivers and pressures include:

   i. Sea- and land-use change
   ii. Habitat fragmentation, connectivity and destruction
   iii. Harvesting and hunting pressure
   iv. Climate change
| v. | Natural and anthropogenic catastrophes |
| vi. | Pollution, including eutrophication and nitrogen deposition |
| vii. | Non-indigenous and invasive organisms and emergent diseases |
| viii. | Loss of genetic diversity and key functional groups (e.g. pollinators and bio-turbators) |
| ix. | Globalisation, trade, consumption patterns, business practices and social conflicts |
| x. | Institutional structures and property rights |
| xi. | Policy conflicts |
| xii. | New technologies including GMOs and renewable energy |

4. Further develop models at relevant scales, within and across disciplines, to understand and predict the effects of these drivers on biodiversity. Produce and implement decision support tools incorporating these models.

5. Improve understanding of public beliefs, perceptions, attitudes and preferences regarding biodiversity, and how these relate to behaviour and public policy; increase knowledge of the various values of biodiversity (not limited to economic) and improve methods for their evaluation.

6. Improve understanding of the ways humans use biodiversity, and the ways those uses affect biodiversity, ecosystem goods and services and ecological-economic system resilience. Quantify the contribution of biodiversity to livelihoods and further understand how changes in biodiversity and ecosystem functions influence livelihoods, and improve and assess strategies for sustainable livelihoods and lifestyles.

**Response and policy evaluation**

7. Further develop participatory and conflict management methods and effective and cost-effective policy instruments, implementing sustainable use, conservation and restoration of species and habitats, and improve methods to implement the ecosystem approach and to monitor and evaluate policy.
8. Investigate forms of governance and management of biodiversity use, conservation and restoration in different sectors, taking into account uncertainty, irreversibility, and the complex nature of ecosystems, including research into implementation of the precautionary principle, addressing legal issues including cross-border and multi-level governance and jurisdiction.

Specific priorities for Biodiversity Action Plan on Conservation of Natural Resources

9. Assess and evaluate legislation, policy and sectoral activities, at all scales, that impact the conservation of natural resources, and identify solutions to conflicts.

10. Develop and assess methods of conserving natural resources that achieve sustainable lifestyles and that reduce impact on biodiversity.

11. Develop concepts, tools and methods to achieve favourable conservation status of habitats and species and establish baselines and targets.

12. Understand how species interact and contribute to ecosystem function, structure and services, and discriminate anthropogenic and natural dynamics in ecosystems.

13. Develop concepts, tools and methods to enable species recovery and to restore and manage the various functions of degraded ecosystems with reference to their resilience.

Specific priorities for Biodiversity Action Plan on Agriculture

14. Assess the performance of the reformed CAP in achieving the target of halting biodiversity loss by developing a harmonized framework for evaluation, and urgently support the development of monitoring systems using agreed indicators.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.</strong></td>
<td>Define harmonized farming and landscape classification systems for the identification of priority biodiversity objectives, establish reference condition and targets and develop appropriate policy instruments for specific farm contexts and habitats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.</strong></td>
<td>Improve the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of agri-environmental instruments at the scales at which they most effectively deliver on the 2010 biodiversity targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17.</strong></td>
<td>Develop ecologically-based agricultural and food supply systems that enhance biodiversity and utilize its benefits, starting with research for conservation programmes for the most vulnerable and potentially useful species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18.</strong></td>
<td>Analyse land managers’ attitudes, motives and behaviour in order to promote and enhance their role as conservers of biodiversity in different farming contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specific priorities for Biodiversity Action Plan on Fisheries**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>19.</strong></td>
<td>Develop the ecosystem-based approach to the management of fisheries and aquaculture supported by appropriate sociological and socio-economic research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20.</strong></td>
<td>Improve the understanding of the population structure of commercial species, using genetic and traditional approaches, to optimise stock management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21.</strong></td>
<td>Improve understanding of the ecosystem effects of fishing activities and how they may be reduced in particular through fishing gear developments including selectivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22.</strong></td>
<td>Pursue further research into the ecological impacts of aquaculture to facilitate informed and sustainable development and management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Investigate new and alternative approaches to ensure the future economic and environmental sustainability of the aquaculture sector.

Specific priorities for Biodiversity Action Plan on Economic and Development Cooperation

24. Identify and quantify the causes of biodiversity change in developing countries and the impact of this change on livelihoods.

25. Develop and evaluate economic, social, institutional, political, policy and environmental instruments in developing countries to alleviate the impacts of biodiversity change on livelihoods and to develop sustainable use and management of renewable resources.

26. Develop and evaluate long-term biodiversity monitoring programmes and indicators that contribute to the assessment of the 2010 WSSD target in developing countries.
While uncertainty or gaps in knowledge are not excuses for inaction, targeted biodiversity research stimulates and guides action towards meeting the 2010 target.

To develop the necessary high quality and policy relevant research on the above priority areas, and to ensure that the necessary information is available to decision-makers, particular attention should be paid to:

- focusing research priorities on the political agenda, addressing societal concerns and values;
- developing and testing methods which successfully engage public participation in research and monitoring;
- further developing participatory interfaces between science and policy, including scientists, policy makers and stakeholders;
- building capacity in biodiversity research both within the European Union and in developing countries, in interdisciplinary research bringing together natural and social science and traditional and local knowledge;
- enhancing communication and dissemination of biodiversity research results and increasing awareness of scientists on policy and governance issues;
- expanding focus from single species research and management approaches to more holistic approaches; focussing on life-support systems, conservation and restoration; and bridging the gap between different scales;
- encouraging better integration of research and management, recognising the ability to learn through systematic experimentation in resource management;
- studying historical interactions between societies and nature, how they evolved to reach the present time, and what can be learned from this for the future;
- maximizing the value and accessibility of existing data including archives and the interoperability of existing data bases;
- encouraging the development of national and regional networks that can then be linked to form European networks, paying particular attention to newer and less well established research groups, and link these networks to international ones.
ANNEX 1: Environment Council Conclusions of 28 June 2004

BIODIVERSITY - Council conclusions

The Council adopted the following conclusions on "Halting the loss of biodiversity by 2010":

RECALLING the objective established at Gothenburg by the European Council to halt biodiversity loss by 2010; and RECALLING the priority actions identified in the 6th Environmental Action Programme;

RECOGNISING the continuing alarming rate of overall loss of biodiversity in the EU and at global level and that this loss threatens to undermine the achievement of the Lisbon agenda, the environmental, economic and social goals of the EU, as well as the global Millennium Development Goals;

RECALLING the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) target to significantly reduce the rate of biodiversity loss by 2010, which the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) endorsed;

CONVINCED that biodiversity has a major contribution to make to sustaining life, sustaining livelihoods, to poverty eradication, to the promotion of human health and to sustainable development;

RECALLING the Council contribution to the Spring European Council in 2004, in the matter of cross-cutting issues such as climate change, energy, transport, and international sustainable development commitments in general, and biological diversity, including biodiversity indicators, in particular;

NOTING that the Council contribution emphasised that implementation of WSSD commitments must continue to have a high priority and be integrated into all relevant internal and external policies of the EU;

ALSO RECALLING the Council Conclusions of 22 December 2003 on the seventh meeting of the Conference of Parties (COP 7) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the first Meeting of Parties (MOP 1) to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the CBD;
WELCOMING the entry into force of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

NOTING the results of the EPBRS meeting held in Killarney*, and the Stakeholders' Conference held in Malahide**;

these conclusions are without prejudice to the position of the Council on the Commission communication on Building our common future: Policy challenges and budgetary means of the enlarged Union 2007-2013 and related legislative proposals;

THE COUNCIL:

A. *The internal dimension*

1. TAKES NOTE OF the "Message from Malahide" setting out priority objectives and targets in order to meet the overall 2010 targets, as an outcome of broad stakeholder consultations;

2. URGES the Commission to submit, as early as possible in 2005, a report to Council and Parliament on its assessment of the implementation, effectiveness and appropriateness of each of the objectives and targets set in the European Community Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans taking into account the consultative process now concluded and, notably, the "Message from Malahide";

3. WELCOMES the 'first set of headline biodiversity indicators' as outlined in Annex 1 to the "Message from Malahide" and urges the Commission further to develop, test and finalise this set by 2006 having regard to their evolving nature;

4. RECALLS the need to include, as soon as possible and not later than the next review of the Sustainable Development Strategy, an indicator on biodiversity

---

* European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy (EPBRS) meeting on “Sustaining Livelihoods and Biodiversity - Attaining the 2010 targets in the European Biodiversity Strategy” at Killarney, Ireland 21 to 24 May 2004.

** Stakeholders Conference on “Biodiversity and the EU - Sustaining Life, Sustaining Livelihoods” at Malahide, Ireland, 25 to 27 May 2004.
in the list of structural indicators, as called for in particular in the Council conclusions on structural indicators of 8 December 2003;

5. CALLS UPON the Commission to take the biodiversity objectives fully into account when reviewing this Strategy and when assessing the mid-term review of the Lisbon Strategy;

6. WELCOMES the Killarney recommendations for research priorities, and the "Killarney Declaration", which STRESSES inter alia that knowledge is essential for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the crucial role the European Research Area/7th Framework Programme must play in supporting the achievement of the biodiversity targets;

7. REITERATES the need for Member States and the Commission to consider measures that would strengthen further, through appropriate means including financing, the integration of biodiversity concerns into the policies and programmes of the key sectors relevant to biodiversity, including environment, agriculture, fisheries, forestry, regional and spatial planning, transport and energy, research, tourism, trade and economic and development cooperation;

8. Taking into account the principle of subsidiarity, STRESSES the importance of establishing the Natura 2000 network and implementing the necessary technical and financial instruments and measures required for its full implementation and for the protection, outside the Natura 2000 areas, of species protected under the habitats and birds Directives; RECALLS that the Sixth Environmental Action Programme identifies these measures as priority actions;

9. Insofar as the habitats Directive provides, inter alia, that a contribution by means of Community co-financing for the designated sites shall be provided for within the limits of the resources made available under the Community’s decisions, NOTES that the Message from Malahide identified, inter alia, the importance of Community co-financing for the NATURA 2000 network within a thriving wider environment as an important step for achieving the objective of halting the loss of biodiversity by 2010; LOOKS FORWARD to debating the Commission’s communication on the financing of the NATURA 2000 network;
10. EMPHASISES the importance of monitoring, evaluating and reporting on progress towards the 2010 targets, and that it is absolutely vital to communicate biodiversity issues effectively to the general public and to decision-makers in order to provoke appropriate policy responses;

11. URGES Member States:

- to reinforce implementation of the relevant instruments available for achieving the three objectives of the CBD provided under the reformed Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) as well as within Cohesion Policy and in economic and development co-operation and to support strengthening biodiversity-related instruments within the future rural development policy;
- to ensure the full and timely implementation of all relevant environmental legislation;
- to provide enhanced support for the development and monitoring of biodiversity indicators;
- to provide enhanced support for biodiversity research;
- to ensure that, in accordance with Article 6 of the CBD, strategies such as national biodiversity strategies and action plans are focused, and to have reporting arrangements in place in order to achieve the 2010 targets; and
- to promote the integration of biodiversity considerations in their national sustainable development strategies, national development plans, national budgets, and poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs);

12. CALLS upon key stakeholders to commit themselves to the 2010 targets and to work in partnership with Member States and the Commission to achieve these targets;

13. WELCOMES the Countdown 2010 initiative, launched by a partnership of civil organisations, including the Irish Presidency, the Commissioner for the Environment and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and other key actors at the Malahide Conference, as an important sensitising initiative to the significance of biodiversity loss across the globe and as a means to act as an independent monitor of progress towards the 2010 targets and ENCOURAGES Member States, Commission and civil society to support the Countdown 2010 initiative;
14. ACKNOWLEDGES the need to address the EU’s impact on third countries’ biodiversity as well as the EU’s particular responsibility in contributing to the achievement of the 2010 targets at pan-European and global levels.

15. EMPHASISES the need for urgent action to eliminate imports of illegally harvested timber into the EU as a contribution to fostering sustainable development by halting the loss of biodiversity and protecting the environment; STRESSES the need to continue work on implementation of the Community’s Action Plan on Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT); URGES the Commission to present its reports and proposals on the issue without delay, taking account inter alia of existing multilateral mechanisms, as requested in the Council’s October 2003 conclusions on the FLEGT Action Plan.

B. The international dimension: Outcome of the seventh ordinary meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 7) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the first meeting of the Parties (MOP 1) to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

16. STRONGLY WELCOMES the outcome of COP 7 and MOP 1;

17. FURTHER WELCOMES that the Kuala Lumpur Declaration, which was adopted by consensus by Ministers who attended the High-Level Segment of COP 7 and MOP 1, reflects EU priorities on protected areas, on indicators and on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol;

18. SUPPORTS the focus at COP 7 on the achievement of the 2010 target of significantly reducing the rate of biodiversity loss and on the need to move from the policy development phase to concrete implementation; in this respect WELCOMES the agreement at COP 7 on a core set of biodiversity indicators to be tested, identified or developed in order to monitor the progress of the CBD towards the 2010 target;

19. RECOGNISES the importance of broadening the financing basis for implementation, from both the public and the private sector, and elaborating innovative strategies such as self-financing and refocusing actions;
20. **URGES** the Commission and Member States to implement the new programmes of work adopted at COP 7 on protected areas, including actions regarding marine and coastal protected areas, mountain biodiversity, and technology transfer, as well as the other decisions of COP 7 and MOP 1;

21. **WELCOMES** the initiative of the Commission to come forward with its communication to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation by the European Community of the "Bonn Guidelines" on access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing under the CBD;

22. **WELCOMES** the creation of an open-ended working group on review of implementation of the CBD, an open-ended working group on protected areas and the agreement on the terms of reference for an open-ended working group to negotiate an international regime on access and benefit sharing; and **COMMENTS** itself to contributing constructively to the successful work of these groups and to strengthening implementation of the CBD Strategic Plan;

23. **RECOGNISES** the need fully to implement the CBD Strategic Plan, with the aim of achieving its mission and its four goals by 2010; **NOTES** the expanded workload of the CBD, having particular regard to the fact that there are less than six years for the achievement of the CBD 2010 target and, therefore, **EMPHASISES** that the EU will need to strengthen the implementation of the CBD, and to continue to be a driving force in international work and activities in support of the CBD;

24. **RECOGNISES** the need to strengthen biodiversity research and monitoring as an important contribution to the implementation of the various CBD work programmes, initiatives and action plans;

25. **REITERATES** the importance of strengthening sectoral integration of biodiversity issues at all levels to help to achieve the 2010 targets;

26. **AFFIRMS** that the three objectives of the CBD are closely inter-linked with the concepts of sustaining life, sustaining livelihoods, poverty eradication, the promotion of human health and sustainable development and are essential to achieving the Millennium Development Goals; **INVITES** the Commission and
Member States, UN agencies and international financial institutions to work with their developing country partners to support measures to achieve the three objectives of the CBD in their national sustainable development strategies, national development plans, national budgets, poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs) and in country and regional strategy papers for international development co-operation;

27. URGES Member States, the Commission, other Parties and countries, the G8, the GEF, the World Bank and other relevant agencies and donor organisations to seize the opportunity of the proposed meeting of donors to discuss options for mobilising new and additional funding for developing countries, countries with economies in transition and small island developing states to implement the programme of work on protected areas;

28. WELCOMES the concrete steps taken at COP 7 regarding co-operation with other Conventions and organisations, including the establishment of a biodiversity liaison group, and EMPHASISES that the EU will further contribute to these initiatives at national level and in the relevant fora;

29. WELCOMES the key decisions made at MOP 1 for the purpose of giving operational effect to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety; RECOGNISES that the Protocol is the key international legally-binding instrument in the area of biosafety and the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs resulting from modern biotechnology and SUPPORTS its full and effective implementation; and in this regard:

(a) LOOKS FORWARD TO the work of the open-ended ad hoc working group on liability and redress, and COMMITS itself to contributing constructively to the successful completion of the group’s work within the agreed four-year time frame;

(b) STRONGLY SUPPORTS the procedures and mechanisms adopted at MOP 1 to promote compliance and to address cases of non-compliance, and COMMITs itself to their full implementation;

(c) WELCOMES the further development at MOP 1 of documentation requirements for the transboundary movement of LMOs and SUPPORTS the establishment of an open-ended technical expert group
to specify these requirements, including the requirements for identification, with a view to adopting a decision at MOP 2; and COMMITS itself to contributing constructively to the work of the group;

(d) URGES the Commission and Member States to put in place and maintain the EC biosafety clearing house which would be globally accessible and interlinked with national biosafety clearing houses;

30. URGES countries that have not yet done so to ratify the Cartagena Protocol and INVITES non-Parties to adhere to the objectives of the Protocol;

31. EMPHASISES that the EU will need to continue to be a driving force in international work and activities in support of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the CBD.”
The European Council welcomes the progress made since its Spring meeting on important measures of direct and tangible benefit to citizens as part of the Union’s pursuit of social, economic and environmental goals. In doing so, it acknowledges the good co-operation the Council has enjoyed with the outgoing European Parliament and the Commission during a period of considerable opportunity and challenge. In particular, the European Council wishes to highlight major progress in the following areas:

- **the Financial Services Action Plan**, with the necessary decisions made on its remaining elements relating to transparency and investment services
- **mobility** of European citizens, businesses and services; through legislation on recognition of professional qualifications, social security co-ordination, the Europass and the introduction of the European Health Insurance Card
- **intellectual property rights** and arrangements for patentability of computer-implemented inventions, through agreement on measures that will stimulate and protect European innovation.
- **consumer protection**, through measures on enforcement and on unfair commercial practices
- **environmental protection**, through measures on air quality, maritime protection, environmental liability, biodiversity conservation and climate change, including putting in place all the necessary mechanisms for the EU’s Emissions Trading Scheme to facilitate compliance with the Kyoto Protocol Goals
• infrastructural development, through the decisions on Trans-European Networks for Transport and Energy.

42 The European Council regrets that it has not proved possible to secure unanimous agreement on the adoption of a Regulation on the Community Patent; a period of reflection should be used to see how to move forward, taking account of the support by all Member States for the principle of a Community Patent.

43 Reflecting the equality goals of the Lisbon agenda, and on the basis of political agreement which has been reached within the Council, the European Council expresses its support for the establishment of a European Gender Institute and invites the Commission to bring forward a specific proposal.

44 The European Council reiterates its call to the Council and the Member States for further efforts to close the delivery gap in the implementation of the Lisbon Strategy.

45 In light of the good initial work carried out on proposals and initiatives that will further contribute to sustainable growth and development, the European Council urges that work proceed quickly, inter alia on the following:

- all necessary arrangements to ensure better regulation in the European Union
- improvements in the area of corporate governance
- the proposed framework Directive on services
- consideration of the White Paper on services of general interest
- the REACH proposal regarding chemicals
- encouragement for the mobility of researchers, as an example of practical action to further stimulate innovation
- the review of the Sustainable Development Strategy
- further work on emission reduction strategies in the context of climate change, and on the promotion of environmental technologies

- the implementation of the appropriate measures to reach the agreed target of halting the decline of biodiversity by 2010

- examination of the Commission Communication on the Strategy for the Outermost Regions.

46 In the run up to the mid-term review of the Lisbon Strategy, the European Council looks forward to the report of the High-level Group to be presented to the Commission by 1 November 2004.
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http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/nature/home.htm
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- An introduction to the conference, the draft programme and an explanatory note on conference papers;
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1. INTRODUCTION, PROGRAMME & EXPLANATORY NOTE ON PAPERS

   (1) MALAHIDE/Intro: An introduction to the conference.
   (2) MALAHIDE/Programme: The draft conference programme.
   (3) MALAHIDE/Papers: This explanatory note on the conference papers.

2. MAIN PAPERS

   (4) MALAHIDE/MP/Message. The Message from Malahide paper is a draft of the anticipated output of the Conference. It proposes priorities, targets and implementation arrangements to meet the Gothenburg 2010 target of halting the decline of biodiversity (in the EU) by 2010 and to optimise the EU’s contribution to the WSSD target of significantly reducing the rate of loss of biodiversity (globally) by 2010. These priorities, targets and implementation arrangements are drawn from the analyses presented in the working session papers.
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3. WORKING GROUP PAPERS
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(8) MALAHIDE/WGP/Towards2010/3: The forward-looking paper from Working Group 3 which addressed the Biodiversity Action Plan for Fisheries.
3.2. Audit Papers

These papers present a summary of the assessments of implementation, effectiveness and appropriateness of the objectives and actions laid down in the EC Biodiversity Strategy (COM(1998)42 final) and its four sectoral Biodiversity Action Plans (COM(2001)162final). It is this analysis which underpins the ‘Towards 2010’ papers and ultimately the Message from Malahide.

(10) MALAHIDE/WGP/Audit/1: The assessment from Working Group 1 which addressed the Biodiversity Action Plan for the Conservation of Natural Resources and those themes and elements of the EC Biodiversity Strategy not addressed in the BAPs. This includes at Annex 1 the Review on “Research, identification, monitoring and exchange of information” in the European Biodiversity Strategy, a report from the European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy (EPBRS).

(11) MALAHIDE/WGP/Audit/2: The assessment from Working Group 2 which addressed the Biodiversity Action Plan for Agriculture.

(12) MALAHIDE/WGP/Audit/3: The assessment from Working Group 3 which addressed the Biodiversity Action Plan for Fisheries.

(13) MALAHIDE/WGP/Audit/4: The assessment from Working Group 4 which addressed the Biodiversity Action Plan for Economic and Development Cooperation.

4. INFORMATION PAPERS

These papers provide background information on a number of topics. These papers have largely been prepared by the EC DG Environment, with some
external assistance. INF/2 was prepared by the European Environment Agency.

(14) MALAHIDE/INF/1: The Value of Biodiversity. Insights from Ecology, Ethics and Economics.

(15) MALAHIDE/INF/2: The State of Biological Diversity in the European Union.

(16) MALAHIDE/INF/3: Literature review: Effectiveness of key actions of the Biodiversity Action Plans for Natural Resources, Agriculture and Fisheries.


(18) MALAHIDE/INF/5: Outcomes of CBD COP6 and COP7.

5. BACKGROUND PAPERS

(19) European Community Biodiversity Strategy COM(1998) 42final


**End note:**

Three supplementary papers were provided to the Conference by the EPBRS Killarney meeting of 21st - 24th May 2004:

(25) Revised Objective 19 for Draft Message from Malahide (see paper no.4 above) (NB: this became objective 16 in the final Message from Malahide).

(26) Killarney Declaration and Recommendations (elaborating future research needs).

(27) EPBRS Review of EC Biodiversity Strategy, Theme 3 (to be read in conjunction with the WG1 audit, paper no.10 above).
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hackett</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>+353 1 6072000</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:richard.hackett@agriculture.gov.ie">richard.hackett@agriculture.gov.ie</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Telephone No.</td>
<td>Fax No.</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Jebb</td>
<td>National Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>+353 1 8040329</td>
<td>+353 1 8360080</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mjebb@duchas.ie">mjebb@duchas.ie</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Foley</td>
<td>Forest Service</td>
<td>+353 74 9121848</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:tnoelfoley@eircom.net">tnoelfoley@eircom.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Farrell</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:martin.farrell@agriculture.gov.ie">martin.farrell@agriculture.gov.ie</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel O'Connor</td>
<td>Forest Service</td>
<td>00353 53 63400</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Noel.oconnor@agriculture.gov.ie">Noel.oconnor@agriculture.gov.ie</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Shine</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>+ 32 2 4082032</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:tara.shine@iveagh.gov.ie">tara.shine@iveagh.gov.ie</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wilson</td>
<td>Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government</td>
<td>+353 1 6472342</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwilson@duchas.ie">jwilson@duchas.ie</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo Ciasca</td>
<td>Ministry for Environment and Territory</td>
<td>+39 06 57228355</td>
<td>+39 06 57228390</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ciasca.angelo@minambiente.it">ciasca.angelo@minambiente.it</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrizia De Angelis</td>
<td>Ministry for Environment and Territory</td>
<td></td>
<td>+39 06 57228390</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Patrizia.deAngelis@minambiente.it">Patrizia.deAngelis@minambiente.it</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marino Mario</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture &amp; Forestry Policy</td>
<td>+39 06 46654035</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:m.marino@politicheagricole.it">m.marino@politicheagricole.it</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luigi Servadei</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture &amp; Forestry Policy</td>
<td>+ 39 06 4665568</td>
<td>+ 39 06 4881707</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Luigi.servadei@politicheagricole.it">Luigi.servadei@politicheagricole.it</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Telephone No.</td>
<td>Fax No.</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicoletta Tartaglini</td>
<td>Ministry for Environment &amp; Territory</td>
<td>+39 06 5722 8401</td>
<td>+ 39 06 57228390</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tartaglini.nicoletta@minambiente.it">tartaglini.nicoletta@minambiente.it</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilona Mendzina</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment Latvia</td>
<td>+371 7026432</td>
<td>+371 7820442</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ilona.mendzina@vidm.gov.lv">ilona.mendzina@vidm.gov.lv</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andis Zeikars</td>
<td>Rural Development Department of ministry of Agriculture</td>
<td>+ 371 7027398</td>
<td>+ 371 7027005</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andis.zeikars@zm.gov.lv">andis.zeikars@zm.gov.lv</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilmantas Greiciunas</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>+370 5 2663555</td>
<td>+370 5 2663663</td>
<td><a href="mailto:v.greiciunas@am.lt">v.greiciunas@am.lt</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther Bollendorff</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>+352 4768645</td>
<td>+352 400410</td>
<td><a href="mailto:esther.bollendorff@mev.etat.lu">esther.bollendorff@mev.etat.lu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Bos</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality</td>
<td>+31 70 3785529</td>
<td>+31 70 3786146</td>
<td><a href="mailto:p.v.bos@minlnv.nl">p.v.bos@minlnv.nl</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix Hoogveld</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>+31 70 3484329</td>
<td>+31 70 348 4303</td>
<td><a href="mailto:felix.hoogveld@minbuza.nl">felix.hoogveld@minbuza.nl</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giuseppe Raaphorst</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Nature &amp; Food</td>
<td>+31 70 3786114</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:g.b.raaphorst@minlnv.nl">g.b.raaphorst@minlnv.nl</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Braddley</td>
<td>Department of the Environment for Northern Ireland</td>
<td>+48 2890 544579</td>
<td>+48 2890 544599</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ken.braddley@doeni.gov.uk">ken.braddley@doeni.gov.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Faulkner</td>
<td>Department of the Environment for Northern Ireland</td>
<td>+ -- 28 90546571</td>
<td>+ -- 28 90546513</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.faulkner@doeni.gov.uk">john.faulkner@doeni.gov.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ove Hokstad</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>+47 22 245834</td>
<td>+47 22 242756</td>
<td><a href="mailto:oho@md.dep.no">oho@md.dep.no</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Telephone No.</td>
<td>Fax No.</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvi Østad Samstag</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment, Department of Nature Management</td>
<td>+ 47 22245714</td>
<td>+ 47 22242756</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sylvi.ofstad@md.dep.no">sylvi.ofstad@md.dep.no</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozena Haczek</td>
<td>Ministry of the Environment, Department of Nature Conservation</td>
<td>+48 22 5792282</td>
<td>+48 22 5792555</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bozena.haczek@mos.gov.pl">bozena.haczek@mos.gov.pl</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lurdes Maria Carvalho</td>
<td>Ministry for Environment</td>
<td>+-- 21 3507900</td>
<td>+ -- 21 3232588</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carvalhol@icn.pt">carvalhol@icn.pt</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Cowie</td>
<td>Scottish Executive, Environment and Rural Affairs Department</td>
<td>+44 131 2446201</td>
<td>+44 131 2444765</td>
<td><a href="mailto:derek.cowie@scotland.gsi.gov.uk">derek.cowie@scotland.gsi.gov.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamil Vilinovic</td>
<td>EU Affairs Department, Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>+ 421 2 5956 3423</td>
<td>+421 2926 2132</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vilinovic.kamil@enviro.gov.sk">vilinovic.kamil@enviro.gov.sk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio Alvarez</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>+ 34 91 5964650</td>
<td>+34 91 5964873</td>
<td><a href="mailto:salvarez@mma.es">salvarez@mma.es</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel Barbero Martin</td>
<td>Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación</td>
<td>+34 91 3471668</td>
<td>+34 91 3471841</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abarbero@mapya.es">abarbero@mapya.es</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Jesús De Pablo</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>+ 34 91 5964611</td>
<td>+34 91 5964873</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mjdepablo@mma.es">Mjdepablo@mma.es</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando Estirado</td>
<td>Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación</td>
<td>+34 91 3471625</td>
<td>+34 91 3471841</td>
<td><a href="mailto:festirad@mapya.es">festirad@mapya.es</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelia Fontevedra</td>
<td>Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación</td>
<td>+34 91 3471808</td>
<td>+34 91 3471554</td>
<td><a href="mailto:efonteve@mapya.es">efonteve@mapya.es</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address:
- Sylvi Østad Samstag: P.O. Box 8013, Dep 0030, Oslo, Norway
- Bozena Haczek: Wawelska 52/54, 00-922 Warsaw, Poland
- Lurdes Maria Carvalho: ICN, Rue de Santa Marta, 55, 1200 Lisboa, Portugal
- Derek Cowie: Mailpoint E1, Pentland House, 47 Robb’s Loan, Edinburgh EH14 1TY, Scotland
- Kamil Vilinovic: Nam. L. Stura 1, 812 35 Bratislava, Slovakia
- Sergio Alvarez: Dirección General de Conservación de la Naturaleza, Subdirección General de Conservación de la Biodiversidad, Gran Via San Francisco 4, 2005 Madrid, Spain
- Angel Barbero Martín: C/ Alfonso XII, 62-7a planta, 28071 Madrid, Spain
- Maria Jesús De Pablo: Dirección General de Conservación de la Naturaleza, Subdirección General de Conservación de la Biodiversidad, Gran Via San Francisco 4, 2005 Madrid, Spain
- Fernando Estirado Gomez: C/ Alfonso XII, 62-5a planta, 28071 Madrid, Spain
- Evelia Fontevedra: Avenida Alfonso XII, 62, 28071 Madrid, Spain

For more details on the addresses, please refer to the original source.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Telephone No.</th>
<th>Fax No.</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maite Martin Crespo</td>
<td>Ministry for the Environment</td>
<td>+ 34 91 596 4694</td>
<td>+ 34 91 596 4873</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmcrespo@mma.es">mmcrespo@mma.es</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direccion General de Conservacion de la Naturaleza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subdireccion General de Conservacion de la Biodiversidad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gran Via San Francisco 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005 Madrid Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Martin Novella</td>
<td>Ministry for the Environment</td>
<td>+32 26561519</td>
<td>+32 2 6561519</td>
<td>carlos.martin-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direccion General de Conservacion de la Naturaleza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subdireccion General de Conservacion de la Biodiversidad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gran Via San Francisco 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005 Madrid Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingela Byfors</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
<td>+46 8 4051116</td>
<td>+46 8 105061</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ingela.byfors@ministry.agriculture.se">ingela.byfors@ministry.agriculture.se</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 33 Stockholm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl-Fredrick Loof</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Food &amp; Consumer Affairs</td>
<td>+46 8 405 1134</td>
<td>+46 8 249546</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carl-fredrik.loof@agriculture.ministry.se">carl-fredrik.loof@agriculture.ministry.se</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE-103 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulf Svensson</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Stott</td>
<td>DEFRA</td>
<td>+ 44 9117 372 8445</td>
<td>+44 117 372 8182</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew.stott@defra.gsi.gov.uk">andrew.stott@defra.gsi.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/09 Temple Quay House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol BS2 9DJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Swash</td>
<td>DEFRA</td>
<td>+44 1392 822903</td>
<td>+44 1392 822900</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andy.swash@defra.gsi.gov.uk">andy.swash@defra.gsi.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hanover Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX2 8QJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Angell</td>
<td>Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs</td>
<td>+ 44 1173 728138</td>
<td>+ 44 1173 728182</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.angell@defra.gsi.gov.uk">john.angell@defra.gsi.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kite Zone 1/10 Temple Quay House, 2 The Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Quay House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol BS1 6EB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Capstick</td>
<td>Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs</td>
<td>+ 44 117 372</td>
<td>+ 44 117 3728182</td>
<td><a href="mailto:martin.capstick@defra.gsi.gov.uk">martin.capstick@defra.gsi.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Wildlife Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10 Temple Quay House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Quay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol BS2 9DJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Telephone No.</td>
<td>Fax No.</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish Fretten</td>
<td>Welsh Assembly Government - Environment, Planning and Countryside</td>
<td>+44 2920 825985</td>
<td>+44 2920 801353</td>
<td><a href="mailto:trish.fretten@wales.gsi.gov.uk">trish.fretten@wales.gsi.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathays Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff CF10 3NQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Hynes</td>
<td>Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs</td>
<td>+44 20 72708307</td>
<td>+44 20 72708302</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anthony.hynes@defra.gsi.gov.uk">anthony.hynes@defra.gsi.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London SW1A 2HH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix Otton</td>
<td>Scottish Executive Environment &amp; Rural Affairs Department</td>
<td>0131 244 7830</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:felix.otton@scotland.gsi.gov.uk">felix.otton@scotland.gsi.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Quay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 1-J(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH6 6QQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gy Ovenden</td>
<td>DEFRA</td>
<td>+44 177 9593103</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:gy.ovenden@defra.gsi.gov.uk">gy.ovenden@defra.gsi.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burghill Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbury on Trym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol B510 6 NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Telephone No.</td>
<td>Fax No.</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grainne O’Brien</td>
<td>Acquaculture Initiative</td>
<td>+353 42 938 5074</td>
<td>+353 42 9352490</td>
<td><a href="mailto:grainneobrien@oceanfree.net">grainneobrien@oceanfree.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naïg Cozannet</td>
<td>AFD - French Agency for Development</td>
<td>+33 1 53443058</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cozannnetn@afd.fr">cozannnetn@afd.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Plesník</td>
<td>Agency for Nature Conservation &amp; Landscape Protection</td>
<td>+420 2258 0582</td>
<td>+420 2 2258 0012</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jan_plesnik@nature.cz">jan_plesnik@nature.cz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Clerkin</td>
<td>An Taisce</td>
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<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Beveridge</td>
<td>EUROPECHE</td>
<td>+44 1472 352141</td>
<td>+44 1472 242486</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nffo@nffo.org.uk">nffo@nffo.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c/o NFFO, NFFO Offices Marsden Road Grimsby N.E. Lincs. DN31 3SG uk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Gatins</td>
<td>Eurosite</td>
<td>+353 74 9121837</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jgatins@duchas.ie">jgatins@duchas.ie</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laghey Co. Donegal Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Nowicki</td>
<td>Eurosite</td>
<td>+ 31 13 5944970</td>
<td>+ 31 13 5944975</td>
<td>eurositenl@eurosite-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nature.org Reipperplein 3 NL 5037 AA Tilburg Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Swift</td>
<td>FACE</td>
<td>+44 1244 573 003</td>
<td>+44 1244 579138</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.swift@basc.org.uk">john.swift@basc.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marford Mill Rossett Wrexham LL12 OHU UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Hollands</td>
<td>Fauna and Flora International (FFI)</td>
<td>+44 1223 571000</td>
<td>+44 1223 461481</td>
<td>martin.hollands@fauna-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Eastern House Tenison Road Cambridge UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Collin</td>
<td>Federal Public Service of Public Health, Food Chain Security and Environment - DG 5</td>
<td>+32 2 2104662</td>
<td>+32 2 210 4699</td>
<td><a href="mailto:claire.collin@health.fgov.be">claire.collin@health.fgov.be</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cité administrative de l'Etat Quartier Esplanade Montagne de l'Oratoire 20, boîte 3 B-1010 Brussels Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel de Tillesse</td>
<td>Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation in the EU (FACE)</td>
<td>+32 2 7326900</td>
<td>+32 2 7327072</td>
<td><a href="mailto:conservation@face-europe.org">conservation@face-europe.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rue F. Pelletier, 82 B-1030 Brussels Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Clabby</td>
<td>Fingal County Council</td>
<td>+353 1 8905697</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:gerry.clabby@fingalcoco.ie">gerry.clabby@fingalcoco.ie</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Hall Swords Co. Dublin Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Visser</td>
<td>Fingal County Council / Parks Division</td>
<td>+353 1 890 5606</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:hans.visser@fingalcoco.ie">hans.visser@fingalcoco.ie</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Street Swords Co Dublin Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olli Pekka Turvnen</td>
<td>Finnish Association of Nature Conservation</td>
<td>+358 40 755 3815</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:turvnen@511.fi">turvnen@511.fi</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kotkankatu 9 00510 Helsinki Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Telephone No.</td>
<td>Fax No.</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jukka-Pekka Jäppinen</td>
<td>Finnish Environment Institute</td>
<td>+358 9 40300749</td>
<td>+358 9 40300791</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jukka-pekkja.jappinen@ymparisto.fi">jukka-pekkja.jappinen@ymparisto.fi</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zbignien Karpowicz</td>
<td>Flora &amp; Fauna International</td>
<td>+44 1223 571000</td>
<td>+44 1223 461481</td>
<td><a href="mailto:zb16.karpowicz@fauna.org">zb16.karpowicz@fauna.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Mueller</td>
<td>GT 2 German Technical Cooperation</td>
<td>+49 6146797403</td>
<td>+49 6196796190</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alexandra.mueller@gtz.de">alexandra.mueller@gtz.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Elisa Oliveira</td>
<td>ICN</td>
<td>+359 29 3507900</td>
<td>+359 29 350 7984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Swales</td>
<td>IEEP</td>
<td>+44 20 7799 2244</td>
<td>0044 207 77992600</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vswales@ieeplondon.org.uk">vswales@ieeplondon.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dillon</td>
<td>IFA</td>
<td>00353 1 4500 266</td>
<td>00353 1 4551043</td>
<td><a href="mailto:postmaster@ifa.ie">postmaster@ifa.ie</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan O’Conneide</td>
<td>IFPO</td>
<td>+ 353 1 668 70770</td>
<td>+353 1 668 4466</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ifpo@eircom.net">ifpo@eircom.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Doyle</td>
<td>Irish Fishermen’s Organisation (IFO)</td>
<td>+353 1 6612400</td>
<td>+353 1 6612424</td>
<td><a href="mailto:irishfish@eircom.net">irishfish@eircom.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Fields</td>
<td>Irish Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>+353 1 6604530</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:enquiries@iwt.ie">enquiries@iwt.ie</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cepa Giblin</td>
<td>Irish Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>00 353 87 9911767</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cepa.giblin@muigalway.ie">cepa.giblin@muigalway.ie</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Christophersen</td>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>+32 2 7328299</td>
<td>+32 2 7329499</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tim.christophersen@iucn.org">tim.christophersen@iucn.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Telephone No.</td>
<td>Fax No.</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Claude Jacques</td>
<td>IUCN, Regional Office for</td>
<td>+32 2 7393001</td>
<td>+32 2 7329499</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jean-claude.jacques@iucn.org">jean-claude.jacques@iucn.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rue Vergote 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1030 Brussels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamas Marghescu</td>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>+32 2 7328299</td>
<td>+32 2 7329499</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tamas.marghescu@iucn.org">tamas.marghescu@iucn.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Office for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rue Vergote 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1030 - Brussels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despina Symons</td>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>+32 2 230 3070</td>
<td>+32 2 230 8272</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ebed.info@ebed.org">ebed.info@ebed.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Office for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rue Vergote 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1030 Brussels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Terry</td>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>+ 32 2 732 82 99</td>
<td>+ 32 2 732 94 99</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew.terry@iucn.org">andrew.terry@iucn.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Office for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rue Vergote 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1030 Brussels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorg Hoffmann</td>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>+48 22 8410757</td>
<td>+48 22 8518482</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joerg.hoffmann@iucn.org">joerg.hoffmann@iucn.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme Office for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ul. Wloska 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00-777 Warsaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vladimir Moskalo</td>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>+7 095 190 16 04</td>
<td>+7 095 490 58 18</td>
<td><a href="mailto:head@iucn.ru">head@iucn.ru</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Marshal Vasilevsky Str</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123182 Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenya Cherny</td>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>+41 22 9990127</td>
<td>+41 22 9990020</td>
<td><a href="mailto:xenya.cherny@iucn.org">xenya.cherny@iucn.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rue Mauverney 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gland 1196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda Kakabadse</td>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>+41 22 999 0230</td>
<td>+41 22 999 0020</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fmh@iucn.org">fmh@iucn.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 Rue Mauverney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CH-1196 Gland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achim Steiner</td>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>+ 4122 999 0001</td>
<td>+4122 999 0002</td>
<td><a href="mailto:achim.steiner@iucn.org">achim.steiner@iucn.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rue Mauvernay 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CH-1196 Gland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Weatherley</td>
<td>IUCN / EHF</td>
<td>+ 32 2 732 82 99</td>
<td>+ 32 2 732 94 99</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janice.weatherly@iucn.org">janice.weatherly@iucn.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peterborough PE1 1JY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Gibson</td>
<td>Joint Nature Conservation</td>
<td>+44 1733 866815</td>
<td>+44 1733 866855</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steve.gibson@jncc.gov.uk">steve.gibson@jncc.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Telephone No.</td>
<td>Fax No.</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunice Pinn</td>
<td>Joint Nature Conservation Committee Aberdeen</td>
<td>+44 1224 655718</td>
<td>+44 1224 621 488</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eunice.pinn@jncc.gov.uk">eunice.pinn@jncc.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Yeo</td>
<td>Joint Nature Conservation Committee</td>
<td>+44 1733 866897</td>
<td>+44 1733 555948</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marcus.yeo@jncc.gov.uk">marcus.yeo@jncc.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Duncan</td>
<td>Ligue pour la Protection des Oiseaux (LPO) - Birdlife France</td>
<td>+33 546 821234</td>
<td>+33 546 821250</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alison.duncan@lpo.fr">alison.duncan@lpo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudio Celada</td>
<td>LIPU - BirdLife Italy</td>
<td>+39 0521 273043</td>
<td>+39 0521 273419</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ccelada@tiscalinet.it">ccelada@tiscalinet.it</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Els Martens</td>
<td>Ministry of Flemish Community</td>
<td>+32 2 553 7885</td>
<td>+32 2 553 7685</td>
<td><a href="mailto:els.martens@lin.vlaan.deren.be">els.martens@lin.vlaan.deren.be</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruta Vaiciunaite</td>
<td>NARGC</td>
<td>+353 1 4974888</td>
<td>+353 4974828</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nargc@iol.ie">nargc@iol.ie</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Cunningham</td>
<td>NARGC</td>
<td>+353 1 4974888</td>
<td>+353 1 4974828</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nargc@iol.ie">nargc@iol.ie</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desmond Crofton</td>
<td>National Association of Regional Game Councils (NARGC)</td>
<td>+353 1 4974888</td>
<td>+353 1 4974828</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nargc@iol.ie">nargc@iol.ie</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elis Nic Dhonncha</td>
<td>National Platform for Biodiversity Research</td>
<td>+353 91524411</td>
<td>+353 91 151525005</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eilis.nicdhonncha@nuigalway.ie">eilis.nicdhonncha@nuigalway.ie</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gediminas Rascius</td>
<td>Nature Heritage Fund</td>
<td>+370 5 272 1918</td>
<td>+370 5 272 3721</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wetland@gamta.lt">wetland@gamta.lt</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Brown</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Biod. Group care</td>
<td>+44 (0) 2844881636</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:bob@bt30.freeserve.co.uk">bob@bt30.freeserve.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: All contact details are for general information and are subject to change.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Telephone No.</th>
<th>Fax No.</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louise Scally</td>
<td>BEC Consultants Ltd.,</td>
<td>00 353 87 2750784</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mscally@tcd.ie">mscally@tcd.ie</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 Fitzwilliam Street Upper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dublin 2 Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Phillips</td>
<td>BEC Consultants Ltd.,</td>
<td>+ 44 1767 680 551</td>
<td>+ 44 1767 485144</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joanna.phillips@rspb.org.uk">joanna.phillips@rspb.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Bedfordshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SG19 2DL uk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euan Dunn</td>
<td>BEC Consultants Ltd.,</td>
<td>+ 44 1767 680551</td>
<td>+ 44 1767 692365</td>
<td><a href="mailto:euan.dunn@rspb.org.uk">euan.dunn@rspb.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Bedfordshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SG19 2DL uk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alistair Gammell</td>
<td>RSPB - Birdlife International</td>
<td>+ 44 1767 680551</td>
<td>+ 44 1767 683211</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alistair.gammell@rspb.org.uk">alistair.gammell@rspb.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Bedfordshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SG19 2DL uk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoltan Waliczky</td>
<td>RSPB / Birdlife UK</td>
<td>+ 44 1767 680 551</td>
<td>+ 44 1767 683 211</td>
<td><a href="mailto:zoltan.waliczky@rspb.org.uk">zoltan.waliczky@rspb.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Bedfordshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DG19 2DL UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Tripp</td>
<td>Scottish Executive EU Office</td>
<td>+32 2 282 83 34</td>
<td>+ 3 2 282 83 45</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.tripp@scotland.gsi.gov.uk">david.tripp@scotland.gsi.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scotland House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rond-Point Schuman 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1040 Brussels Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Christie</td>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
<td>+44 1738 458657</td>
<td>+44 1738 458627</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mary.christe@snh.gov.uk">Mary.christe@snh.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Battleby Redgorton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perth PH1 3EW Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Jardine</td>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
<td>+44 131 4462201</td>
<td>+44 131 4462278</td>
<td><a href="mailto:linda.nicholls@snh.gov.uk">linda.nicholls@snh.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Hope Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh EH9 2AS Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendan Price</td>
<td>Seal Sanctuary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joachim Spangenberg</td>
<td>Garrisonsgasse 7/27</td>
<td>0049 171 3253105</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:joachim.spangenberg@seri.de">joachim.spangenberg@seri.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1090 Vienna Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jernej Jogan</td>
<td>Slovenian Botanical Society</td>
<td>+386 1 4233388</td>
<td>+386 1 2573390</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nejc.jogan@uni-lj.si">nejc.jogan@uni-lj.si</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Botanični vrt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Izanksa c. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SI-1000 Ljubljana Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Daleus</td>
<td>Swedish Environmental</td>
<td>+46 8 6981153</td>
<td>+46 8 6981433</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maria.daleus@naturvardsverket.se">maria.daleus@naturvardsverket.se</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protection Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Telephone No.</td>
<td>Fax No.</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Christin Weibull</td>
<td>Swedish Nature Protection Agency</td>
<td>+46 8 698 1350</td>
<td>+46 8 698 10 42</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anki.weibull@naturvar.dsverket.se">anki.weibull@naturvar.dsverket.se</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Finn</td>
<td>Teagasc</td>
<td>+353 53 42888</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jfinn@johnstown.teagasc.ie">jfinn@johnstown.teagasc.ie</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tove Maria Ryding</td>
<td>The Danish 92-group</td>
<td>+45 3917 4032</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:92-gruppen@dn.dk">92-gruppen@dn.dk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liam Lysaght</td>
<td>The Heritage Council</td>
<td>+353 56 70777</td>
<td>+353 56 770788</td>
<td><a href="mailto:liam@heritagecouncil.com">liam@heritagecouncil.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Starrett</td>
<td>The Heritage Council</td>
<td>+353 56 7770777</td>
<td>+353 56 7770788</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michael@heritagecouncil.com">michael@heritagecouncil.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Waldren</td>
<td>Trinity College Dublin</td>
<td>+353 1 4972070</td>
<td>+353 1 608 1147</td>
<td><a href="mailto:swaldren@tcd.ie">swaldren@tcd.ie</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michel Dion</td>
<td>UAPF</td>
<td>01 42 66 32 60</td>
<td>01 47 42 91 12</td>
<td><a href="mailto:uapf@wanadoo.fr">uapf@wanadoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippe Pypaert</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>+39 041 260 1512</td>
<td>+39 041 5289995</td>
<td><a href="mailto:p.pypaert@unesco.org">p.pypaert@unesco.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivonne Higuero</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)</td>
<td>+41 22 9178395</td>
<td>+41 22 797 7973420</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ivonne.Higuero@unep.ch">Ivonne.Higuero@unep.ch</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Koetz</td>
<td>Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona</td>
<td>+34 607 824 859</td>
<td>+34 93 581 33 31</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thomas.koetz@web.de">thomas.koetz@web.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Telephone No.</td>
<td>Fax No.</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte B Mogensen</td>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>+32 2 2793 8807</td>
<td>+32 27438819</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cmogensen@wwfepo.org">cmogensen@wwfepo.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Glyn Davies</td>
<td>Zoological Society of London</td>
<td>+44 20 74496201</td>
<td>+44 20 7</td>
<td><a href="mailto:glyn.davies@zsl.org">glyn.davies@zsl.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilles Duperron</td>
<td>EDD Parlement Europeen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:gduperron@unfcd.com">gduperron@unfcd.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 Avenue de Tervuren - B12 1040 Brussels Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regents Park London NW1 4RY uk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rue Wiertz, ASP 71252 1047 Brussels Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 5:

POWERPOINT PRESENTATIONS

DAY 2
Guy Duke, Principal Administrator Biodiversity, DG Environment

Biodiversity and the EU

Towards meeting the 2010 targets
Content of presentation

- EC biodiversity policy, 2010 commitments
- Mandate for review and reinforced action
- The Commission’s response
- Outputs to Malahide
- Audit results
- The draft ‘Message from Malahide’
EU biodiversity policy

- CBD 1992, EC ratification 1993
- EC Biodiversity Strategy 1998
- Biodiversity Action Plans 2001
- Gothenburg 2001 – SDS, 6EAP, EU 2010 commitment

The mandate for review and reinforced action

- **Moral** - state and trends, values
- **Administrative** – ECBS requirement to report on implementation, effectiveness and appropriateness every 3 years
- **Political**
  - “...urges the Council to accelerate work towards a more responsible management of natural resources, including action to meet the 2010 targets for biodiversity.”

The Commission’s response

- EU biodiversity policy review and reinforcement process agreed with BEG, initiated mid-2003
- Dual purpose – objective assessment, building momentum/ownership
• Structure of review
  - Advisory oversight - BEG
  - Assessments – DGs ENV, AGRI, FISH, DEV +IDCG
  - Expert review – 4 BAP WGs + MI&R + EPBRS

Outputs to Malahide

• Audits

• Towards 2010

• Draft Message from Malahide
  - priority objectives, 2010 (sub-)targets

• Set of headline biodiversity indicators

• Research priorities

• Information papers
EU BIODIVERSITY POLICY REVIEW

The outputs to Malahide

- Message from Malahide
- Towards 2010 papers
- Audit papers
- Annex 1
  Biodiversity headline indicators
- Annex 2
  Killarney Declaration Research priorities
WG1 – ECBS, BAP-NR

• Overall
  - Mediocre performance, frequent delays, still much to be achieved, weaknesses in implementation
  - Little firm evidence of effectiveness of key integration measures
  - Weak overall inter-DG and EC-MS coordination

• Some successes
  - Natura 2000
  - Species Action Plans
  - Indicators
  - New legislation – WFD, liability…

• Areas for concern
  - Regional policy
  - EIA/SEA – transport, energy…
  - Forestry
  - IAS
  - Soils
  - Eco-labelling, EMAS
WG2 – BAP-AGRI

- Reforms heading in right direction
  - Decoupling – reduces incentives to intensive production – from 2005-2007
  - Modulation – more funds to rural development from 2005
  - Cross-compliance – all beneficiaries of direct payments must maintain land in good environmental condition – from 2005
  - More funds, higher rate of EC financing for AEMs

- Rural development measures
  - Rural development measures (AEM, LFA…) spreading – but still not much targeted at biodiversity
  - Good farming practice applied since 2000 reform, priority to biodiversity only in UK, IE, SE, EL
  - Cross-compliance – helping reduce nutrient levels, pesticides, not much focus on biodiversity

- Organic farming – 1.1% 1995, 3% 2000
WG3 – BAP-FISH

• Reduction in fishing pressure
  - Long-term management plans
  - Precautionary limit reference points defined for most stocks
  - Financial aid to new build withdrawn

• Technical measures exploited stocks
  - Shark finning regulation 2003
  - Mediterranean regulation
  - Discard Communication 2002

• Technical measures non-target species and habitat
  - Cetaceans Regulation 2004, studies
  - Darwin Mounds Regulation, sandeel enclosure Firth of Forth
  - Proposed amendment FIFG for salmon
  - Proposal 2004 to protect vulnerable habitats around Macaronesian Isles

• Overall
  - Reforms heading right direction but too soon to assess effectiveness
  - Clear need for better dialogue environment-fishermen – RACs an opportunity
WG4 – BAP-EDC

• Overall
  - Weakest of the BAPs in terms of implementation
  - Some biodiversity specific projects – very localised impact
  - Mainstreaming very disappointing – very little influence on PRSPs, CSPs, RSPs…
  - Trade footprint a major gap

• Causes of failure
  - Recipient-driven
  - Absence of an ‘engine room’ for mainstreaming
  - Cross-cutting fatigue
  - No significant earmarked fund

The enabling environment

• Political priority?
  - will and demand
  - allocation of resources
  - enforcement

• Institutional coordination
  - within Commission
  - between Commission, MS and civil society
Knowledge base/application
- need for more and better monitoring and reporting
- need for more research and stronger research-policy interface

Message from Malahide

Working sessions
- Refine objectives
- Refine targets - make them SMART
- Specific
- Measureable
- Agreed
- Realistic
- Timebound

Beyond Malahide

Presidency Report to ENV Council
- Council conclusions on ‘Message’

Commission Communication to Council and Parliament
- Proposals for action

BEG to follow-up on coordination EC-MS-civil society
ANNEX 5B: A First Set of EU Headline Biodiversity Indicators

Gordon McInnes, Deputy Director, European Environment Agency
Presentation will include:

- Background to the proposed set
- Example illustrative indicators
- How to deliver

Background to the proposed EU set

- Recent decisions and discussions at global, pan-European and EU level on requirements for biodiversity monitoring, indicators and reporting
- CBD has agreed 7 focal areas for indicators – for immediate testing and further development
- Proposal from Biodiversity Expert Group/WG5 for a first set of EU headline biodiversity indicators consistent with the CBD focal areas and indicators

Considerations for EU set

- EU target to halt biodiversity loss by 2010
- Link to other EU Biodiversity Policies
- Link to relevant sectors, threats and pressures
- Make use of ongoing indicator developments (EEA core set, OECD, Bio-IMPs, Biodiversity Index etc)
- Distinguish different indicator functions
- Be selective in the communication
EU Sixth Environmental Action Programme (from overall aims in Art. 2)

“Protecting, conserving, restoring and developing the functioning of natural systems, natural habitats, wild flora and fauna with the aim of halting desertification and the loss of biodiversity [by 2010], including diversity of genetic resources, both in the European Union and on a global scale.”

Biodiversity loss definitions

UNEP/CBD/COP/7/L.27 defines biodiversity loss as the long term or permanent qualitative or quantitative reduction in components of biodiversity and their potential to provide goods and services, to be measured at global, regional and national levels.

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/9/INF/26 recognises as a basis for developing indicators that biodiversity loss can consist of:

- A decline in extent, condition or sustainable productivity of ecosystems
- A decline in abundance, distribution or sustainable use of species populations, and extinctions
- Genetic erosion
LEVELS OF COMMUNICATIONS

Heads of State and Government

Level 1
Structural Indicator for Biodiversity

Level 2
Headline Indicators for Biodiversity

Level 3
Indicators linked to policy sectors

Policy-makers and public

Stakeholders in each sector
Focal areas for indicators

CBD:

• Status and trends of the components of biological diversity
• Sustainable use
• Threats to biodiversity
• Ecosystem integrity and ecosystem goods and services
• Status of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices
• Status of access and benefits sharing
• Status of resource transfers

EU:

• Public opinion
First set of EU headline biodiversity indicators based on CBD decision and focal areas (2/3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status and trends of the components of biological diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trends in extent of selected biomes, ecosystems and habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in abundance and distribution of selected species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in status of threatened and/or protected species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in genetic diversity of domesticated animals, cultivated plants, and fish species of major socioeconomic importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage of protected areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of forest, agricultural, fishery and aquaculture ecosystems under sustainable management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trends in extent of ecosystems

Legend

Wetlands intensity in a 20 km neighbourhood (%)
- 0 - 8
- 9 - 19
- 20 - 35
- 36 - 56
- 67 - 83

Afforestation over Peatbogs 1990-2000
- 2% - 10%
- 10% - 20%
- >20%
Change in status of threatened and/or protected species

Iberian Lynx now critically endangered
Source: IUCN 2003 red list of globally threatened species

‘It is time to ring the alarm bell. Biodiversity loss has accelerated to an unprecedented level, both in Europe and worldwide’.

Margot Wallström, EU Commissioner for the Environment, at the Third Intergovernmental ‘Biodiversity in Europe’ Conference, Madrid, January 2004
First set of EU headline biodiversity indicators based on CBD decisions and focal areas (2/3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threats to Biodiversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen deposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers and costs of invasive alien species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of climate change on biodiversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecosystem integrity and ecosystem goods and services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine trophic index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity/Fragmentation of ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quality in aquatic ecosystems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact of climate change on biodiversity

Average change in glacier (m)

Observed changes in growing season length (days)

Relative abundance of plankton (%)
Water quality in aquatic ecosystems

Nitrate concentration (mg NO₃/l)

Arable land cover
(% of total upstream catchment)
First set of EU headline biodiversity indicators based on CBD decision and focal areas (3/3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of access and benefits sharing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of resource transfers and use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding to biodiversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public opinion (not included in CBD list)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness and participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How to deliver**

**NOT:** T

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Pan-European</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2010 Target**

**BUT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Pan-European</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2010 Target**
Indicative overview biodiversity organisations and activities

Global (~200)  Pan European (52)  European Union (25)
Objetives for coordination team (to be led by EEA in cooperation with ECNC and UNEP-WCMC)

- Improve coordination, information exchange and collaboration
- Build on current activities and good practice within both governmental and non-governmental organisations
- Do it! - consolidate, test, refine, document and produce agreed biodiversity indicators
- Ensure adequate funding for monitoring, indicators and assessments to support achievement of 2010 target

Workplan and related events

- **May 2004:** mandate from Malahide Conference to Coordination team
- **August 2004:** detailed work plan prepared
- **2005-2007:** indicators developed and tested; monitoring and reporting requirements defined
- **2005:** reporting under CBD
- **2007:** reporting under Habitats Directive
- **2008:** baseline for 2010 defined
- **2010:** target year
- **2011-2012:** reporting on 2010
Man has a special responsibility to safeguard and wisely manage the heritage of wildlife and its habitat, which are now gravely imperilled by a combination of adverse factors. Nature conservation, including wildlife, must therefore receive importance in planning for economic development.

Stockholm Declaration - Principle 4 (1972)
Research Priorities to 2010 and Beyond
The Killarney Recommendations and Declaration

Sybil van den Hove, European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy
The European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy

• EPBRS is a forum for scientists and policy makers to ensure that research contributes to halting the loss of biodiversity by 2010

• Participants are representatives from each country that participates in the EU framework programmes – policy makers and scientists, the EEA, the EC, and invited experts including social scientists, economists and NGOs

• National Platforms for Biodiversity support EPBRS

• 32 Countries

• EPBRS recommends key scientific priorities for biodiversity research in Europe - including CBD issues

• EPBRS is part of the interface between biodiversity science and biodiversity policy, it
  - helps to define science policy for biodiversity...
  - ...that will generate understanding...
  - ...to inform biodiversity policy

EPBRS Participatory Process

• EPBRS meets twice a year under successive EU Presidencies

• Most recent meeting: Killarney 20-24 May, 2004:

  “Sustaining Livelihoods and Biodiversity: Attaining the 2010 Target in the European Biodiversity Strategy”

• Recommendations are prepared based on:

  - Two open electronic conferences prior to each meeting (Bioplatform and Marbena)
- Keynote presentations
- Working group discussions
- Plenary discussions and adoption of recommendations

EPBRS Outputs

Recommendations
- on specified topics of policy concern
- for research to fill identified gaps
- including methodological comments if needed
- focus on science policy and science for policy

The Killarney Output

- Review of Theme 3 of the European Biodiversity Strategy
- Recommendations for research priorities to achieve the objectives of the Biodiversity Strategy and the 2010 target
- Recommendation for revised Objective 19
- Killarney Declaration

Review of theme 3 in the Biodiversity Strategy

Theme 3:
- Research, identification, monitoring and exchange of information

Process:
- First synthesis based on input from National platforms
Electronic discussion of the synthesis

2 electronic conferences (marine and terrestrial)

New synthesis adopted by EPBRS Plenary in Killarney

Output:

- Research progress on issues raised in Theme 3
- Barriers, difficulties and outstanding issues
- Preliminary recommendations for priority research

**Review of theme 3: Key Conclusions**

- Research has made significant but far from sufficient progress towards the understanding and measurement of biodiversity
- Still large gaps in key research areas to reach the 2010 target
- Barriers and difficulties:
  - Inherent complexity of biodiversity issues
  - Lack of interdisciplinarity between natural and social sciences
  - Linking different scales in biodiversity knowledge
  - Validation of monitoring schemes and indicators
  - Building effective real time science policy interfaces
  - Finance-bounded lifespan of research networks
**Killarney Recommendations for research priorities to 2010 and beyond**

**Process:**
- Based on research priorities identified during the review process and electronic conferences
- EPBRS plenary and working group discussion

**Output:**
- 8 overarching research priorities
- BAP-specific research priorities
- Methodological priorities

**Status and trends**
- Geo-referenced inventories
- Indicators, habitats and landscape classifications

**Pressures and drivers of biodiversity change**
- Major anthropogenic and natural drivers
- Models at relevant scales, within and across disciplines
- Public beliefs, perceptions, attitudes and preferences
- Human uses, livelihoods and lifestyles

**Responses and policy evaluation**
- Participatory and conflict management methods
- Effective and cost-effective policy instruments
- Governance and management
- Conservation and restoration in different sectors

**Specific research priorities for BAP Conservation of Natural Resources**

- Legislation, policy and sectoral activities
- Methods of conserving natural resources that achieve sustainable livelihoods and lifestyles
- Methods to achieve favourable conservation status of habitats and species
- Ecosystems function, structure and services
- Concepts, tools and methods to enable species and habitat recovery

**Specific research priorities for BAP Agriculture**

- Assessment of the performance of the reformed CAP
- Farming system-specific goals for biodiversity
- Evaluation and improvement of the performance of agri-environmental schemes
- Development of ecologically based agricultural systems that enhance biodiversity
- Analysis of land managers’ attitudes, motives and behaviour, and their role as conservers of biodiversity
Research priorities for BAP Fisheries

• Development of ecosystem-based approaches to the management of fisheries and aquaculture
• Improvement of the understanding of population structure of commercial species
• Ecosystem effects of fishing activities and options for their mitigation, e.g. selective fishing gear
• New and alternative approaches for economic and environmental sustainability of aquaculture

Research priorities for BAP Economic and Development Cooperation

• Causes of biodiversity change/ impacts on livelihoods in developing countries
• Development of instruments to alleviate negative impacts of biodiversity changes on livelihoods
• Development of methods for sustainable use and management of renewable resources
• Development and evaluation of long-term biodiversity monitoring programmes and indicators (WSSD 2010 target)

Objective and 2010 targets for biodiversity research

Process:

• Based on the Killarney recommendations for research priorities
• EPBRS discussions with involvement of Irish Presidency, DG Environment and DG Research
Output: proposal for revised objective 19

- To improve and apply the knowledge base for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity

- Targets for knowledge outcomes and enabling outcomes which reflect the Killarney research priorities

Targets for Knowledge Outcomes

- Status, trends and distribution of all habitats and species of Community Interest and of additional habitats and species of policy relevance by 2010.

- Impacts of the most significant pressures on biodiversity for each key sector of the European Community Biodiversity Strategy discriminated, ranked and quantified where possible, and prevention and mitigation options developed and tested by 2010.

- Tools for measuring, anticipating and improving the effectiveness of the most important policy instruments for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in each of the sectors of the Biodiversity Strategy developed and applied by 2010.

Targets for Enabling Outcomes

- Adequate financial resources (to achieve knowledge and enabling outcomes) allocated to European and national biodiversity research and the dissemination of its results by 2006.

- Effective and inclusive European Research Area for biodiversity established research capacity in key disciplines (e.g. taxonomy) with interdisciplinary and participatory science strengthened by 2008.

- Institutional arrangements in place to ensure essential policy-relevant research is done and research outcomes are assimilated by policy-makers by 2010.
• common data standards and quality assurance procedures established and promoted to enable interoperability of key European and national biodiversity databases and inventories by 2008.

Killarney Declaration

Emphasises:

• that biodiversity is essential for sustaining human life and well-being
• that biodiversity is critical in sustaining livelihoods
• the vital role of biodiversity as a provider of natural capital, goods and services underpinning the Lisbon agenda across all sectors

Recognises:

• the alarming rate of biodiversity loss in the EU and globally
• that urgent and effective action is needed to meet the 2010 target

Stresses:

• that knowledge is essential for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity
• the crucial role the European Research Area/7th Framework Programme
• the critical importance of research in delivering the EC Biodiversity Strategy
• the need for immediate research actions to fill gaps in current knowledge