



<p>CGBN</p> <p>Co-ordination Group for Biodiversity and Nature</p> <p>9th meeting – 18/11/10</p>		
--	--	---

Brussels, 22 12. 2010
ENV.B.2-B.3 *adl* (2010) Ares

**OPERATIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 9TH MEETING
OF THE CO-ORDINATION GROUP FOR BIODIVERSITY AND NATURE (CGBN)
HELD ON 18TH NOVEMBER 2010 (BORSCHETTE CENTRE, BRUSSELS – 10.30 UNTIL 17.30)**

Participants (see attached list)

This operational summary record is to be seen in parallel with the supporting documents prepared by the Commission and posted on the CGBN CIRCA site prior to the meeting (http://circa.europa.eu/Members/irc/env/biodiversity_nature/home - site with registered access). All presentations made during the meeting can also be found on the CIRCA site.

Chair: Stefan Leiner (Head of Unit ENV.B.3 "Natura 2000") for the morning session and Claudia Olazabal (Deputy Head of Unit ENV.B.2 "Biodiversity") for the afternoon session

1) Summary Record of the Previous Meeting (22nd June 2010)

The summary record of the previous meeting was approved.

2) Implementation of the Habitats and Birds Directives

The following issues had been identified for discussion prior to the meeting. An exchange of views followed presentations by the Commission, with the following outcome:

✓ **Financing Natura 2000** (see DOC.2-1 and Powerpoint presentation by Micheal O'Briain):

The key issues tabled for discussion were:

- The proposal to develop Natura 2000 national / regional financing prioritised action frameworks (PAFs) and how best to achieve this;
- The potential of market-based instruments and innovative approaches, including from private funds, for Natura 2000 financing.

Regarding the PAF, the Commission clarified that this should address all habitats and species subject to Natura 2000 protection, not only for those listed in Habitats Directive as priority (there is also a list of priority bird species for LIFE funding). The PAF would enable Member States at national and/or regional level to provide, in a co-ordinated and strategic way, relevant information concerning their financial needs for Natura 2000. The Chair emphasised that preparation of a PAF would not be a substitute for MS submitting plans such as Rural Development Plans, etc but that

timely preparation of a PAF would help ensure that Natura 2000 dimension is better factored into other plans. The following key points were noted from the exchanges:

- The PAF is an interesting proposal and could be a useful tool to strategically set out needs and priorities as well as bringing together all stakeholders. Need to minimise administrative burden and duplication of efforts. Need to consider including a transboundary co-operation mechanism in the PAF.
- The integrated approach to funding Natura 2000 is crucial without restricting the possibilities of MS to decide and prioritised financing sources. Earmarking of funds would represent important progress.
- Whereas LIFE is a valuable fund for Natura 2000 and needs to be strengthened there is a significant administrative burden (and investment even for non-approved proposals) which needs to be addressed.
- There will be a need for further studies on the value of Ecosystem Services of Natura 2000 sites and how to include them in national accounts.
- There is a lack of knowledge on innovative instruments. In the context of biodiversity agenda there is clearly a need to promote market-based instrument such as offsetting credits and habitat banking. However, their usefulness and applicability to Natura 2000 may be limited. Need to learn from existing initiatives.

CGBN participants were invited to send any written comments to the Commission before the end of the year.

✓ **New biogeographical process to promote implementation of the Nature legislation** (see DOC.2-2 and Powerpoint presentation by François Kremer):

Several participants (BE, FR, SF, DK, SE, NL, UK, COPA-COGECA, EHF, BirdLife, EEB, CEPF,...) welcomed the proposal to launch a new biogeographical process while underlining that the new process should be very different in both legal and content nature from the initial biogeographical process, be based on sound scientific knowledge, help defining priorities and cost-effective ways to reach favourable conservation status, deal with climate change impacts on the conservation status of species and habitat types, enhance trans-boundary cooperation and facilitate the exchange of information on the design and the follow-up of conservation measures. The new process should not be a new instrument for assessing Member States' performance. It should rather help the Member States in exchanging information on measures and best practice and catalyse cooperation between Member States. The need to actively involve economic sectors, landowners and NGOs was also stressed as well as the importance of well defining their role in the process. It was proposed to discuss possible ways of involving NGOs in the European Habitats Forum. It was suggested that the new process should also cover SPAs. The EEA offered to support the process notably by providing background information from different sources. It suggested that the process should also tackle reference values for species and habitat types at the biogeographical level.

Finland kindly offered to host a first seminar for the boreal biogeographical region, which should be organised as a pilot seminar during the second half of 2011. That seminar could benefit from experience gained from a similar exercise that was organised between Nordic countries under the Ramsar convention.

The Chair concluded that there was an overall support for launching a new biogeographical process. The new process should be useful to Member States. CGBN members were invited to send any additional feed-back to the Commission, for example on specific issues that should be tackled by the new process. The Commission counts on the help of Member States and the support by the EEA and the ETC/BD for preparing the first seminar.

✓ **Further work on guidance documents** (see DOC.2-3 and Powerpoint presentation by Fotis Papoulias): The Commission introduced the point by highlighting the importance of guidance documents to promote sound implementation of EU nature legislation and specifying their nature and preparation process. It presented a non-exhaustive list of such guidelines produced so far as well as those in the pipeline (including a guide on aquaculture & Natura 2000 - for which Member States and stakeholders will very soon be asked to appoint contact persons for consultation - and the possible updating of the Article 6 "Managing Natura 2000" guide). CGBN members were asked for input as regards further priority issues for which guidance would be needed in the future and for suggestions as regards the preparation and dissemination of such documents, taking into account that the development of guidelines can be cumbersome.

CGBN members acknowledged the usefulness of Commission guidance documents produced so far. Several participants expressed concerns about the workload that this activity implies especially for smaller Member States who have to be represented in various working groups. Accordingly, work should take into account current high priorities (management and financing Natura 2000) and draw on existing best practice at Member State level. Further topics proposed to be addressed in the future included: fisheries impacts and related management measures; recreation activities and tourism; relationship of the Habitats Directive with the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD); forestry. Platforms for information exchange (e.g. for farmers) might also be useful. As regards in particular a possible revision of the Article 6 guide, it was suggested that the scope of such work should be carefully considered, taking into account that the existing guide is already being used widely in the Member States and has been translated in several languages.

In response to comments and questions raised, the Commission acknowledged the resource constraints. It will consider more flexible means for consultation (e.g. only by e-mail) and all proposals for future guidance will be assessed in the light of current policy priorities. Work on issues related to fisheries management & Natura 2000 and links with WFD and MSFD is already ongoing. In relation to the updating of the Article 6 guide, the intention is not to revise the whole guide but rather to take on board recent relevant ECJ jurisprudence as well as to elaborate more on some key concepts, which could also be done through some "addenda" to the document. The Commission will inform the CGBN on the envisaged approach.

3) Recent and Upcoming Meetings (see DOC.3-1)

The recent and upcoming meetings table is updated on a monthly basis on the CGBN circa site.

4) Biodiversity Policy

The following issues had been identified for discussion prior to the meeting. An exchange of views followed presentations to the CGBN, with the following outcome:

✓ **International negotiations at the COP 10 of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the EU post-2010 biodiversity strategy** (see Powerpoint presentations by Anne Teller):

A short presentation was provided on the outcomes of the 10th conference of the Parties (COP10) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), which took place in Nagoya on 18th-29th October 2010.

This year the agenda of the COP was particularly heavy and important for the further proceeding of the convention. There were 3 main priorities on the agenda, which were treated as a package: 1/ the adoption of the Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) as a conclusion of a long negotiation process, which started in Johannesburg in 2002, and which should lead to payments by users of genetic resources to providers of those resources; 2/ the adoption of a new strategic plan for biodiversity 2011-2020, including a 2020 mission and 20 targets to be achieved by 2020; and 3/ the adoption of a strategy on resource mobilisation calling for the adoption of a quantified target in 2012. Nagoya succeeded in adopting good decisions on these 3 items as well as many others on

issues as broad ranging as climate change and biodiversity, biofuels, invasive alien species, marine and coastal biodiversity, etc., and it was therefore a success.

Nagoya was also a success thanks to the Presidency where EU and its 27 Member States played a strong and decisive role throughout the negotiation. The constructive and lead role of EU was recognised by all.

Following Nagoya, there are some important tasks to be undertaken such as some work on the assessment of finance and resource mobilisation (cf. discussion at EPRG meeting of 17th November), some of which need to be completed by mid-2011, the ratification of the ABS protocol and implementation package to be put in place at EU level and the transposition of the commitments taken in the strategic plan which need to be delivered at EU level. If some targets are less ambitious than the EU would have liked (e.g. terrestrial protected areas), most of them need to be factored into the impact assessment and further design of the EU's own post-2010 biodiversity strategy.

Draft Council conclusions on Nagoya's follow-up are currently being discussed at the Working Party on Environment in view of an adoption at the Environment Council of 20th December.

The question of the governance of the process to be started on resource mobilisation was raised. Written comments should be provided soon.

✓ **Update on progress in the development of the EU post-2010 biodiversity strategy** (see Powerpoint presentation by Claudia Olazabal):

A detailed presentation of the latest development of the post-2010 EU biodiversity strategy was provided, including the adoption of the 2010 BAP assessment, the outcomes of stakeholder and Member State consultations, the recent developments in other relevant policies and the resolutions by other EU institutions. The rationale for the 6 sub-targets, measures and impacts was explained.

Input was provided during the discussion with CGBN members on the following issues:

- The ordering of the sub-targets where the primary focus should be on nature conservation and green infrastructure; then the key threats (agriculture, fisheries, IAS/trade; and global).
- The wording of the sub-target on 'no deterioration and restoration of ecosystems', which was considered as difficult to communicate.
- The links and contributions between the different sub-targets should be well explained.
- The global target, which seemed disconnected from the others and should include issues such as sustainable trade, food security, climate change, innovative financial mechanisms.
- The need to clarify the link between ecosystems and ecosystems services and to retain the intrinsic value of biodiversity.
- The articulation between the outcomes of CBD COP10 and the EU post-2010 biodiversity strategy.
- The need to establish a very clear and intuitive story line for the sub-targets and the measures that would be easy to communicate to policy makers and the general public.
- The need to build string links with the EU 2020 Strategy.
- The need also not to neglect other pressures in biodiversity such as pollution and climate change.
- The need to build on existing work done by other institutions (i.e. Council of Europe) on invasive alien species.

The adoption of the EU Biodiversity Strategy 2011-2020 is foreseen for early 2011.

✓ **Final baseline report and knowledge gaps analysis** (see Powerpoint presentation by Carlos Romao from EEA):

The EEA presented the EU 2010 Biodiversity Baseline report released on 19 October 2010 (see also <http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/eu-2010-biodiversity-baseline/report-summary>), including a knowledge gap analysis. The presentation was followed by a discussion with CGBN members. The final report will be available soon.

The EEA has also published a report based on the updated SEBI indicators "Assessing biodiversity in Europe - the 2010 report" on 4th October 2010 (<http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/assessing-biodiversity-in-europe-84>).

The Joint Research Centre informed participants of the ongoing mapping of ecosystems services in Europe due by the end of 2010 and of the EFDAC - the European Forest Data Centre - that includes relevant data and maps on biodiversity (species, deadwood, forest increase versus connectivity trend 90-2006). This work could be presented in more detail at a future CGBN meeting.

EPBRS mentioned that the report of the Presidency workshop on 'Positive visions for biodiversity' of 16th-19th November would be available soon (<http://www.biodiversity.be/epbrsbe2010>).

The note to the Nature and Forestry Directors on the European strategic plan to fill gaps in knowledge and data was distributed to CGBN members for information.

5) Any Other Business

✓ **Report “Rethinking Global Biodiversity Strategy” drafted by the PBL (Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency)** (see Powerpoint presentation by the NL representative, Martin Lok)

The Dutch delegation very briefly presented to CGBN members a recent report produced by the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL), in close cooperation with the Dutch Agricultural Economic Research Institute (LEI-WUR) and the 'Sea Around US Project' of the Fisheries Centre of the University of British Columbia, Canada issued at CBD COP10 (see http://www.pbl.nl/en/publications/2010/Rethinking_Global_Biodiversity_Strategies.html).

✓ **Dates of CGBN meetings in 2011:** Tuesdays 1st March 2011, 28th June 2011 and 15th November 2011.

CGBN members' attention is drawn to the fact that those dates remain indicative and are only confirmed when the official invitations are sent out - which, for procedural reasons inside the Commission, cannot be done until 6 weeks prior to the meeting date.

6) Information points

- Conference on Bird Conservation in the EU: planning for recovery action and sustainable use, Brussels, 23rd-24th November 2010 - (INFO DOC.6.-1)
- Coordination and implementation of the designation process for the off-shore marine sites- (INFO DOC.6.-2)
- Working group on streamlining and modernising the reporting tasks under the Habitats and Birds directives including the dataflow on the Natura 2000 network - (INFO DOC.6.-3)
- Update on the progress achieved with the Business and Biodiversity Platform - (INFO DOC.6.-4)
- Update on the progress BEST scheme "Voluntary scheme for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services in Territories of European Overseas" - (INFO DOC.6.-5)

The activities under these documents were just for information and were not discussed in the meeting. These written contributions had been posted on the circa site a few days prior to the meeting and CGBN participants have until 31st December 2010 to comment on them.

Enclosure: List of participants

**9TH MEETING OF THE CO-ORDINATION GROUP FOR BIODIVERSITY AND NATURE
HELD ON 18TH NOVEMBER 2010 IN BRUSSELS**

Participants' list

Member States:

- Austria: Edda-Maria BERTEL
- Belgium: Els MARTENS, Catherine DEBRUYNE
- Cyprus: Anna SAVVIDOU
- Czech Republic: Michael HOSEK
- Denmark: Eva JUUL JENSEN, Lars RUDFELD
- Estonia: Lilika KÄIS, Hanno ZINGEL
- Finland: Jussi SORAMÄKI
- France: Fanny LENDI-RAMIREZ
- Germany: Gordon MODRO, Christa RATTE, Detlef SZYMANSKI
- Greece: Eleni TRYFON
- Hungary: Eva SASHALMI
- Ireland: Ciaran O'KEEFFE, Conor O'RAGHALLAIGH
- Italy: Eugenio DUPRE
- The Netherlands: Martin LOK
- Poland: Anna LIRO
- Portugal: Rita FREITAS FERREIRA, Raquel GOMES CAETANO FERREIRA
- Romania: Fulvia COJOCARU
- Slovenia: Andrej BIBIC
- Spain: Rafael HIDALGO
- Sweden: Michael LÖFROTH
- United Kingdom: Martin BRASHER, Ian HOOPER

Excused: Slovak Republic

Not represented: Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Malta

NGOs and other stakeholders:

- BirdLife: Tatiana NEMCOVA
- CEPF (Confédération européenne des propriétaires forestiers): Marta GAWORSKA
- COE (Council of Europe): Ivana D'ALESSANDRO
- COPA-COGECA (Committee of Professional Agriculture Organizations - General Committee for Agricultural Cooperation in the EU): Tania RUNGE
- EEB (European Environment Bureau): Sarolta TRIPOLSKY
- EIB (European Investment Bank): Andrew NOBREGA
- ELO (European Landowners' Organization): Delphine DUPEUX
- EPBRS (European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy): Allan WATT
- FACE (Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the EU): Angus MIDDLETON, Gabor VON BETHLENFALVY
- FOE (Friends of the Earth): Friedrich WULF
- UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme): Thierry LUCAS
- WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature) and EHF (European Habitats Forum): Andreas BAUMUELLER

Not represented: BusinessEurope, EBRD (European Bank for Reconstruction and Development), ECNC (European Centre for Nature Conservation), IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature)

European Environment Agency / European Topic Centre: Carlos ROMAO / Marita ARVELA,
Sophie CONDE

European Commission:

Attended all or part of the meeting:

Claudia OLAZABAL, Johanna KARHU, Anne TELLER (ENV.B.2);
Stefan LEINER, Sylvia BAROVA, Annick DE LOMBAERDE, Ctibor KOČMAN, François
KREMER, Micheal O'BRIAIN, Fotis PAPOULIAS, Joseph VAN DER STEGEN, Susanne
WEGEFELT, Araceli ZORRILLA QUINZA (ENV.B.3)

Christine ESTREGUIL (JRC-ISPRA)
Rita SANTOS (MARE)

