

14 May 2001

ENGLISH ONLY

UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

Fourteenth session

Bonn, 16-27 July 2001

Item 6 of the provisional agenda

**COOPERATION WITH RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

**Submissions from Parties**

**Note by the secretariat**

1. At its thirteenth session, the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice took note of the information contained in a discussion note prepared by the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). It also took note of the decisions of the fifth Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity relating to forest biodiversity and marine and coastal biodiversity, particularly coral reefs, and their links to the UNFCCC. The SBSTA agreed to consider this matter in more detail at its fourteenth session. It invited Parties to submit their views on the issues identified in the discussion note prepared by the Executive Secretary of the CBD to the UNFCCC secretariat no later than 1 March 2001, for compilation into a miscellaneous document (FCCC/SBSTA/2000/14, para. 60).
2. As at 17 April 2001, the secretariat has received four such submissions.\* In accordance with the procedure for miscellaneous documents, these submissions are reproduced in the language in which they were received and without formal editing.

---

\* In order to make these submissions available on electronic systems, including the World Wide Web, these submissions have been electronically imported. The secretariat has made every effort to ensure the correct reproduction of the texts as submitted.

**FCCC/SBSTA/2001/MISC.3**

GE.01-

## CONTENTS

<b>Paper No.</b>		<b>Page</b>
1.	AUSTRALIA (Submission received 15 March 2001)	3
2.	JAPAN (Submission received 2 March 2001)	6
3.	NORWAY (Submission received 6 March 2001)	8
4.	SWEDEN (ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND ITS MEMBER STATES) (Submission received 1 March 2001)	10

PAPER NO. 1: AUSTRALIA

**COOPERATION WITH RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS**

**DISCUSSION NOTE FROM THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE  
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY – CLIMATE CHANGE AND  
BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY: COOPERATION BETWEEN THE CONVENTION ON  
BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND THE UNITED NATIONS  
FRAMEWORK CONVENTION  
ON CLIMATE CHANGE**

**Introduction**

Australia welcomes the opportunity to make a submission on cooperation between the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in assessing the impacts of climate change on biological diversity. This submission draws on both the discussion note provided to the UNFCCC by the Executive Secretary of the CBD and a paper prepared for CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) 6, UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/6/11.

Australia is supportive of collaboration with the CBD and strongly encourages the involvement of both UNFCCC experts and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in such a process.

***Impact of climate change on biological diversity, and response measures***

Australia supports the CBD Conference of the Parties (COP 5) decision calling for collaboration with the UNFCCC in the development and implementation of a specific work plan on coral bleaching. Australia supports each of the areas proposed for examination in the discussion note, (ie. assessing the vulnerability of coral-reef species to global warming; predicting and monitoring the impacts of coral bleaching, developing response measures to coral bleaching and guidance to financial institutions to support such measures).

Australia is keen to avoid duplication of processes and work. We therefore seek clarification of the interaction between and potential duplication of the work proposed in the following three projects:

1. CBD SBSTTA in considering the impact of climate change and biological diversity,
2. the Forest Resource Assessment's consideration of climate change; and
3. the pilot assessment described in UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/6/11 Annex I.

Australia is supportive of the four possibilities for collaboration between the Convention on Biological Diversity and UNFCCC listed in the discussion note. However, Australia believes work on possible response mechanisms to climate change should be delayed until the eligible activities under Article 3.4 and the Clean Development Mechanism are finalised through decision making by the UNFCCC COP.

***Incentive measures and the integration of biodiversity considerations in the implementation of the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol.***

At CBD COP 5, SBSTTA was requested to prepare scientific advice in order to integrate biodiversity considerations in the implementation of the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol, in

collaboration with the appropriate bodies of the UNFCCC and IPCC where appropriate. It is unclear from UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/6/11 which aspect of the work program will address the preparation of this scientific advice.

Australia notes that the Executive Secretary's discussion note includes considerable focus on Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry and sinks activities. Australia is of the view that there are a range of other greenhouse mitigation activities that may have impacts on biodiversity. Australia encourages Parties to the CBD to broaden the scope of their consideration of climate change and biodiversity impacts to include activities in sectors other than land use, land use change and forestry.

Australia notes Table 1 of the Executive Secretary's discussion note. We query the value of the approach adopted in the Table, given the extent of qualification required to address the variety of national circumstances and vegetation diversity. At a minimum, the list of activities in the Table under Article 3.3 and 3.4 need to better reflect likely Kyoto Protocol requirements. The activities listed under Article 3.4 should reflect the current eligible activities being negotiated, ie forest management, crop land management, grazing land management and revegetation.

The Executive Secretary's note includes reference to potential for Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry activities to be screened for their contribution to sustainable development, including the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. Possible screening procedures identified were eligibility criteria, indicators, and impact assessment.

The Executive Secretary's note goes on to list a number of approaches to be considered:

- strategic environmental assessments;
- environmental impact assessments;
- procedures to ensure participation of stakeholder groups including indigenous and local communities in the assessment and decision making processes.

This list constitutes a useful starting point. However we consider that there may be other policy options that could be explored or developed. Australia is also of the view that the eligibility of specific projects should be left to each Party's discretion as to whether an activity is consistent with its national strategy on sustainable development.

### ***Work Program***

Both the Executive Secretary's discussion note prepared for the UNFCCC and UNEP/CDB/SBSTTA/6/11 make reference to proposed work programs. In addition to these work programs, integration of research on climate change into the work of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and the Forest Resources Assessment is proposed. Clarification of the scope, interaction and sequence of the proposed activities is required.

Australia recommends sufficient time is provided for parties to both Conventions to consider the outputs of each stage of the work program. UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/6/11 sets out short timeframes for completion of various elements of the work program. Australia notes the proposed scope of the program and is of the view that extending the timeframes will allow more detailed assessment to occur.

Care must be taken to ensure the sequence of activities allows for cooperation between CBD and UNFCCC, for UNFCCC and IPCC experts to be closely involved and that sufficient time is provided for UNFCCC parties to reflect on outputs in a sequential fashion.

***Expert Group***

Draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for a pilot assessment are included in the CBD SBSTTA paper. These suggest the establishment of an Expert Group. Australia supports the formation of an Expert Group as the mechanism for completing the work program as a whole, rather than overseeing only the pilot assessment. The Terms of Reference should specify the role of the Group, its scope and time lines for products and should be agreed by the CBD SBSTTA and provided to the UNFCCC for comment.

The draft ToR recommends the Group include experts from the CBD roster and IPCC scientists. Australia notes the full work program of the IPCC and suggests the IPCC be consulted as to when it can take part in the CBD processes. We also suggest that the UNFCCC be invited to nominate appropriate experts from the UNFCCC SBSTA roster to participate in the CBD experts group.

Australia believes the Expert Group should commence the pilot assessment with task 1(b) outlined in the ToR – identifying factors that influence the efficacy and reliability of different assemblages of organisms as carbon reservoirs and carbon sinks. As indicated above we also recommend delaying the pilot assessment's consideration of mitigation measures (1 (a) and (c)), until the eligible activities under Article 3.4 and the Clean Development Mechanism are finalised.

PAPER NO. 2: JAPAN

**COOPERATION WITH RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

Japan, herein, submits our views on issues identified in the discussion note prepared by the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Reference expressed here, therefore, is based on the expression noted in the “Note by the Executive Secretary of the Conference on Biological Diversity” (ES of CBD) submitted to the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, “Climate Change and Biological Diversity: Cooperation between the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.”

“The Impacts of Climate Change on Biological Diversity and Response Measures” (Section II of the Note by ES of CBD):

Japan believes that it is quite important to integrate biodiversity considerations into the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol.

Japan believes SBSTA of UNFCCC should first consider and decide whether IPCC should deal with the issue, “The Impacts of Climate Change on Biological Diversity and Response Measures.” If it is decided as such, it is essential for IPCC to consider and decide how the issue should be dealt with by IPCC in its overall activities. Based on this consideration, the IPCC should lay out a work plan that includes this issue. The work plan should define how CBD should participate in implementing the work plan.

“Incentive Measures and the Integration of Biodiversity Considerations in the Implementation of the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol” (Section III of the Note by ES of CBD):

Japan believes that actions for addressing climate change should take into account the aspects of biodiversity. In this regard, it is important that such issues, “incentive measures and the integration of biodiversity considerations,” will be deliberated under UNFCCC in the long run. We consider that Articles 3.3, 3.4, 6, and 12 of the Kyoto Protocol are particularly relevant to this issue.

Japan does not believe, however, that “screening according to agreed norms,” or international screening, as described in para.20 in the Note by ES of CBD is an appropriate approach. Given that whether an activity proposed in the context of climate change has any impacts on biodiversity may depend on the specific characteristics of each case, it does not seem feasible to agree on any international criteria for screening at this stage, including criteria for examination of CDM project activities by Operational Entities. Neither CBD nor UNFCCC have worked on this issue. Therefore, it is more feasible to leave such considerations to the parties at their own discretion, and each party should identify the necessary criteria for itself. The criteria used by each party could be reported under Article 7.2 of the Kyoto Protocol.

As for Article 12, a series of ITTO guidelines that have been already available, for example, can provide useful basis for consideration by host Parties.

For a specific view on Table 1 of the Note by ES of CBD, “Reduced tillage agriculture” should be placed in “Net neutral or uncertain” category. If this is to be placed in “positive” category, some restrictive description should be needed such as “Reduced tillage agriculture without increasing chemical application.” The reason is that “Reduced tillage” sometimes leads to increase of pesticide application which is not necessarily “positive” to biological diversity.

PAPER NO. 3: NORWAY

**CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY  
AND THE UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON  
CLIMATE CHANGE**

Norway welcomes this opportunity to address the potential and the need for cooperation between the two Rio 1992 conventions, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Our comments in the following are related to the note by the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, submitted to SBSTA at its 13<sup>th</sup> session.

We recognise the link between these two conventions for the same reasons as mentioned in the note. First of all Article 2 of the UNFCCC states that “the ultimate objective of this Convention (...) is stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system. Such a level should be achieved within a time-frame sufficient to allow ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change (...)” Furthermore, Article 2 of the Kyoto Protocol states that each Annex I Party shall implement and further elaborate policies and measures in accordance with its national circumstances such as protection and enhancement of sinks and reservoirs of greenhouse gases, taking into account its commitments under relevant international environmental agreements.

Global warming and loss of biodiversity are undoubtedly among the most serious environmental challenges we face today, and it is important that biodiversity concerns are taken into account in the implementation of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol. In this respect Norway sees the need for a closer cooperation between the two conventions and would support the establishment of channels for such cooperation. As we are approaching the implementation phase for the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, we should make sure that our efforts are consistent with the obligations of other multinational environmental agreements.

**The impact of climate change on biological diversity, and response measures**

In the note from the Executive Secretary of the CBD, coral bleaching and forest biological diversity are mentioned as two areas where biological diversity is threatened by climate change. This is also recognised in the recently approved IPCC report on impacts, adaptation and vulnerability (Working group II’s contribution to the Third Assessment Report). In the IPCC report it is stated that natural systems can be especially vulnerable to climate change because of limited adaptive capacity, and some of these systems may undergo significant and irreversible damage. Systems that are mentioned are *inter alia* coral reefs and tropical and boreal forests. The IPCC report further says that while some species may increase in abundance or range, climate change will increase existing risks of some more vulnerable species and loss of biodiversity.

Four areas where coordinated action between the two conventions might be explored are mentioned in the note from the Executive Secretary of the CBD (paragraph 8): Assessments of impacts of climate change on biological diversity and vulnerability of ecosystems, coordinated approaches to response measures, coordinated approaches to capacity building



and coordinated guidance to the GEF and other financial mechanisms. Norway agrees that these are areas where collaboration could be considered. As mentioned above, the IPCC is working on the two first areas, hence we suggest that their expertise be made use of in this work.

### **Incentive measures and consideration of biodiversity concerns in the implementation of the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol**

Consideration of biodiversity concerns are particularly relevant in the implementation of the articles in the Kyoto Protocol regarding sinks, that is Articles 3.3 and 3.4, as well as Article 6 (Joint Implementation) and possibly Article 12 (Clean Development Mechanism). We agree that there are possibilities for both positive and negative impacts on biological diversity from land-use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) activities and projects, as stated in the note from the Executive Secretary of the CBD.

Paragraph 15 of the note mentions that whether avoided deforestation is included as an activity is of particular interest from a biodiversity point of view, since conservation of natural forests has very positive impacts on biological diversity. We recognise these positive impacts. However, inclusion of avoided deforestation in Article 3.4 and Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol raises important methodological challenges which need to be solved, such as the questions of permanence, leakage and baseline setting.

In paragraph 20 of the note from the Executive Secretary, possible tools for the integration of biodiversity considerations in the implementation of the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol are listed. Norway would like to further explore the idea of screening LULUCF activities, including LULUCF projects, for their contribution to sustainable development, including the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, according to agreed norms. Application of indicators and criteria and/or impact assessments are among the approaches that could be considered. In Table I, likely impacts on biodiversity related to specific activities under Articles 3.3 and 3.4 are listed. We suggest that the use of tables/information like this be further explored.

### **The establishment of expert groups**

The note presented by the Executive Secretary of the CBD gives possible options for collaborative actions. The Norwegian government is aware of the fact that the COP5 of the CBD has requested further work aiming at facilitating integration of biodiversity considerations in the implementation of the UNFCCC. The establishment of close cooperation at expert level under the UNFCCC/SBSTA and the CBD/SBSTTA is one approach for practical collaboration between the two conventions that should be considered. Norway is, however, open for considering various possibilities for organizing collaborative action between the CBD and the UNFCCC, such as joint workshops and/or joint ad hoc expert groups.

PAPER NO. 4: SWEDEN  
(ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND ITS MEMBER STATES)

**VIEWS ON THE NOTE BY THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE  
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY SUBMITTED TO THE  
CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK  
CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE (UNFCCC) AT ITS SIXTH SESSION AND  
THE UNFCCC SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL  
ADVICE AT THE SECOND PART OF ITS THIRTEENTH SESSION THE HAGUE,  
13-24 NOVEMBER 2000.**

Sweden on behalf of the European Community and its member states thanks the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity for the note, which provides a valuable review of the synergies and potential conflicts as well as opportunities between the UNFCCC and the CBD. The European Community is party to both Conventions and supports their work towards achieving sustainable development.

**Interactions between conventions**

The note of the Executive Secretary gives examples of many possible interactions between biological diversity and climate change. These interactions can be the result of the change in climate itself or may be the consequence of mitigation and/or adaptation measures taken under the climate convention.

Climate change is a major threat to biodiversity and the EU notes that changes in biodiversity have socio-economic as well as ecological consequences and that both may be a threat to sustainable development. Climate change may also have major consequences for agricultural productivity inter alia through loss of genetic resources, loss of arable land and increased pest problems. In this regard, the EU also recognises the importance of traditional knowledge, innovations, and practices for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and access to genetic resources.

The impacts of climate change on biodiversity warrant that Parties implement policies and measures to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions in order to avoid negative consequences. In addition, the findings of IPCC TAR show that there is an increasing need for adaptation to climate change.

It is important to deal with these interactions so as to contribute to the objectives of the UNFCCC and the CBD as well as to those of the related agreements or organisations such as the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD), UN Forum on Forests (UNFF), the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and the Bonn Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) as these may also be affected.

This requires better understanding of the fundamental driving forces of ecosystem processes. More research is undoubtedly needed in fields such as vulnerability of different ecosystems, possibilities of improving the adaptive capacity, and the hydrological regime of complex landscapes under conditions of climate change.

## **LULUCF activities and biodiversity – impact assessments**

Many types of mitigation and adaptation measures have important implications for biological diversity including policies and measures in the agricultural and energy sector. However the note of the executive secretary focuses on Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) activities which, arguably, have the most direct interaction with biodiversity. The implementation of all sinks activities and any related definitions, methodologies or accounting rules need to be consistent with the protection of biological diversity. The EU considers that conservation and enhancement of biological diversity are essential for sustainable forest development.

Careful consideration is needed with respect to the CDM, given:

- i) the well known legal and methodological concerns that the EU has on this issue;
- ii) the possible negative as well as positive impacts on biodiversity and;
- iii) the absence of screening criteria as identified in paragraphs 17 and 18 of the note of the Executive Secretary of the CBD.

Table 1 of the note from the Executive Secretary of the CBD provides indications whether potential LULUCF activities are likely, overall, to have positive, negative or uncertain effects on biological diversity. The EU suggests that the indications be interpreted with great caution, as a clear categorisation of the impact of LULUCF activities on biodiversity is complex and difficult to make. In addition, Table 1 only looks at the effects on biodiversity whereas there is a need to assess activities that are mutually supportive to both conventions. While some activities may appear attractive from a biodiversity perspective, they may at the same time threaten the possibilities to meet the overall objective of the UNFCCC. In the note, avoided deforestation is presented as an activity that is very positive from a biodiversity perspective. From a climate perspective, however, the impact is highly uncertain due to large difficulties to ensure additionality and to avoid leakage<sup>1</sup>.

In general, to improve the positive interactions, it is important to evaluate any project or activity with regard to its overall environmental integrity and contribution to sustainable development. Some form of overall assessment will be necessary which takes into account the implications for greenhouse gas mitigation, adaptation to climate change as well as biodiversity considerations, socio-economic consequences, and CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration potential.

Voluntary forest certification, as a market driven tool, may help ensure that establishment and management of forest carbon sinks meets criteria, indicators and standards of sustainable forest management and thereby help demonstrate that forest products are derived from sustainably managed forests. These standards would include relevant social, economic and environmental aspects and focus on biodiversity.

---

<sup>1</sup> In Table 1 of the note avoided deforestation is presented as an activity under Article 3.3. This is not correct. Article 3.3 only covers net changes in carbon stock from afforestation, reforestation and deforestation since 1990

## **Integrated approach**

As the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Combating Desertification ultimately aim at sustainable development, it is important to have an integrated approach. Therefore the EU wants to underline the opportunities offered by the ecosystem approach of the CBD.

Besides the ecosystem approach, an integrated approach on common topics such as information sharing, capacity building and technology transfer, is necessary to improve the synergies between the three conventions, as well as with related bodies and processes such as the UNFF, the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and the CMS.

## **Conclusions**

The EU wishes to ensure the environmental integrity of the Kyoto Protocol, taking into account the overall framework on sustainable development. This suggests the need for better and continued dialogue and closer co-operation between UNFCCC, CBD and CCD bodies, as well as other forums, such as the UNFF.

In particular the EU:

- stresses the need for a sound scientific basis for LULUCF activities;
- believes that LULUCF activities under the Kyoto Protocol should be consistent with and supportive of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity;
- also believes that Parties should be asked to include, in their reports to the UNFCCC or the CBD, how LULUCF activities are consistent with the principles of the Convention on Biological Diversity and/or other related international agreements on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity to which they are Parties without duplication of reporting requirements;
- emphasises that any forest related decisions on definitions, methodologies and accounting rules for LULUCF activities under the Kyoto protocol should be consistent with sustainable forest management including the conservation of biological diversity;
- recognises the relevance of the ecosystem approach in taking into account the ecological and socio-economic aspects and using the ecosystem functions in order to adapt to or mitigate climate change;
- stresses the importance of policy tools such as EIA, Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Assessment when assessing activities undertaken with a view to tackling climate change, including LULUCF projects;
- believes that, when carrying out impact assessments, the loss of biodiversity and the interrelated socio-economic, cultural, and human health aspects relevant to biological diversity should be fully taken into account;

- welcomes the proposal on potential areas of collaboration and co-ordinated actions, as mentioned by the Executive Secretary of the CBD, between the CBD and the UNFCCC for integrating biodiversity concerns into the implementation of the UNFCCC and its Kyoto protocol and in this respect wishes to highlight;

- i) The impacts of climate change on biological diversity, and the vulnerability and adaptability of the components of biological diversity and ecosystems to climate change;
- ii) The potential impact on biological diversity of mitigation measures and the identification of potential mitigation measures that also contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity;
- iii) The potential for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity to contribute to adaptation measures taken under the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol on biological diversity.

-notes that the Conference of the Parties to the CBD has requested SBSTTA<sup>2</sup> to consider, before the sixth meeting of the Parties to the CBD convention, where appropriate and feasible in collaboration with the appropriate bodies of the UNFCCC and the IPCC, the impact of climate change on forest biological diversity. In this context the EU intends to propose that the SBSTA<sup>3</sup> takes necessary action so as to facilitate such collaboration;

-encourages the SBSTA to work closely together with the biodiversity bodies with the help of the IPCC to provide scientific information to help to improve positive connections between climate change and biodiversity while avoiding negative impacts;

-stresses the need for co-ordination of policy development also at the national level;

- considers proposing to the SBSTA to ask the UNFCCC secretariat to undertake the necessary preparations in collaboration with the executive secretary of the UNFCCC to convene a joint workshop subsequent to SBSTA 15, which should further explore adequate means for extended co-operation and collaborative action between the two conventions.

- - - - -

---

<sup>2</sup> SBSTTA is the CBD's Subsidiary Body for Scientific, Technological and Technical Advice

<sup>3</sup> SBSTA is the UNFCCC's Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice